
GOVERNANCE AND SECURITY IN CONTEMPORARY NIGERIA: A RELATIVE DEPRIVATION THEORY APPROACH

By

Dr. Isah Adamu

Department of Public Administration, Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai

&

Edita Muhammad NmaDepartment of Political Science, Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai

Abstract

Attributable to the state as a sovereign entity is the provisions of both social and physical security to the citizen living within the state. If this fundamental ingredient of a state is denied as a result of state failure, the citizens would be desperate which in most cases lead to social deviance. This paper posit that contemporary security challenges in Nigeria where government is loosen some parts of its territory to the insurgents and bandits is the function of state failure to provide socio-economic goods the citizens. The paper relied on primary and secondary materials as a source of data. With the help of relative deprivation theory, it is the arguments of this paper that current security challenges in the country could not be tamed if government does not address citizens social deprivation. Beyond military intervention in the course of the current insecurity in the country, the paper recommends socio-economic intervention among other recommendations.

Key words: Security, Governance, State failure, Nigeria

Introduction

Highly associated with security in a political community is Hobbessian social contract of a state. In fact modern security architecture in the modern states pay premium to national security which define the status of a state even among the comity of nations. For instance, Buzan et al (1993) points out that societal security as a concept is concerned with states when they are undermined or destabilized by their societies, becoming threatened or weakened in terms of social cohesion and identity. Societal insecurity occurs when people within a certain geographically defined state assume that their identity is threatened. This perceived threat can be triggered and bolstered by a collective feeling of relative deprivation, be it social, economic, political, or cultural. The result manifests itself in societal insecurity. The intensive economic and political insufficiency leads to insecurity within the state (Moaddel, 1993). The relationship between social security and social deprivation cannot be underestimated. Correlating governance and security, Obasanjo succinctly put it thus;

The primary objective of national security shall be to strengthen the federal republic of Nigeria, to advance her interest and objectives, to contain instability, control crime, eliminate corruption, enhance genuine development, progress and growth, improve the welfare and well-being of and quality of life every citizenry (Obasanjo, 2003).

Governance therefore is strategic measures to ensure safety of people from both physical threat and social deprivation. These threats according to Buzan, are multi-dimensional thus; societal threats come in a wide variety of forms, but there are four obvious basic types: physical threats (pain, injury, death), economic threats (seizure, or destruction of property, denial of access to work or resources), threats to rights (imprisonment, denial of normal civil liberties), and threats to position or status (demotion, public humiliation) (Buzan, 1991). Insecurity is the causal factor of disconnection between governments and governed which could galvanize into revolutionaries conflict. Ervand Abrahamian states that the cause of the 1979 revolution in Iran was the interaction between political organization and social forces, such as ethnic groups, youth, women, and class politics. He further suggests that Shi'a revolutionary discourse, in turn, transformed the economic difficulties and social discontents of the 1970s into a revolutionary crisis (Abrahamian, 1982). Essentially, where a state apparatus fails to fulfill its responsibilities towards civil society, or, at a more profound level, attempts to alter the identity of society at large, the result can be violent resistance to the policies of the ruling elite. Good governance is therefore panacea to security of life and property of individual living within the state. Shirk in government responsibilities in providing good governance is a direct investment in insecurity and underdevelopment. In his opinion, Sonni stated that;

security is primary consideration for any government needs no restatement;

in fact, it is usually taken for granted as a major government responsibility. It is thus no wonder that of the three key obligatory responsibilities of the Nigerian constitution outlines for its government in terms of its relationship with the Nigerian people, the issue of security is conspicuous (sonni, 2005).

Porosity in governance by Nigerian government in contemporary days have exposed the citizenry to all form of political, social and economic insecurity of hunger, poverty, armed robbery, banditry, kidnapping etc. Human security therefore became a scarce commodity for Nigeria populace across their homes, Church/Mosques, markets, work places, and most hazardously on the roads. As an asset of any healthy state, human security is a critical component of the global political and development agenda. Two ideas lie at its heart: firstly, the protection of individuals is a strategic concern for national as well as international security; secondly, security conditions for people's development are not bound to traditional matters of national defense, law and order, but rather encompass all political, economic and social issues enabling a life free from risk and fear. Karim, Donata and Julia, 2004)

Conceptual Framework Governance

It could be argued that governance is not a new concept, it being as old as human civilization (Tamyko, 2014). The roots of governance can be found in the Greek word *kybernan*, which means to steer or to pilot a ship, but the concept was also used during the Roman Empire under the Latin word *gubernare*, meaning to direct, rule and guide. Obviously, its meaning has changed throughout the centuries and, nowadays, governance can be broadly understood as the interaction between governments, business stakeholders and non-profit organizations by which and policy decisions implementation are undertaken (Tamyko, 2014). Governance is therefore majorly concerned with institutional framework of fulfilling the public goals. Bevir see as an interactive phenomenon in which public, private and non-profit actors interact to establish and implement public policies. Some key determinants of this form of governing are the emergence and empowerment of different actors, either public or private, with whom the state has to deal, and the loss of hierarchical forms of governance in favor of a relatively more equal power distribution (Bevir, 2009). Similarly, Emerson et al. (2011), governance can be understood as the processes and structures of public policy making and management that engage people constructively across the boundaries of public agencies, levels of government, and/or the public, private and civic spheres in order to carry out a public purpose that could not otherwise be accomplished? (Emerson et al., 2011: 2).

Generally, governance refers to the manner in which power is exercised (Amoako, 2003). Sometimes, such responsibility may be secured through elections, appointments and so on. On the other, governance is viewed as the steering or controlling of state affairs (Dwivedi, 2010: 683). Fundamentally, governance is the process of decision making or procedure by which decision is taken by those who govern and are willing to improve the living conditions of citizens. Governance is distinguished from government, which means an institution made up of instruments through which the state governs itself by means of laws, rules and regulations implemented by the state apparatus. The quality of life of people in a democracy depends on the nature of governance in terms of how political and administrative arrangements accommodate or permit diversity of groups to participate in public decision making (Lysias and Fidelis, 2014). It is perhaps obvious that governance and security and inseparable. As state is majorly concerned with the security and state power lied on governance, the nature of security would largely depends on governance and governmental structure of the state.

Security

Security is one of the social science concepts that suffered political inclination in terms of definition. This may not be unconnected to the national interest of some states and their inclination towards particular state at a particular situation. In spite of its conceptual complexities, the understanding of the term shows that security is vital for national cohesion, peace and sustainable development. Thus: "Security has to do with freedom from danger or with threats to a nation's ability to protect and develop itself, promote its cherished values and legitimate interests and enhance the well being of its people. Thus, internal security could be seen as the freedom from or the absence of those tendencies which could undermine internal cohesion and the cooperate existence of the nation and its ability to maintain its vital institutions for the promotion of its core values and socio-political and economic objectives, as well as meet the legitimate aspirations of the people. Internal security also implies freedom from danger to life and prosperity? (Imobighe cited in Oche 2001:76-77). Achumba et al (2013) defines insecurity from two perspectives. Firstly, insecurity is the state of being open or

subject to danger or threat of danger, where danger is the condition of being susceptible to harm or injury. Secondly insecurity is the state of being exposed to risk or anxiety, where anxiety is a vague unpleasant emotion that is experienced in anticipation of some misfortune. For Wolfers security refers to an *absence of objective dangers*, i.e. of security 'threats', 'challenges', 'vulnerabilities' and risks', and of *subjective fears or concerns*, and to the *perception thereof*. (Wolfers, 1962). Both Achumba et al and Wolfers definition of security suffered some structural deficiency as they overlooked social and political situation of the people which is desideratum to physical security.

It is on this note that UNDP developed a very broad understanding of human security resting on the idea that security should not focus exclusively on states, territory and military questions as individuals are at the heart of security concerns. The Human Development Report 1994 entitled *New Dimensions of Human Security*, was probably the first attempt to define such a concept in a holistic way. Security is described in relation to seven dimensions reflecting almost all of the key components of human development. The Report, however, does not address explicitly the difference between 'human security' and 'human development'. These seven dimensions are;

1. **Economic security** Assured basic income: access to employment and resources.
2. **Food security** Physical and economic access to food for all people at all times. Hundreds of millions of people in the world remain hungry either through local unavailability of food or, more often, through lack of entitlements or resources to purchase food.
3. **Health security** Access to medical treatment and improved health conditions. Poor people in general have less health security and in developing countries, the major causes of death are infectious and parasitic diseases.
4. **Environmental security** Living in a healthy physical environment which is spared from desertification, deforestation and other environmental threats that endanger people's survival.
5. **Personal security** Individual security from physical violence. Threats can take several forms, for example: threats from the State, foreign states, other groups of people (ethnic tension), individuals or gangs; threats directed against women or children based on their vulnerability and dependence; threats to self (e.g. suicide, drug use, etc.).
6. **Community security** Most people derive their security from membership of a social group (family, community, organization, political grouping, ethnic group, etc.). Tensions often arise between these groups due to competition over limited access to opportunities and resources.
7. **Political security** Living in a society that guarantees basic human rights and freedom of expression.

Security from this observation thus is more than physical threats but more fundamentally, self economic confidence free from social alienation and denial of Political rights.

Theoretical Framework

Theory is the assumption which assist in explaining the political phenomenal. It is therefore a guiding tool of analysis. Relative deprivation theory is designed to guide this work to explain the factors that induced citizenry to rebel against the state or constituted authority. In his book: *Why Men Rebel*, Gurr (1970) articulates that relative deprivation manifests a gap between expected and achieved socioeconomic and political opportunities. He explains different kinds of political violence as the result of collective discontent caused by a sense of relative deprivation. To this theorist, social deviance such as armed banditry, armed robbers, terrorism, etc are function of state failure to provide the expectant role of the government towards the citizenry. The meaning of relative deprivation can be gleaned from the works of its finest exponents. In furtherance of this analysis, Ted Gurr (1970) argues that people become dissatisfied if they feel they have less than they should and could have. Over time, such dissatisfaction leads to frustration and then rebellion against the (real or perceived) source of their deprivation. This postulation is a mere justification that relative deprivation theory is

related to the frustration aggression theory which postulated that insecurity is resulted from state failure to deliver good governance capable of providing essential services to the governed devoid of frustration. Gurr (2005: 20) further argues constituted authority negligent that often resulted into structural poverty and inequality within countries are 'are motivating factors that caused insecurity such organized crime, insurgency and terrorism.'

This development has prompted Birrel on his study of conflict in Northern Ireland that group tensions develop from a discrepancy between the 'ought' and the 'is' of collective value satisfaction motivated the conflicts (1972: 317). Buttressing this view, it is the opinion of Davies (1962) that the occasion of political violence is due to the insupportable gap between what people want and what they get; the difference between expectations and gratifications: 'this discrepancy is a frustrating experience that is sufficiently intense and focused to result in either rebellion or revolution' (Davies 1962: 5). All these collective ideas bent on the fact that the deleterious consequences of insecurity in a state are intrinsically linked to the reaction by socially deprived individuals living within the state.

In his on study of relative deprivation theory, Adesoji (2012), argues that relative deprivation theory holds some predictive value that the regions in the country that are relatively deprived of socio-economic and political opportunities are more likely to stage terrorist attacks to weaken the hated political authority. The relative deprivation theorists seem to have adopted the Marxian ideological premise by identifying socio-economic deprivation, inequality, marginalization and unequal access to opportunities. The argument here is that violent and terrorist criminality is an ultimate consequence of socio-economic and political deprivation, marginalization and unequal access to opportunities. The Boko Haram uprising in Nigeria was aided by the prevailing unequal access to economic opportunities, the advent of party politics and the associated deprivation and desperation of politicians for political power and to discredit the government of President Jonathan after the 2011 Presidential elections (Adesoji 2012).

To relate this theory to the contemporary security challenge in Nigeria, the political entity referred to as Nigeria is bedeviled by activities of organized social crime such armed robbery, banditry, insurgency, kidnapping etc. in fact, the country is fast loosen some part of the state dominated by the insurgents and bandits. Realistically, the source of this crime is the function of relative deprivation suffered by the Nigerian populace. Frustration which arises from their inability to access wealth necessary for human development is no doubt motivating factor that ease their recruitments into the activities of either both insurgency and banditry sometime against their will. Since the state have violated the social contract of providing the citizenry with both social and physical security, the aggrieved members of political community in Nigeria have reacted by social resentment against the state. A militancy activity by Niger Delta militant is not unconnected to the violation of this contract by constituted authority which exposed the region to social misery and economic deprivation. Similarly, in his study of insecurity challenge in northern Nigeria in connection of relative deprivation theory, Adesoji (2012) opined that backwardness of the Northern Nigeria is linked to the deprivation, unequal access to opportunities and attendant social problems of illiteracy, poverty, unemployment and high maternal and child mortality rate. The implication therefore is the adoption of aggression, violence and terrorist criminality to address their frustrations.

Governance and Security: The Nexus

Security is not military force, though it may involve it, security is not traditional military activity, though it may include it. Security is development and without development, there can be no security (McNamara, 1968).

This notion of security by McNamara is probably one of the contemporary political thesis that shape the idea that national security is majorly concerned with government efforts to embark on political and economic policies that would guarantee access to wealth, reduce inequality, provide social infrastructure that ensure desire development. The justification is that physical security is meaningless and possibly unattainable if there is no social security. The notion of national security as a military capability of a state is queried in contemporary realities. This is because it is impracticable for government to build and strengthen the military for the purpose of external aggression while its internal structure is threaten. McNamara has elaborately depicted that;

There is among us an almost ineradicable tendency to think of our security

problem as been exclusively a military problem, and to think of the military problem as been exclusively a weapons or manpower problem -. We still tend to conceive of national security almost solely as a state of armed readiness, a vast awesome arsenal of weaponry. We still tend to assume that it's primarily this purely military ingredient that creates security (McNamara, 1968).

This clearly justify that governance by implication is not military capability but institutional capacity to transform the state in line with the wider expectations of the populace. By and large, there is consensus across Africa that security should be people-centred; security means, first and foremost, **people's safety**. This idea is reflected in the 1991 OAU Kampala document *Towards a Conference on Security, Stability, Development and Co-operation in Africa*:

Security embraces all aspects of the society including economic, political and social dimensions of individual, family, community, local and national life. The security of a nation must be constructed in terms of the security of the individual citizen to live in peace with access to basic necessities of life while fully participating in the affairs of his/her society in freedom and enjoying all fundamental human rights (OAU, 1991).

In practice, however, the majority of African governments have continued to consider security issues in terms of protecting the State, its institutions and frontiers, regime stability and military defence (Karim and Julia, 2004). Nigeria is not an exception of this phenomenon as governance in Nigeria is usually based on used of state apparatus for maintenance of power as opposed to the delivery of essential services to the governed. This partly explains why, except perhaps in the case of South Africa, the concept of human security in its current form has come to be considered as donor-driven. Despite this perception, the OECD/DAC survey indicates that human security represents an 'ideal' or ultimate goal to which African populations aspire. However, African populations consider that it is the State's primary duty to act to provide basic protection of life and property. Nonetheless, in many contexts, violence and/or political disorder continue to be widespread, adding to the lack of confidence in the State's capacity to create the conditions for human security to be achieved (Karim and Julia 2004).

United Nations has provided a sufficient explanation which by large, have exemplify the nexus between governance and security. In its effort to conceptualizing human security in the political context of the United Nations, three pillars of human security have been identified thus;

1. *Freedom from fear*?protecting the physical integrity of human beings.
2. *Freedom from want*?providing access to the goods and services needed to satisfy material and non-material needs.
3. *Freedom of future generations to inherit a healthy environment*?environmental protection (Annan 2000a, pp. 1; Owen 2004, pp. 384).

In addition, the need for a fourth pillar has been identified and it has subsequently been conceptualized: *freedom from hazard impact*. This implies that people are able to mobilize their resources and concentrate on sustainable development goals instead of not being able to escape the 'survival dilemma'. Survival of the state both from external aggression and internal uprising therefore largely depends on governance to provide enabling environment for peace to strive in political community.

Implication of Insecurity to the State

The implication of insecurity to the state cannot be underestimated. In fact, there is no any phenomenon that caused legitimacy question on the part of constituted authority like insecurity. Also, pace for development is always alter in unsecured environment. Ugwu (2013) in highlighting the effect of insecurity on community development noted that many communities cannot benefit from any development project because of unresolved age-long conflicts. This is because it is difficult to mobilize members of such community to get involved in development process since workers cannot enter conflict prone communities for fear of hostility. Similarly, Imobighe in Ugwu (2013) observed that: in conflict prone areas, unemployment rises, financial and banking systems become in-operative as investors have no confidence anymore and move to more secure areas. Ugwu (2008:105) further observed that:

During conflicts, there is inadequate cooperation among community members, absence of outside support, destruction of completed projects, inadequate participation in community development process, difficulty in need identification, lack of fund among others which impact negatively on community development.

The current reality Nigeria security challenge is a manifestation of Ugwu's argument as many communities in Nigeria that have business ties are delink and their business altered thereby exposing them to miserable life condition. Furthermore, according to Imobighe (2003) Nigeria's security challenges have great effect on the economic growth and development in the country. This was supported by Eme and Anthony in Dantala (2014) when he summarized the effect of insecurity on development in Nigeria in the following ways:

- i. Social dislocation and population displacement
- ii. Social tensions and new pattern of settlements which encourages Muslims/Christians or members of an ethnic group moving to Muslim/Christian dominated enclaves.
- iii. Heightens citizenship question and encourages hostility between 'indigenes' and 'settlers'.
- iv. Dislocation and disruption of family and communal life. v. General atmosphere of mistrust, fear, anxiety and frenzy
- v. Dehumanization of women, children, and men especially in areas where rape, child abuse and neglect are used as instruments of war.
- vi. Deepening of hunger and poverty in the polity
- vii. Atmosphere of political insecurity and instability including declining confidence in the political leadership and apprehension about the system.
- viii. Governance deficit as a result of security agencies inefficiency and corruption.
- ix. Loss of man hours due to shortened working hours by banks and commercial institutions and the unprecedented loss of man hours or closure of businesses by those who work at night due to the curfew consequent on the declaration of state of emergency on some states. This has affected the informal but widespread sector of the local economy such as *suya*, *shayi*, *kosai* vendors who make out their living on day to day basis (Shettima, 2012).

Interrogating the implication of insecurity in Nigeria, Garga (2015), averred that socio-political and economic landscape in Nigeria has been blighted by the endemic twin evil of crime and violence. The abysmal failure of successive administrations in Nigeria to address challenges of poverty, unemployment and inequitable distribution of wealth among ethnic nationalities, ultimately resulted to anger, agitation and violent crimes against the Nigerian state by some individuals and groups. Such crimes include militancy, kidnapping, bombing, armed robbery, destruction of government properties, among others. These activities of various militia groups consequently resulted in low income for government from oil revenue, moderating the Gross Domestic Product growth rate, low participation of local and foreign investors in economic development and insecurity of lives and properties of the citizens. In similar vein, Denney (2013) observed that the relationship between insecurity and underdevelopment is much stronger than the relationship between peace and development. That is, where there is conflict there is often underdevelopment. This view was shared by Dike (2013) when he asserted that lack of security of lives and property of citizens is a major hindrance to meaningful development.

Development in Nigeria is thus scarce thanks to insecurity that have taken the centre stage among the populace. People are exposed to fear even in their homes, business centre and roads as criminal have adopted multidimensional plan and strategies of carrying out their heinous acts. This phenomenon of security challenge has tremendously affected our drive to national economic development.

Conclusion

That fact that security is panacea or inexcusable prerequisite to national economic development is undisputable. This is to say that no Nation can achieve its desire development if its internal security is threatened. It is therefore conclusion of this paper that Nigeria's contemporary security challenge is link to poor governance that denied the downtrodden access to wealth thereby exposing them to social misery and vulnerable to be recruited as agent of insecurities. Any nation that deprived her citizen of economic goods is doubt investing in insecurities. Nigeria political elites both at state and national level have succeeded in kidnapping the national resources which is causal factor for decaying health and educational institutions, bad roads and poor electric supply. Grievance which resulted from these social deprivation therefore breed insecurities which some time question the government legitimacy.

Recommendation

This paper used the relative deprivation theory and explore the contemporary security challenge in Nigeria. Since the paper concluded that relative deprivation is to a greatest extent cause of insecurities in the country, the paper recommends the followings;

Military engagement or intervention in country's security conundrum should be drastically reduced and replace with socio-economic intervention. As has been argued, security is not military capability or availability of military weapons or hardware but citizens access to wealth capable of improving their socio-economic condition.

Mass unification of masses across the regions irrespective of their Political difference and religious affiliation is strongly recommended. Elites in Nigeria have succeeded in balkanizing the country by dividing the downtrodden along ethnic and religious line which make it possible for them to accumulate weath fraudulently thereby exposing the country to social deprivation which subsequently causes insecurities.

Security agents must be trained and re-train and most importantly be motivated with incentive to live up to their expectations. Evidences have shown that security agents in the country do connived with the criminal to carry out the operation. This is intricacies is linked to the government negligence to provide incentive to security agents.

References

- Abrahamian, E. (1982). *Iran between two revolutions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press,
- Achumba, I. C., Ighomereho, O. S., & Akpan-Robaro, M. O. M. (2013). Security Challenges in Nigeria and the Implications for Business Activities and Sustainable Development. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 4(2), 79-99.
- Adesoji, A. (2012). *The Boko Haram Uprising and Islamic revivalism in Nigeria*. African Spectr Pp.95-108.
- Amoako, K. Y. (2003). The UNECA and good governance in Africa. Paper presented at the Harvard International Development Conference on Governance and Development in a Dynamic Global Environment, Boston, Massachusetts, April 2003.
- Bevir, M. (2009). *Key Concepts in Governance*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Buzan, B. (1991). *People, states and fear: An agenda for international security studies in the post-cold war era*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf
- Buzan, B. Et?al (1993). (eds). *Identity, migration and the new security agenda in Europe*. London: Pinter
- Dantala, D. P. (2014). Insecurity and the challenges of development in Nigeria. *Journal of Developing Country Studies*, 4(22), 50-52.
- Davies, W. (1987). Religion and Development: Weber and the East Asian Experience. In *Understanding Development*, edited by Myron Weiner and Samuel P. Huntington, pp. 221?80. Boston: MA: Little, Brown.
- Denney, L. (2013). Insecurity disrupts development but peace doesn't drive it. Retrieved from www.thebrokenonline.eu/Blogs
- Dike, A. B. (2010). On the measurement of income inequality. *Journal of Economic Theory* 2, 244-263.

- Dwivedi, I. O. (2010). Good Governance. *International Encyclopedia of Political Science* 683-685). Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Emerson, K., Nabatchi., T., Balogh., S., (2011). An integrative Framework for collaborative Governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 22: 1-29.
- Garga, E. (2015). The effects of insecurity and poverty on human development at the municipal level in the Northern Nigeria. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economic and Management Sciences* 6 (7), 268-276.
- Gilbert, L.D (2010). *Ethnic Militias and Conflict in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria: The International Dimensions (1999-2009)*. Doctoral Thesis Submitted to University of KwaZulu-Natal, Howard College Campus, South Africa.
- Gurr, R. T. (2005). Economic Factors that contribute to terrorism in social and political context. Working Group Report, 'International Summit on Democracy, Terrorism and Security.' Retrieved from www.academia.com
- Gurr, T. R. (1971). *Why Men Rebel* Princeton: Princeton University Press
- Imobighe, T. A (2003). *The OAU (AU) and OAS in regional conflict management. a comparative assessment*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- Karim, H., Donata, G. & Julia, W. (2004). **Security and human security: an overview of concepts and initiatives what implications for west africa?** *sah/d (2004)547*
- Lysias, D. G. & Fidelis, A. (2014). **Democracy and good governance: The missing link in Nigeria**. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* Vol 5 No 16
- McNamara, R. S. (1968. *The essence security: Reflection in Office*. New York: Harper and Row
- Moaddel, M. (1993). *Class, politics, and ideology in the Iranian revolution*. New York: Columbia University Press
- Obsanjo, O. (2003, April 26). Grand strategy for national security. *The Gordian*, Pp. 16
- Roy, O. (2004). *Globalized Islam: The search for a new Ummah*. New York: Columbia University Press
- Sonni, G. T. (2005). State and security in Nigeria's fourth republic in, T. G. Aaron &, B. C. O. Yakubu, (eds.), *Democratic rebirth in Nigeria 1999-2003*. Abuja: African Centre for Democratic Governors
- Tamyko, Y. (2014). What is governance? Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269107473>
- Ugwu, A. N. (2008). *Conflict management for sustainable community development in selected Local Government Areas in Rivers State*. Unpublished PhD Thesis.
- Ugwu, A. N. (2013). Conflict management for sustainable community development in Nigeria in the 21st Century. In B. A, Eheazu, C. N. Barikor, and I.S., Nzeneri, (Eds.), *Readings in adult and non formal education*. Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt Press
- Wolfers .A (1962). National security as an ambiguous symbol. In A. walfer, *Discord and collaboration: Essay on international politics*. Baltimore: John Hopkins university press.