Niger Delta Militancy and Boko Haram Insurgency: National Security in Nigeria

Ogbonnaya, Ufiem Maurice
Ehigiamusoe, Uyi Kizito
National Institute for Legislative Studies
National Assembly, Research Division
Abuja, Nigeria
godscourt24@yahoo.com

Abstract

The state system as was designed by the Westphalia Treaty of 1648 is meant to function on the dual principles of sovereignty and territoriality - "centralized political units conceived in territorial terms and subject to no superior authority." Another core attribute of the state apart from sovereignty and territorial authority, is the monopoly on the exercise of force or the use of instrument of violence. But globalization in its current form and dimension has developed on the questioning of these attributes of the state with the emergence of international terrorism and international violent ideological groups that have developed military and strategic arsenals that threaten the security of nation-states and their citizens. With particular focus on Nigeria, this study seeks to examine the security challenges posed to nation-states by these "violent non-state actors" such as Boko Haram and Niger Delta Militancy in international politics, especially since the September 11, 2001 bombing of the World Trade Centre in the United States. The study adopted descriptive and analytical approaches and discovered that these two terrorist groups have not only challenged the security of the Nigerian state but also threatened its unity, territoriality and sovereignty. The study therefore recommends a thorough understanding of the operational methodologies of all terrorist groups by policy makers and a global agreement/ cooperation to be reached among states and those that act on their behalf towards curtailing international terrorism with a view to ensuring global security.

Key words: National Security, International Terrorism, Globalization, Niger Delta Militancy, Boko Haram Insurgency

Introduction

One of the fundamental responsibilities of the state is to ensure the security of the life and property of its citizens. Others include the protection of its territoriality and sovereignty and the guarantee of its socio-economic and political stability. However, this protective function of the state has been threatened by local and international terrorism and terrorism-related activities. This threat has been exemplified by the September 11, 2001 bombing of the World Trade Centre (WTC) in the United States by the Al-Qaeda terrorist network, other attacks in Spain and Great Britain (Duru and Ogbonnaya, 2010). In Nigeria, incidences of kidnapping, hostage-taking and militancy in the Niger Delta region and the Boko Haram insurgency in the Northern states are cases in point. In Somali, the operations of religious fundamentalists and ethnic militia groups aided by international terrorist groups have crippled governmental operations and state functions.

In Mali, ethnic Tuareg fighters aided by foreign terrorist groups have stoked a simmering rebellion, and the consequent Malian coup d'état (Raghavan, 2011; CNN. 3 June 2012). Consequently, the pursuit of the protection of national security, territorial authority and sovereignty of nation-states by state actors has been on the ascendancy assuming a global dimension. The reason is that international and local terrorism have been recognized as potent threats to the security and sovereignty of nation-states and their citizens. Though international terrorism dates back to 1945, the period immediately after the World War II, its contemporary form and dimension has been engendered by the process of globalization. With the aid of globalization, terrorist groups and organizations have become powerful national security challengers which the nation-states in most cases are not adequately prepared to encounter (William, 2008; Aydinli, 2006).

Using Nigeria as a focus, this paper seeks to examine the security challenge posed by the militancy in the Niger Delta region and the Boko Haram insurgency in the Northern states to the Nigerian state. It also aims at making policy recommendations and proffering sustainable solutions that will ensure national security in Nigeria.

Conceptual Framework

A most rewarding approach to this presentation is to situate certain leading and basic concepts in their correct and critical perspectives by way of conceptual and contextual definitions analysis in order to justify what direction(s) our argument here will lead to. Thus, concepts such as security, national security, State, globalization and terrorism will be clarified. Thus, while security denotes a situation which provides national and international conditions favourable to the protection of a nation, state, and its citizens against existing and potential threats, national security traditionally is understood as "the acquisition, deployment and use of military force to achieve national goals" (Held, 1998:226). In the contemporary political and scholarly discourse however, the concept of national security cuts across many disciplines covering military protection, surveillance, protection of national values and human rights. According to Romm (1993), a nation is said to be secured when it does not have to sacrifice its legitimate interest to avoid war, and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by war. It has also been defined as the absence of threats to acquired values and the absence of fear that such values will be attacked. Implicitly therefore, national security is the ability of a nation to preserve its internal values from external threats (Romm, 1993).

Epistemologically, the term 'state' is derived from the Italian word, "lo stato", coined by Niccolo Machiavelli to describe the whole of the social hierarchy that governed and ruled a country. But over the years, the term has come to acquire more complex and sophisticated meanings. According to Rasmussen (2001:3), the world 'state' means "the supreme legitimate authority entrusted with the exercise of violent force over a group of people." Conspicuously absent from this definition is the concept of territorial authority, yet the legitimacy and jurisdictional authority of states is tied so intimately to this attribute that it cannot be ignored. This shortcoming notwithstanding, the above definition has a conceptual utility having clearly pointed out one of the core attributes of the state with which we are concerned here; "exercise of violent force over a group of people."

In a more specific way, Ekanem (2001:55) operationalizes the state as follows; "A state is a permanent specialized organization of men armed with rules and means of coercion for maintaining order over a population in a defined territory over which this organization exercise power." Embodied in this definition are the major attributes and characteristics of the

state such as sovereignty, territorial authority, population, government and most importantly, the monopoly of use of instruments of force or violence. Above all, the definition draws out the intricate relationship between the state and government.

Terrorism which is a dimension of insecurity is defined by the United States Law Code – the law that governs the entire country, to mean "premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against non-combatant targets by sub-national groups or clandestine agents." Drawing from the same source, international terrorism refers to terrorism involving citizens or the territory of more than one country (U.S. Code Title 22, ch.38, para. 2656f(d)). This is to say that international terrorism refers to those acts in which the terrorists cross national frontiers and carry out attacks, or attack foreign targets at home such as bombing embassies, or hijacking air or sea liners (Lesser, 1999:6).

Globalization is a typical social science concept, so easy to use but so difficult to define in such a way that it can ensure in-controvertible acceptance. It was in recognition of this fact that Clark (1997:6) asserts that "the utility of 'globalization' as a theoretical concept is in dispute." Asobie (2001:37) agrees with Clark. According to him, "globalization is a contested concept. Its meaning is in contention. Its character is a point in dispute. Its history is mired in controversy." However, the "controversy" and "dispute" surrounding the definition and meaning of globalization arise from the fact that scholars and policy makers who write, do so from different disciplinary backgrounds as scholars and stand points as international actors.

Be that as it may, this paper asserts in line with Mittelman (2000:6) that globalization means a historical transformation in the economy of livelihoods and modes of existence; in politics, a loss in the degree of control exercised such that the locus of power gradually shifts in varying proportions above and below the territorial state; and in culture, a devaluation of a collectivity's achievements or perceptions of them. It can thus be concluded that globalization is a broad process permeating the whole world, with far – reaching ramifications covering economic, political and cultural dimensions of contemporary life (Ibrahim, 2002:2).

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

The concepts of security and insecurity are typical social science concepts that appear principally in the literature of social psychology, sociology, political science and allied subjects. In the frame work of political science, the concept of security according to Bar-Tal and Jacobson (1998) denotes a situation which provides national and international conditions favorable to the protection of a nation, state, and its citizens against existing and potential threats. The socio-psychological conceptual framework of security on the other hand, acknowledges the military, political, economic and cultural conditions which play an important role in creating situations of security. Specifically, however, the situation of security assures a survival of a state, its territorial integrity, repulsion of a military attack, defense and protection of citizens' life and property, protection of economic welfare and social stability (Haftendorn, 1991).

Analysts have examined the problem of insecurity generally from various perspectives. Cameron and McCormic (1954) have pointed out nine different sources of insecurity, namely; insecurity as emotional response to sudden external threats from within; and insecurity from a relatively constant threatening external situation; insecurity due to threat from within; and insecurity as a function of beliefs, especially religious; etc. these categories of insecurity are believed to be caused by "frustration and neurosis" (Cameron and McCormic (1954:559). This classification notwithstanding, Cameron and McCormic's work contains little of what can be

regarded as empirical research on insecurity. This is because the work is filled with speculations without empirical evidences. Also, issues raised are not exhaustively discussed.

Bar-Tal and Jacobson (1998) have also examined issues of security and insecurity. Using the security challenges in Israel as a case study, they specifically concerned themselves with approaches and methods of dealing with security situations. Thus, two main approaches to security studies were indentified, namely, political and socio-psychological approaches. According to the political approach, security is an essential precondition of an ordered existence for an individual and societal system. Here, individuals and collectives must have a secured environment which allows them to pursue their goals without being subjected to threats. The argument of this approach is that, it is the role of the state to provide security to its citizens, both on internal and external levels. On the domestic level, the state has to create economic, societal, cultural, environmental, and educational conditions which assure life to its citizens. On the international level, the state has to defend the citizens against possible harm from external forces (Buzan, 1991). Thus, this approach is concerned with military alliances, and foreign policy. Comprehensive as this approach may be, it neglects the economic, societal, cultural and psychological issues which are imperative to the study of security. The socio-psychological approach on the other hand, argues that people as individuals and/or as group members (e.g., members of economic groups, nations) experience security, or insecurity, with regard to own personal life and/or with regard to their collective entity and its systems. Security thus, is a psychological experience. Generally, however, the paper did not explain, using both approaches to the study of security, what primarily causes insecurity in any given society.

In a recent study, Eriksen, Bal and Salemink (2010), examined security and insecurity from an anthropological perspective. Here, attempts were made to conceptualize insecurity from the perspective of social and human security. However, the major flaw of the paper is that it did not contextualize insecurity. In other words, the study did not locate insecurity within a given geographical environment or location.

With particular reference to Nigeria, Okonkwo (2009) has catalogued a history of conflicts and insecurity in Nigeria since independence in 1960. Here, the conflicts which result in insecurity are traced to the colonialists creating antagonistic ruling class along ethnic and religious line. Thus, the northern part of Nigeria has had a long history of security challenges, communal and ethno-religious crises. For example, in Plateau State, there have been many outbreaks of bloody violence between different communities since the return to democracy in 1999. There have also been riots in urban centers of Kaduna and Kano, and for several decades there has been simmering conflict in the Tafewa Balewa district of Bauchi (Walker, 2012). According to Walker (2012) and Azizi (2012), when viewed from outside, it does seem that these conflicts boil down to religious differences, tensions between blocs of Muslim and Christian inhabitants. But on a closer consideration, one finds that politics – more precisely, control of government patronage – is the primary cause of many of these conflicts. However, the Boko Haram insurgency which surfaced in 2009 with bombing attacks and killings which as at last count, have left over 16,000 Policemen, soldiers and civilians including politicians dead (Nigerian Crime News, May 31, 2011; UNCIRF, 2012) remains one of the recent terrorist-related dimensions to security challenges facing Nigeria.

The Jamaatul Alissuma lid da a wa wal Jihad, otherwise known as Boko Haram rebellion started in Bauchi state on July 26, 2009 and has since spread to other parts of Nigeria especially in the northern part. The group has since 2009 existed with known preferences in religious belief and social practices. But as Eso (2011) has observed, "the root causes of resort to violence and

criminality in order to influence public policy is rather deep-seated and beyond the sectarian." This is because the attacks of the group have been targeted or directed at the State, its institutions, and the civilian populations. Several police stations including the Force Headquarters in Abuja, army barracks, schools, government establishments and places of worship have been attacked in several states of the Federation. But the attack on the UN office in Abuja in 2011 was, according to Eso (2011), "a game-changer with new dynamics, far reaching and imponderable reverberations that dramatically altered the scope, intensity, and focus of Boko Haram's Voilence and mission, as well as any consideration of sect." Thus, some analysts have argued that the Boko Haram induced security crisis in the north is more religious than political.

Those who argue along this line submit that beginning from 1987 to the controversial introduction of Sharia penal system by some States in the north in 2000, some political leaders have laid the foundation for extremist sects to emerge through religious manipulation which coupled with widespread illiteracy, poverty and a weak leadership, has since allowed a terrorist group like Boko Haram to emerge (Harrington, 2012; Punch Editorial, February 19, 2012). Others have argued that the current insecurity is worsened or aided by the high level of poverty in that region in particular and Nigeria in general (Awonyemi, 2012). According to Awoyemi (2012), "…the Boko Haram phenomenon has a deep economic root more than any other perspectives from which the investigating intelligence can suggest." These realities are much more obvious in rural areas. A factual indicator is the result of the Harmonized Nigeria Living Standard Survey published by the National Bureau of Statistics in 2012 which showed that the North scored badly and accounted for the large proportion of Nigerians living in poverty. Another analyst who has urged along this perspective is Jonnie Carson, US Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs. According to him, "religion is not driving extremist violence either in Jos or northern Nigeria" (Harrington, 2012). Others have contended that violence in the north is orchestrated by the betrayal of peoples trust in government. According to Mr. Terence McCulley (the US Ambassador to Nigeria), the betrayal of people by the governments and the low level of government presence provided criminals and terrorists a platform to launch insurrection being witnessed across northern Nigeria (Benjamin, Ogunmola, Joseph and Ibrahim, 2012). Be that as it may, the major focus of this paper was to examine the impact of insecurity on the socio-economic development of northern states.

Globalization as Force Multiplier of International Terrorism

Multiplication of actors in international relations is one of the recent trends in the development of contemporary international politics especially in the twenty – first century. These actors are classified into state and non-state actors. Among the non-state actors in international politics are international terrorist groups or as Williams (2008) would describe them; "violent non-state actors." All non-state actors in international politics whether violent or not, have many features and characteristics in common that enable them to initiate, participate and, often, influence the outcome of international relations. One of the major characteristics of these non-state actors is that they espouse and promote ideas, beliefs and courses of action whose impacts cut across several independent and sovereign states. Thus, whether it is the international working class ideology of Marx, Charismatic Catholicism, or ethnic minorities such as the Ogonis of Nigeria and native Indians of the Amazon forest or Boko Haram and Al-Qaeda terrorist networks, these movements have become recognized and are increasingly gaining global relevance and significance.

Though a television documentary series, "International Terrorism Since 1945", shown on U.K. TV History and British Broadcasting Corporation Knowledge (BBCK) since January 5, 2009, has depicted a history of some major and minor terrorist groups since World War II and their activities, a number of scholars (Williams, 2008; Negroponte, 2006; Agbu, 2004; and Ampatuam, 2003), have successfully established a nexus between the emergence and growth of modern international terrorism and globalization especially in the twenty-first century.

According to Williams (2008), although terrorism has a long historical background, an important factor in the understanding of the rise of Violent Non-State Actors (VNSAs), since the events of September 11, 2001, is globalization. Williams submits that not only has globalization challenged individual state's capacity to manage economic affairs, it has provided facilitators and force multipliers for VNSAs. According to him, global flow of arms, for example is no longer under the exclusive control of nation-states. Illicit arm dealers have become transnational players and have contributed to a diffusion of military power that has provided VNSAs with weapon capabilities that allow them to challenge government forces. In a similar vein, globalization has allowed Violent Non-State Actors to develop transnational social capital and to create alliance and generate support outside their immediate area of operations. Globalization, along with the rise of illicit global economy has also provided funding opportunities for Violent Non-State Actors and other terrorist groups generally.

In 2006, John Negroponte, then Director of U.S. National Intelligence wrote thus; "The 21st century is less dangerous than the 20th century in certain respects, but more dangerous in others. Globalization, particularly of technologies that can be used to produce weapons of mass destruction (WMD), has led to the spread of jihadist movements, and of course, the horrific events of September 11, 2001" (Negroponte, 2006:1, 2). In a similar vein, Agbu (2004) submits that one of the major features of the current conjecture in international politics and international security is the appearance of international terrorism in a more deadly and impersonal fashion. Establishing a relationship between international terrorism and globalization, Agbu (2004:324) states that; "Globalization, which has enabled the brand of international terrorism as at present, generally implies the integration of countries into the world economy through increased trade, investment, short-term capital flows and international migration of skilled and unskilled labour."

Also, Ampatuam (2003:1) submits that while globalization has brought unprecedented development and progress to people, it has also unleashed negative aspects such as "facilitating international terrorism and other forms of transnational crimes." According to him, transnational terrorism is a global phenomenon which is seen as one of the most destructive. The September 11, 2001 attacks on the United States of America illustrate the lethality of this threat.

Nigeria's National Security Framework

National security has been one of the key interests in the studies of international relations and strategic studies. Generally, definitions of national security have been about the protection states and their citizens from threats and dangers and the ability to preserve core values (Yong, 2011). In Nigeria's context, national security is concerned with protecting the lives and property of Nigerians, preserving her sovereignty, territoriality and its economy, and enhancing socio-cultural and political harmony. To achieve these objectives, the concept of total security was adopted for Nigeria's defence and security by the Federal Government. Total security comprises three elements – Total Defence, Diplomacy and Internal Security. Total Defence is the cornerstone of Nigeria's deterrence strategy. It provides the framework for a comprehensive and integrated response to deal with all kinds of threats and challenges including global terrorism,

national security crisis like Boko Haram and the Niger Delta militancy, and economic crisis. The following key sectors of the society – Military, Civil, Economic, Social and Psychological Defence, form the core interest areas of Nigeria's national security. Responsive Defence aims at uniting all relevant government agencies, private sector organizations and all Nigerians in the defence of the country. With the above it is expected that, any potential aggressor who takes on the Nigeria Armed Forces (NAF) would have to face the formidable task of taking on all Nigerians (Bassey and Dokubo, 2011). It has however, been argued that total defence, diplomacy and deterrence, as national defence and security policies, are insufficient to ensure the security of Nigerian state and ineffective in achieving the national security goals.

Other security analysts have contended that the current security challenges confronting the Nigeria state is capable of making the country porous for internal and external subversion and insurrection. Thus, they have called for more stringent security measures and policies rather than being saddled with peace-keeping operations in other countries while lacking the ability to deal with internal security crisis, conflicts and tensions. Finally, these analysts have submitted that current national defense budget and policy should be properly channeled towards economic, social and political development (Dixon, 2012; Azazi, 2012).

Theoretical Framework

This work utilized the Instrumental Theory of terrorism or violence. This is because, apart from its ability to explain the organizational structure of a terrorist group such as Boko Haram, the theory adequately captures and explains the whole gamut of explanatory variables and the dynamics that inform the reasons why terrorists operate and their methodology of operation. The Instrumental Theory of terrorism is associated with scholars such as Martha Crenshaw (1985), Richard Betts (1982), and Edward Mickolus (1976). It is premised on the assertion that the act of terrorism is a deliberate choice by a political actor and that the organization, as a unit, acts to achieve collective values, which involve radical changes in political and social conditions (Crenshaw, 1985:13). Here, terrorism is interpreted as a response to external stimuli, particularly government actions. The major thrust or basic assumption of this theory is that violence is intentional. Terrorism is a means to a political end. Schelling (1966) suggests that terrorism is one form of violent coercion, a bargaining process based on the power to hurt and intimidate as a substitute for the use of overt military force. As such it is similar to other strategies based on the power to hurt rather than conventional military strength. Within this context, terrorism is meant to produce a change in the government's political position, not the destruction of military potential. The theory also submits that non-state organizations using terrorism is assumed to act on the basis of calculation of the benefit or value to be gained from an action, the cost of the attempt and of its failure, the consequences of inaction, or the probability of success. According to Betts (1982), terrorist actions may occur for several reasons; the value sought for is overwhelmingly important; costs of trying are low; the status quo is intolerable; or the probability of succeeding (even at high cost) is high. Thus, terrorists may act out of anticipation of reward or out of desperation, in response to opportunity or to threat. This strategic perspective, according to Betts (1982), is a conceptual foundation for the analysis of surprise attacks. Thus, he concludes that terrorism is par excellence a strategy of surprise, necessary for small groups who must thereby compensate for weakness in numbers and destructive capability.

Applied within the context of Nigeria's security challenges, the Boko Haram Islamic sect believes that politics in northern Nigeria has been seized by a group of corrupt, false Muslims and thus seeks to wage a war against them, and the Federal Republic of Nigeria generally, to create a "pure" Islamic state ruled by Sharia law. Since August 2011 Boko Haram has planted bombs almost weekly in public places or in churches in Nigeria's north east region in particular and the north in general. The group has also broadened its targets to include setting fire to schools. In March 2012, some twelve public schools in Maiduguri were burned down during the night, and as many as 10,000 pupils were forced out of education (Walker, 2012).

Though the theory explicitly explained the organizational structure of terrorist group like Boko Harram, the variables and dynamics that inform the reasons why they operate and their method of operations, using the same theoretical framework, it becomes difficult to establish any link between the operations of Boko Harram and the socio-economic activities of northern Nigeria.

National Security Challenges in Nigeria

The long years of neglect and deprivation, coupled with insensitivity of successive governments and the oil companies, had by the late 1990s created a volatile atmosphere characterized by protests, agitations and conflicts. According to Azigbo (2008:18), the restiveness which started on a mild not as pockets of peaceful demonstrations to the offices of multinational oil companies by community development committees of various host communities, soon degenerated into lock-ins and seizures of oil installations. By 1998, the Niger Delta region had become "a lawless zone, where youths disrupted oil production activities and communities frequently engaged with little provocation, in destructive inter-and intra-community strife (NDDC, 2004)."

The crises in the Niger Delta manifests in various ways namely, militancy, hostage taking and kidnapping of oil workers and frequent disruption of oil production activities through the destruction of oil and gas installations and facilities.

Prominent among the militant groups operating in the region are the Movement for the Emancipation of the Niger Delta (MEND) led by Henry Okah, the Niger Delta People's Volunteer Force (NDPVF) led by Alhaji Asari Dokubo, the Niger Delta Vigilante force (NDVF) led by Ateke Tom, the Bush Boys, the Martyrs Brigade among others. These militant groups have carried out deadly and paralyzing attacks on oil and gas facilities with their weapons. For instance, on March 16, 2003, Shell Petroleum Development Corporation (SPDC), Nigeria's biggest oil producing company, evacuated non-essential staff from its facilities in Warri, Delta State, and shut down oil production, following a mouth of mounting unrest by ethnic Ijaw militant groups that culminated in an attack on the Nigerian Navy on the Escravos River that left seven people dead, several soldiers wounded, and significantly disrupted riverine travel. Subsequently attacks by militants killed one Chevron contract worker and five TotalFinalElf (IFE) personnel, while gunfire badly damaged a shell helicopter seeking to evacuate employees (Cesarz, Morrison and Cooke, 2003:1). On July 12, 2006, the Movement for the Emancipation of the Niger Delta (MEND) combatants killed four naval personnel and injured three soldiers who were escorting a Chevron oil tanker along Chomoni creeks in the Warri South West Local Government Area of Delta State (The Punch, July 13, 2006). On the eve of the Governorship and House of Assembly elections on April 14, 2007, armed militants attacked the Mini-Okoro, Elelenwo Police Stations, killing many police officers during the attack (The Midweek

Telegraph, April 18 – 24, 2007). On Tuesday, January 1, 2008, the Niger Delta Vigilante Force (NDVF) led by Ateke Tom attacked two Police Stations and a five star hotel in Port Harcourt. The list of attacks is long and seemingly endless. The latest being the bomb blast on Eagle Square in Abuja on October 1, 2010 caused by MEND.

Hostage taking and kidnapping are other operational activities of militant groups in the region. A recent statistics released by Niger Delta Development Monitoring and Corporate Watch (NIDDEMCOW), a non-governmental organization, shows that between 1999 and 2007, a total of 308 hostage taking incidents occurred in the region (see the Tide, Tuesday, July 10, 2007). A breakdown of this record shows that Bayelsa State was on the lead with 131 incidents. Rivers State had 113; Delta State 45, while Akwa Ibom had the least record of 15. The record further shows that in 2003, 18 oil workers were taken hostage in Bayelsa, in 2004, 5 hostages, 39 in 2006 while between January and June, 2007 69 people were taken hostage, out of which 50 were soldiers. Within the period under review, Rivers State recorded 2 incidents in 1999, one in 2005, 55 in 2006 and 60 as at June, 2007, with 26 soldiers, 1 woman and a three year-old child involved. Unfortunately, the situation has since then deteriorated and the spate of militancy, hostage taking and kidnapping incidents have increased in scope and tempo covering virtually all the oil producing states of Nigeria.

The dexterity with which the militants operate coupled with the sophisticated nature of their weapons have defiled all curbing measures and raised questions such as the source of the militants' weapons and where and how they receive the military experience and training.

Be that as it may, the issue at stake in all cases is the demand by the armed militant groups for greater autonomy and control of the oil resources in the Niger Delta region, equitable distribution of the benefits of oil mineral exploitation, justice and the development of the region though some analysts have asserted that militancy in the region has assumed some criminal dimension rather than the legitimate struggle for the emancipation of the region.

Boko Haram Insurgency

While the security challenge thrown up by the crisis in the Niger Delta was being contained, the Boko Haram insurgency surfaced with bombing attacks and killings which as at the last count, have left over 16,000 policemen, soldiers and civilians including politicians dead (Nigerian Crime News, May 31, 2011).

The Jamaatul Alissunna lid da a wa wal Jihad, otherwise known as Boko Haram rebellion started in Bauchi State on July 26, 2009 and has since then spread to other parts of Nigeria especially the Northern part. The group has since 2009 existed with known preferences in religious belief and social practices. But as Eso (2011) has observed, "the root causes of resort to violence and criminality in order to influence public policy is rather deep-seated and beyond the sectarian." This is because the attacks of the group have been targeted or directed at the State, its institutions, and the civilian populations. Several police stations including the Force Headquarters in Abuja, army barracks, schools, government establishments and places of worship have been attacked in several states of the Federation. But the attack on the UN Office in Abuja in 2011 was, according to Eso (2011), "a game-changer replete with new dynamics, far reaching and imponderable reverberations that dramatically altered the scope, intensity, and focus of Boko Haram's violence and mission, as well as any consideration of sect."

Currently, the North-Eastern states of Nigeria (Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe) with a population of 18,971,965 inhabitants and other major northern cities such as

Jos, Kaduna, Kano and Madalla (in Niger State), have become the epicentre of Nigeria's terrorism related violence. Incidences of suicide bombings, killings and destruction have occurred in these areas since 2009. This has resulted in the loss of thousands of lives, extensive damage to property, and the socio-economic development prospects of the region have been set back.

The security challenge posed by the emergence of these terrorist groups (Niger Delta Militants and the Boko Haram insurgents) is enormous. Drawing examples from the Niger Delta militancy and the Boko Haram insurgency in Nigeria, we can reasonably infer that what these terrorist groups represent in terms of the global potential and feasibility for non-state actors as security challengers with destructive capabilities rivaling those of the state is alarming. This is because their modus operandi has defiled national security mechanism and the strategic dexterity with which they operate coupled with the sophisticated nature of their weapons have raised such questions as to the source of their military training and experience, weapon system and general logistics making some analysts to have them linked to other international terrorist groups like Al-Qaeda.

Unfortunately, the Nigerian State and its security institutions have not lived up to their bidding in handling these challenges. Just like the Niger Delta militancy, the ascendancy of Boko Haram was facilitated by the paradox of sectional indifference. Just like the North cared little about the Niger Delta violence and the scourge of kidnapping it wrought until now, the rest of the Nigerian nation cared very little about the rise of Boko Haram. As far as they were concerned, it was purely and totally a Northern problem. This attitude unwittingly slipped into the policymaking realm and the overall lackluster response to Boko Haram until it got out of control. This brings to the fore, the fact that inspite of what has been done to move our security agencies forward, a lot more still need to be done.

In Nigeria, the two most recent terrorist challenges to national security have been the Niger Delta militancy and the Boko Haram insurgency. These two terrorist groups have not only challenged the security of the Nigerian state but also its unity, territoriality and sovereignty. How did we get to this terrible state and how do these terrorists groups operate?

Conclusion and Policy Recommendations

Be that as it may, the responses of nation-states since September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States shows that in the post-sovereign globalized world, states remain important agents of security (Karacasulu, 2006:1). Though international terrorism poses a threat to the protective capabilities of states, security operatives of states and their mutually created global and regional organizations have not disappeared, nor have they ceded place completely to these violent non-state actors and entities. Rather, as international terrorism, beginning with the September 11, 2001 bombing of the World Trade Centre in New York, USA, and other attacks in Spain and Great Britain, emphasized the vulnerability of international frontiers, and thereby called attention to the obsolescence of the territorial state as the basis of both individual and group security, the nation-states have woken up with stricter measures at national frontiers and the entry points, all reminiscent of the era of the early phase in the rise of the modern state system.

Scholars such as Remo (2007), Klarevas (2004), and de Wijk (2002) have argued that the nature of threat posed by international terrorism does not only render traditional national security arrangements of nation-states inadequate to respond to the threat, but also in many respects have

diminished state control and augmented and empowered the terrorist groups. This challenge to the dominance of the Westphalia state in international politics has become more prevalent as the state itself has become increasingly deficient. This deficiency of the state was succinctly captured by Jayantha Dhanapala, a former United Nations Under-Secretary General for Disarmament Affairs who on April 2, 2001 wrote that;

> In an age of total war, of instant communications and fast cheap travel, the nation state has appeared to many observers as a quaint, even dangerous anachronism. Modern technology has rendered the nation-state obsolete as a principle of political organization, for the nation-state is no longer able to perform what is the elementary function of any political organization: to protect the lives of its members and their way of life. The modern technologies of transportation, communications, and warfare and the resultant feasibility of all-out atomic war, have completely destroyed this protective function of the state (Dhanapala, 2001: 6).

The implication of the relative or absolute decline of the state is that;

1) The Nigerian state and those involved in national and international security policymaking should study and thoroughly understand the operational methodologies and instruments of these terrorist organizations and the threats from them;
2) There is the urgent need for a complete and total overhauling of the security institutions of the Nigerian state to meet the current security challenges confronting the state. This will entail adequate training, funding and equipping of these security institutions;
3) Global agreements must be reached among states and their governments for cooperation in various areas in order to curtail international crime and terrorism and reduce global insecurity and poverty and also bridge socio-economic inequalities which in most cases result in aggressive behaviours among the less privileged as exemplified by the Niger Delta militancy and Boko Haram insurgency.

References

Agbu, O. (2004), Globalization and International Terrorism: The Challenges for Nigeria's Foreign Policy. In B. A. Akinterinwa (Ed). Nigeria's New Foreign Policy Thrust: Essays in Honour of Ambassador Oluyemi Adeniyi. Ibadan: Vantage Publishers, pp. 323-339.

Ampatuam, T. P. (2003), Terrorism and Nation – State Institutions: Actions and Inter-actions. Retrieved on March 16, 2009 from www.pvtr.org/pdf/GlobalAnalysis/Nation-States%20institutions.pdf

Asobie, H. A. (2001), Globalization: A View from the South, Annals of the Social Science Academy of Nigeria, 13, 36-56.

Awoyemi, O. (2012), Revenue Allocation, Insecurity and Poverty in Northern Nigeria. Retrieved on 5th July, 2012 from www.proshareng.com/news/16703

Aydinli, E. (2006), Globalization, Security and Non-State Actors. Papers presented to the GW Centre for the Study of Globalization. Retrieved on December 19, 2008 from http://gstudynet.org/what/events/gweek/spring06/globalization.php

Azazi, O. A. (2012), Northern Nigeria, the Prosperity Agenda and National Security. A paper presented at the Northern Transformation Impact Submit sponsored by Arewa Transformation and Empowerment Initiative at the Arewa House, Kaduna, Kaduna State on May 10 – 12

Azigbo, O. (2008), Paying Lip Service to Niger Delta Development, Vanguard Monday, February 18 P. 18.

Bassey, C. O and Dokubo, C. Q. (2011), Defence Policy of Nigeria: Capability and Context, A Reader, Indiana: Authorhouse

Bar-Tar, D and Jacobson, D. (1998), Psychological Perspective on Security, Applied Psychology: An International Review 47, No. 1: 59-71

Benjamin, I, Ogunmola, T, Joseph, M. and Ibrahim, S. (2012), Government Betrayal Root Cause of Violence – US Ambassador, Leadership, Friday, July 6

Betts, R. K. (1982), Surprise Attack: Lessons for Defense Planning. Washington D. C: Brookings

Buzan, B. (1991), New Patterns of Global Security in the Twenty-First Century, International Affairs, 67(3), 431-451

Cameron, W. B. & T. C. McCormick (1954), Concepts of Security and Insecurity, American Journal of Sociology, 59(6), 556-564

Clark, I. C. (1997), Globalization and Fragmentation: International Relations in the Twentieth, Oxford: University Press

Crenshaw, M. (1985), Theories of Terrorism: Instrumental and Organizational Approaches. A paper presented at the Defense Nuclear Agency's 10th Annual symposium on the Role of the Behavioural Sciences in Physical Security, April. Retrieved from www.psci.edu/jbook/crenshaw.pdf.

De Wijk, R. (2002), The Limits of Military Power. In Howard, P. (Ed.) Defeating Terrorism, New York: McGraw – Hill

Dhanapala, J. (2001), Globalization and the Nation State, Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy. Retrieved on December 19, 2008 from www.globalpolicy.org/nations/future/2003/0530blob.htm

Dixon, H. (2012), The Ingenuity Gap: Facing the Economic, Environmental and other Challenges of an Increasingly Complex and Unpredictable Future. New York: Vintage Books.

Duru, E. J. C and Ogbonnaya, U. M. (2010), Globalization, International Security and National Security Challenges, Kogi Journal of Politics, 1(1), 1 – 9.

Ekanem, O. (2001), The Dialectics of Instability and Underdevelopment in Africa, Calabar Journal of Politics and Administration, 1(2), 52 – 66.

Eriksen, T. H, Bal, E, and Salemink, O. (2010), A World of Insecurity: Anthropological Perspective of Human Security, London: Pluto Press.

Eso, H. (2011), Boko Haram: The Enemy Within. Retrieved on 6 March, 2012 from www.kwenu.com/moe/2011/boko_haram_enemy_within.htm

Federal Republic of Nigeria: APRM Country Review Report No. 8: October 2008.

Haftendorn, H. (1991), The Security Puzzle: Theory-Building and Discipline-Building in International Security, International Studies Quarterly 35, 3-17

Harrington, E. (2012), Religion is not Driving Extremist Violence in Nigeria, Says Obama Official After Church Bombings. CNS News. Retrieved on 5th May, 2012 from www.cnsnews /news/article/…/

Held, D. and McGrew, A. (1998), The End of the Old Order? Review of International Studies, No. 24, 219-243

Ibrahim, J. (2002), Notes on Globalization and the Marginalization of Africa. Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA) Bulletin, 384, 3-7.

Ibrahim, S. (2012), Boko Haram Destroying the North, FG Cries Out". Leadership, Thursday, February 9, 2012. Retrieved from www.leadership.ng/nga/articles.

IOL News, Thursday, 21 June, 2012.

Karacasulu, N. (2006), Security and Globalization in the Context of International Terrorism, Review of International Law and Politics (RILP - An USAK Publication, Ankara), Vol.2, No.5, pp. 1-17.

Klarevas, L. (2004), Political Realism: A Culprit for the 9/11 Attacks, Harvard International. Review, 26(3). Retrieved on August 16, 2007 from www.harvard.edu/articles/print.php?article=1252.

Lesser, I. B. (1999), Countering the New Terrorism. Retrieved on July 23, 2008 from www.rand.org/publication

Mickolus, E. F. (1976), Negotiating for Hostages: A Policy Dilemma, Orbis, 19(4), 13 – 25.

Mittelman, J. (2000), The Globalization Syndrome: Transformation and Resistance. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

National Daily Newspaper, Monday, April 2, 2012. Retrieved from www.nationaldailyngr.com/business-news

Negroponte, J. D. (2006), Annual Threat Assessment of the Director of National Intelligence Presented to the United States of American Senate Committee on Intelligence, February 2.

Nigerian Crime News, 31 May, 2011.

Okonkwo, R. O. (2009), Beyond the Nigerian Terrorist Bomber', Sahara Reporter, December 28, www.saharareporter.com/...

Raghavan, S. (2011), Inspired by Tunisia and Egypt, Yemenis join in Anti-government Protests, Washington Post, Thursday, January 27.

Rasmussen, P. R. (2001), Nations or States: An Attempt at Definition, Scholiast. Retrieved on 20 January, 2009 from www.globalpolicy.org/nation/2001/0720definition.htm

Remo, W. (2007), Protectors and Predators: Why is There a Difference Among West African Militias? In Andersen, L., Moller, B., and Stepputat, F. (Eds.) Fragile States and Insecure People: Violence, Security and Statehood in Twenty –First Century. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 99-122.

Romm, J.J. (1993), Defining National Security: The Non Military Aspect. Council of Foreign Relations Press, New York

Rotberg, R.I. (2002), Failed States in a World of Terror. New York: Council on Foreign Relations. Retrieved from http://www.cfr.org/africa/failed-states-world-terror/p4733

Schelling, T. C. (1966), Arms and Influence, New Haven CT: Yale University Press.

The Guardian, Tuesday, 24 April, 2012.

The Nigerian Voice (2012), Security Heightens in Kaduna … FG says BH Attacks Make North Economically Backward. February 9, 2012. Retrieved from www.thenigerianvoice.com/nvnews

United States Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF) Annual Report 2012 - Countries of Particular Concern: Nigeria, 20 March 2012. Retrieved on 4 July, 2012 from http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4f71a675a.html

Walker, A. (2012), What Is Boko Haram? United States Institute of Peace Special, Report 308 June.

Weekly Trust, Saturday, 24 March, 2012.

Williams, P. (2008), Violent Non-State Actors and National and International Security, International Relations and Security Network Series, Zurich: Swiss Institute of Technology. Retrieved March 16, 2009 from http://se2.isn.ch/serviceengine/filecontent?serviceID.ISFPub&field=8EEBA9FE-AA15-32FC9434Alng=en

World Bank (2001), Globalization Can Work for Africa. Washington D. C: The World Bank.

Yong, L. H. (2000), Impact of National Security on Socio-Economic Development of Singapore. Department of Statistics, Singapore Armed Forces. Retrieved from http://www.singstat.gov.sg/stats/themes/economy/hist/gdp2.html