



GOVERNING INSECURITY IN VOICELESS VICTIM-COMMUNITIES IN NIGERIA.

By

***Henry O. Majaro-Majesty, Abisoye F. Adenaike, & John L. Okunola**

Department of Adult Education, Solarin University of Education, Ijagun, Ogun State, Nigeria.

Abstract

Nigeria's insecurity is alarming and uncontrollable. Terror unleashed on ungoverned spaces and vulnerable individuals, groups and communities by syndicates of terror perpetrating killings and kidnaps, and gun running, are investigated. Security agencies, both military and paramilitary all fail to stop this terror. Examine are conspiracy theories surrounding governments commitments and body languages towards terror activities and members of these terror groups. Terrorism and governance were examined from the perspectives that Boko Haram, Bandits, and Fulani Herdsmen and kidnappers' groups are establishments, competing with government for legitimacy and control of ungoverned communities. Terrorist arrogated power and authority over victimised-community people as a result of Governments' adopted strategy of denial, refusal to name terror groups terrorists also is a factor for weak military action against terror. Negotiating and payments of ransoms further emboldens terrorism. Investigating governance, security and insecurity, reveals relationship between legitimacy, authority and power. Review of terrorism also revealed that government also engage in terrorism and force like terrorists. Citizens and terrorists experience this Military hostility in line of duty forces and stringent laws. Government's failed social contract to secure citizens demeans their constitutional legitimacy, in ungoverned communities captured by terror groups. It is concluded therefore that both government and terror groups are engaged in governance of insecurity, both seek legitimacy and provide security for their subjects. Further research on terrorism was recommended to study governance and insecurity to uncover theoretical and practical virtues for effective prevention of terrorism in Nigeria and beyond.

Keywords: *Governance, insecurity, governing insecurity, victimised-communities, voiceless communities, ungoverned spaces, Nigerian government*

Accepted February 2021

Published April 2021

Introduction

Nigeria Government's loss of control is caused by their failure to secure ungoverned communities therefore losing power to terrorist to gain legitimacy and control of many rural communities in the Northern part of Nigeria. Bandits, Miyetti Allah and Boko Haram set up their own leadership structures and tax regime, - controlling the markets and instituting their own laws-command in those communities. For seven years and more – since 2015, these groups have governed these victimized-communities seen as vulnerable and ungoverned areas. They are called ungoverned communities because these areas are very remote, and without government's presence, inform of police station, medical care and poor infrastructures and amenities - pipe borne water, electricity and communication networks. Poor road networks, purely traditional farming settlements passing for an agrarian society. In practical terms these communities are governments' forgotten areas, very much at the outskirts of the cities. These victimised-communities become territories vulnerable to attack and forceful occupation and control of any group or force illegal or legal powers or authorities. Terror groups are technically recognized by governments because in many occasions, Government have negotiated with these groups, and refused to declare them as terrorist groups. In this paper, these ungoverned communities are referred to as victimised-community (ies), because they are being terrorised and controlled by the illegitimate group (terror Groups). To date, in the North-East and the North-West, over 100,000 deaths have been recorded and More than 20,000 cases of abduction and rapes, kidnap and ransom taken (Adibe, 2012). Governments reported successful release of kidnapped victims by various groups with sources insisting that these groups are one and the same groups, working for the Fulanisation and Islamisation of the country (Adibe, 2012, Uzodike and Maiangwa, 2012). Going by these claims, these groups shall be collectively referred to as terror groups. It would be wrong to call or refer to them as terrorist group when governed have refused to declare them as such. Even though these groups operate as terrorist, they are obviously no freedom fighters.

The Nigeria security organs have been accused of compromise as organised terror groups ravish the rural communities consisting of villages and farm settlements (Punch, March 26, 2018, Vanguard 29, March 2018). Initially, attacking Christian communities, they have spread to other communities, leaving doubts as to whether they are religious fighters. They seize and take refuge in ungoverned areas creating territories for themselves. From these victimised-communities they

perpetrate their nefarious activities of kidnapping, abduction, and land grabbing, illegal taxations, and illegal mining. Government until recently denies the level of insecurity and the reality of the strength of these terrorist group. The Nigerian government obviously struggles to operate the essential constitutional rights, a power given her to secure lives and properties. Vanguard Newspapers (Sept.2021), report, that Northern and Southern Governors have called on their citizen to take up arms to defend themselves, corroborating same assertion and conviction of the former Defense Minister Major General T.Y Danjuma, that the Military connives with Boko Haram and Bandits to perpetrate violence and killings (Punch, march 26, 2018, Vanguard 29, March 2018, Sahara, Reporters, 31, march 3018). Since then several organisations and religious leaders, have also called, for self-defense. Christian Bishops in August 2020, declared that Christians should defend themselves (Guardian, 20, August 2020). Lister (2012), reports, that “Federal government have completely lost control of the North East, and North West. Despite deploying thousands of troops and establishing a Joint Task Force... not a whole lot of visible efforts (are seen) from the federal government to calm things down” (2012:14). Military operations recorded so many casualties initially, because of poor weaponry, equipment and hardware, laying excuses on poor logistics. In spite of the losses and continuous open claim of responsibility for attacks and killings by these terror groups, Federal and State governments still continue to negotiate, hold round table discussion with these organized gun lawmen, and agreeing to recruit assumed repentant (Bandits, Boko-Haram and Fulani Herdsmen) terror gang members into the military, without any formal rehabilitation training. State governments have also paid ransoms to the bandits and popular among these cases is the return of some Chibok and Zamfara, Girls girls held captive by the Boko Haram, according to Bandit leader, “...government paid us 60 million ransom...”. Although denied it by the Department of State Security, Boko Haram announced that they collected ransom and returned the girls (Sahara Reporters, 2022). Even though the initial 99 school girls under President Goodluck Jonathan have till today, not been found or rescued. A Christian girl, Leah Sharibu, has not been released in spite of her fellow captures, mostly Muslims, were released (USCIRF, 2022).

Civil organizations, members of House of Representatives, victims and communities have all cried out to Buhari led government, to end insecurity in the country and accept foreign help. The Nigeria Government and military have continued to repeat the same assurances and promises. The same rhetoric’s and growing concern is made by Christian religious body, the Christian Association of

Nigeria, (CAN), The Muslim community remained silent, accusing Christians of creating division in the nation, while government continues the act of denial, tagging the terror as conflict between the farmers-cattle breeders' and not Fulani Muslims-Christian conflicts. The questions asked are: Is this governance? Is this all government can offer its citizens? Is government truly in control as they say? If government is in control, what kind of strategy are they adopting? Is this a new way of governing insecurity? What kind of terrorism are we faced with? What is the difference between terrorism, freedom fighting and crime? Are faced with new kind way of governance, what is governance and how has this helped the nation's security. Could this be a new way of looking governance?

Insecurity and Governance: a framework

Insecurity, defined in several ways, from the political, economic, food and nutrition, concerns the focus of this paper. However safety of lives and properties is our preoccupation here. The insight drawn from any English dictionary describes insecurity as the opposite of security. From whatever angle insecurity is viewed from, they seem to have a link with each other, a situation of uncertainty and vulnerability, UNDP (1994), sees insecurity from the human angle, as a chronic threat to life, hunger, disease and oppression. The state of fear or anxiety stemming from a concrete or alleged lack of protection or inadequate freedom from danger is seen as insecurity (Obi, 2015; Beland, 2005; Achumba, Ighomeroho and Akpor-Robaro, 2013). Achumba et.al, explained that insecurity involves peril; deathtrap; ambiguity; dearth of fortification, and lack of security. Collins dictionary describes insecurity as a loss of confidence, all definitions and description of insecurity, will hang on uncertainty and lack of confidence either in oneself or in a protector. It involves a social contract between citizens and their governments. When citizens lose confidence and are unsure of their government to protect them from threats to life and property, it means that a higher or equal force either over-powers or competes favourably against that trust for defense given by government. Uncertainty indicates fear; the fear in uncertainty is therefore a state of insecurity. In psychological perspective, Fear underlines insecurity, while fear features in the mind and in the physical. Fear, is potent to control, lead or rule a physical reaction towards obedience by tiring down the confidence and trust a citizen has for its government. With this deduction of what insecurity means and portends, it shares a relationship with governance (This shall be reviewed later below). What then is governance?

Governance ordinarily referred to as governments' power and control of resources and people, runs deeper than just exercise of power and control, by government. Organisations and groups formal or informal, all have rights to the use of the word governance because it involves the use of rules, law, and decision making, processes. UNESCO's International Bureau for Education defines it as 'structures and processes, designed to guarantee accountability, transparency, responsiveness, rule of law, stability, equity and inclusiveness, empowerment, and broad-based participation. Meaning that the framework upon, which government operates are larger than power and control. The framework may now depend on the operational style either democratic or autocratic. The bureau emphasis, that norms, values and rules of the game, through which public affairs are managed in a manner that is transparent, participatory, inclusive and responsive are features of governance. Governments can be held accountable using these features or elements, which according to the 2009 Global Monitoring Report, governance is 'power relationships,' 'formal and informal processes of formulating policies and allocating resources,' 'processes of decision-making' and 'mechanisms for holding governments accountable.' UNDP, the World Bank, the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) all supports and agree that governance exercises, authority of power to manage a country's economic, political and administrative affairs. These are the defining features of governance. Generating a comprehensive and detailed definition is somehow difficult, but attempts have been made by organizations, nations and political parties.

The British Council, a government agency, who propagates British political cultures emphasizes that "Governance, involves the interaction between the formal institution and those in civil society. Governance refers to a process whereby elements in the society wield power, authority and influence and enact policies and decisions concerning public life and social upliftment." Goran Hyden's attempt, reads that governance is "the creative potential of politics, especially with the ability of leaders to arise above the existing structure of the ordinary, to change the rules of the game and to inspire others to partake in efforts to move society forward in new and productive directions." Whether governance is good or not is the prerogative of the assessor, even though the Millennium Development Goal, insists that Good governance is expected to be participatory, transparent, accountable, effective and equitable and promotes rule of law. World bank in (1989), distinguishes between good governance and poor governance as:

“...epitome of predictable, open and enlightened policy – making, a bureaucracy imbued with a professional ethos acting in furtherance of the public good, rule of law, transparent processes, and a strong civil society, participating in public affairs. Poor governance (on the other hand) is characterized by arbitrary policy making, unaccountable bureaucracies, unenforced or unjust legal systems, the abuse of power, civil society engaged in public life, and widespread corruption”

Governance described these ways refers to some level of credibility and legitimacy of authority to exercise power and rule of law. Governance as an effective of use of authority, for resource distribution, stakeholder’s partnership, public participation and generation of feedback to and from the society or public is good. This is essentially what governance should be for a responsible formal, informal, private or public organisation. The revelations from this review exposes governance as not limited to State or National government alone, but also used to understand authority and power in informal or formal organisations or groups. Whether a State or group or State organisation conducts a good or bad or poor governance as the case may be, is indeed, immaterial, what matters are the legitimacy and the exercise of authority and power exercised over a people either citizens or group members. Governance can however be assessed using some indices – accountability, transparency, responsiveness, rule of law, stability, equity and inclusiveness, empowerment, and broad-based participation. Leadership’s legitimacy, authority and power are vital criteria determining acceptance and submission by subjects or citizens. Legitimacy is acquired either through constitutional or unconstitutional means, - by force.

Finally, the relationship between security and governance is that both concepts does not limit to the function of government, but a functional responsibility of government and civil societies which in effect includes any citizens’ organisation formalized or not. In conclusion good governance connotes confidence, certainty and safety (unconditional protection of lives and properties) of a people, bad governance connotes insecurity, exposing citizens to harm and providing opportunities for oppositions to thrive. For the former, these features determines the legitimacy – acceptance and cooperation from citizens but on the other hand, the latter loss of confidence, uncertainty and feeling of unsafe, conditional protection, exposes and forces a people to submit to any available force. For example, a terror group or organized group such as freedom fighters, terrorists, and even social movements may take over a governance of a part of a nation. Below we shall review

terror groups in the North of Nigeria and their escapade in the nation's rural ungoverned communities, to gain some insights into how insecurity has been governed.

Terror in Ungoverned and Voiceless Victimised-Community

Terror describes fear and horror, a situation of very socially horrifying posture in a society or nation. Killings, kidnaps, bombing, abduction and series of rape and assassination happening around the world recently, have been so unprecedented and overwhelming that if they were a disease it would be called a pandemic. Since the plane crashing into the world trade center towers in New York, United States of America and Islamic movements have become so strong, that it led to support of terror in other nations and here in Nigeria. In Nigeria, since 2009, when the Boko Haram movement for secession (Ikenga, and Efebeh, 2013) first terror with several abductions and 800 killed (Obi, 2015), and scary messages, to instill fear in the locals, in the North-East territory where they are located, the military and police force have proved to be ineffective in curbing the group. Boko Haram now well-fortified sacks even the Nigeria military from their locations and captures towns and villages, as they occupy Sambisa forest (Africa in 2020, Panel Reports). Their territory has since spread to Niger State from their initial Maiduguri, in Borno and Yobe State. They strikes' horror in Adamawa, Kano, Kaduna, Kogi, Bauchi, Plateau, Yobe, Abuja, Sokoto, Katsina and Zamfara (Obi, 2015). From 800, deaths in year 2014, till date, Boko Haram has killed more than 20,000, people and displaced many from their traditional villages and homes. Many live in the IDP camps, suffering neglect and sucking their losses.

Another terror group is the Bandits, they proliferate into various gangs. Starting in 2011, they resonated from the Fulani-Hausa conflicts of herders-farmers conflicts for scarce water and arable land. Due to proliferation of arms, the Fulani militias have resorted to participate in the lucrative crime of kidnapping and terror, influenced by Jihadist groups both international and internal by Boko Haram. In recent times Bandits and Boko Haram reconciled forces with the latter giving them technical training and logistics supports. They involve in harms trade and illegal mining and control of the goldmines. They occupy the forests area along the borders and weakly governed communities which are without police and local government presence. Bandits have made these communities their territory of control. These weakly governed areas are called the ungoverned communities and are soft targets for the Bandits terror groups (Azeez, 2012). Bandits ravaging the

North-West, Zamfara, Katsina, Sokoto, Kano, Kaduna and Niger States, have been responsible for a lot of deaths in those area proving very formidable and well-fortified in armor. The Governor of Zamfara State, Bello Matawalle, revealed that Bandits population operating in communities in Zamfara's, Shinkafi, Zurmi, Maradun, Maru and Talata Mafara Local government areas are about 30,000 with 100 camps (the Nations Newspapers 29, July 2021), and have collected over 970 million naira ransom between 2011 till 2019 from victims, while 2,610 have been killed 100,000 people displaced. Economic and farming activities crippled. From the same place, and adjoining forests, armed men on motorcycles also launch attacks and kidnap villagers and travellers in Sabon Birni, Rabah and Isa local governments in Sokoto State. The bandits also access local governments in Katsina like Jibia, Sabuwa, Faskari, Dandume, among others. They could connect to places like Katsina, Kaduna, Niger and Southern Nigeria. (Abdulaziz, Febuary, 26, 2021. The Daily Trust).

They occupied the largest Local government area in Niger State a very vast land with scattered settlements, and rural and at the border of Nigeria (Sahara Reporter, March 2022). Governor Abubakar Sani-Bello lamented that 12 local governments have been taken over by Bandits, out of 25 in Niger State. They involve in massive kidnapping, rape and taxing their victim-communities. Calving territory for themselves, which has provided impregnable to police and military, all sought of crimes are being committed and collecting huge ransom and countless rape. They have engaged the Nigeria Military in gun battles, both in the land and aerial battles with sophisticated weapons. There have been cases were they have deposed and installed their own community heads and either killing or holding community leaders' hostage. The objective of Bandits group is not clear neither their demands. Federal government and State governments have held round table meetings these Bandits and their spokes persons known by them, - Sheike Gumi, a Muslim cleric, who negotiate on behalf of the Bandits and delivers ransom to this group from their victims. (BBC, News May 2021).

The third group with a wider spread who traverse the nation is the Miyetti Allah, herders Association, which President Muhammadu Buhari is a member and the patron (The Whistler, 2019) and Boko Haram group. The fact he has not denied. The Miyetti Allah have been involved in Cattle rustling, kidnapping, rape and killings. The National President of Miyetti Allah, they have also developed cattle grazing sites in the south, where during dry season they migrate to for grazing. They build colonies in bushes in towns and villages where indigenous people have not

settled, forcefully laying claims these settlements, from where they break-out to the roads to kidnap and kill. They have mastered their invincible gun running, using the bush path. They repress villages and communities displacing the real owners especially Christians taking over their farm lands and villages, (The Whistler, 2019). Indigenes have been severely terrorised, oppressed and killed at will. Their farms are destroyed and land taken from them. In some cases after displacing the villagers and the original owners of the land, Bandits change the names. Government still thinks Bandits, Fulani herdsmen and Boko Haram are not terrorists and refused to label them as such (Punch, Dec. 2021). This makes it difficult to engage them in full military attack until recently when instructions have gone out to military rather in vague term to stamp out insecurities in Nigeria.

These three, major terror groups at the north, demonstrates terror for a common interest, which are the occupation and control of land and territories. Their style and method of operating terror is here referred to as governing insecurity (their interest) is similar even though there are slight differences in their demands, their causes are the same. Boko Haram whose intention is to secede from the nation, breaking away from the Western abomination as their name indicates, Boko meaning English or White-man, Haram, meaning forbidden. The Miyetti Allah group wants to have established colonies (Ruga), throughout the nation. 'The policy, which is currently suspended, would "create reserved communities where herders will live, grow and tend their cattle, produce milk and undertake other activities associated with the cattle business without having to move around in search of grazing land for their cows' (The Nations Newspapers, 2019)."From our earlier conclusion, above, the essential feature in governance is the exercise of authority and power. The ability of these terror groups is to remove and install village heads, collect and impose and invoke sanctions, sacking the national police and instituting their own rules and laws indicates governance - power and control. Then whether they operate good governance or not is not accessible to the public, or their subjects, in a time of war because citizens always lose their constitutional rights, facing stringent and hostile subjection to constant security checks and search, as a result of their keeping vigils, vigilance and surveillance against terror groups' incursion in their governed space. How they are assessed is determined by their group objective and in group. For now, it may not be assessed, rated nor determined whether their governance is good or bad. What can be said is that they are a well-coordinated force. This is common with terrorists'

organisations and operation (Wilkinson, 1974). Paul Wilkinson states that terrorist groups reinforce individual member's loyalty constantly through the process of justification (White, 2012). White (2012), illustrates that terrorist may argue that terrorism is a just revenge and lesser form of social evils compared to government's use of power. Terror groups' only course of action available is to create terror and tears. They also develop their parameters of ethical normalcy and process of moral justification (Wilkinson, 1974). These created normalcy, and moral justification will in this research stand as criteria for assessing terror groups' governance. Normalcy is creating order and persuading their victim-communities to accept their justification warfare with government and their style of control - assertion of authorities and power (force), creating normalcy and justification however needs to be scientifically studied.

The following questions, why are these community people despite their suffering not helping government in the fight? If they have helped, how effective has this been? If not, how was their cooperation with terror groups stroke? Answers to this questions will help determine whether or not the government still has howbeit a little influence over the victim-communities, terror groups controlled, because governance entail citizens' participation and giving of legitimacy. If government is not able to elicit participation from victimised-communities, has government failed, and is legitimacy transferred? Are these communities considered, as part of Nigeria's territory or what? Are the inhabitants still citizens of the nation? The view of this paper is that they are still citizens even though, they are forced by circumstance, being held hostage to comply with these terror groups. They could only be described as victim-community is most suiting because they are citizens being victims of terror and bad governance form the Nigerian state how have been hostile. They are double victims, affected by Nigeria government's Hostility by their inability to protect them and by terror groups, who do them harm. They are rendered helpless and voiceless. Voiceless because they are prevented from outside world, and cannot trust, whom they would be talking to for fear of the vast and effective network of terror groups. The rest of the questions would be answered below, by examining government's hostility and the terror group's terrorism.

Governments' hostility Vs Group's Terror: Towards a theory of governing insecurity

Government's hostility, put in good perspective here ensures a clearer understanding why government actions and reaction is called hostility in deviance to terror group's terrors.

Governments' duty to protect the nation and citizens from every threat whatsoever, be it internal or external threats, is the constitutional right and legitimate authority, given it. Government's power to use state instrument and apparatus to confront, subdue and suppress, repress, and expel threat from criminal gangs and terrorist group movements, usually entails the use of force and other harsh means as punishments to quell and deter terrorism and crime, (White, 2012, Chomsky, 2002, Post, 1987). During the course of duty however, government forces' reaction may be similar to those of terrorist. Meanwhile, before terrorist group up, Government's social neglects and relative deprivations are identified as cause(s) for the movement, and government is seen and labeled as Hostile. In the other hand neglected communities described here as victim-communities left weakly governed, which gets them into the hands of Bandit gangs, Boko Haram, and Miyetti Allah regards government as showing hostility. Similarly, when security forces in the course of their operation, show undemocratic treatment and maltreat innocent citizens in name of security, they are shown as hostile. Hostility is therefore defined, 'as governments actions or inaction, which deprives citizens either consciously or unconsciously of rights, privileges, temporary withdrawal or withheld of democratic rights of citizens and armed groups of any kind, in the course of providing security and development. Government's reactions and responses to terrorism, has been based on United Nations conventions, which regulates the use of force against terrorist, even when they are known to use weapons of mass destruction, and high forms of violence.

Terror groups' acts of terrorism or criminality are shred in controversy, both in definition and determination of the distinction between the two concepts. While Terrorism creates a dilemma between the divide of whether it is a politicized term of behaviour of an opposition forces whose activities range from kidnapping, mass killings, or terrorism as a psychopathic function influencing the behaviour of terrorist, which Crenshaw (2000), believes has to be researched to validate empirically. The explanation of Hall, Norwwod, Ursano, Fullerton and Levinson (2007): that strategic goals of terrorists, primarily is to disrupt, provoke intense fear and shatter all sense of personal and community safety, while targeting the nation. The killings are just a means to get at the Nation's government (Bongar, 2007). Terror groups, result to killings as strategy to draw attention, hopping that their demands are met. Terrorists groups relate to a movement, a radical movement against government's insensitivity or perceived hurts. Terror groups in Nigeria, operate from a base, from where they lunch attacks. In recent times, as previously discussed, they have

seized communities, forced some population to relocate and take, over the feeling of religious threats. They govern their captured territories and members with brute force, power to control with fear, and shatter all confidence for safety from government. Fear is instilled in individuals, group's members and communities, to cause division among victimised-communities to defeat a collective reprisal action against terrorists. In the words of Philip G. Zimbardo (2014), "terrorism is about psychology. It is the psychology of fear" (Bongar, 2007). A good example of fear is trauma. An individual terrorised, is traumatised as a victim. His thoughts and actions and behaviour are subdued and controlled. Psychology of terror and trauma helps us understand governance of insecurity, in the same sense that government applied force against terror groups helps understand Government's control by enforcing establishing order, normalcy, and persuaded acceptance (legitimacy) through various media justification. Psychology of terror helps government to examine defensive options and rationale of terrorist attacks and possible targets. Studies in the area of psychology, appeal more towards ideas to win the "War of Ideas" against the adversaries than the brute force exhibited.

Terror groups' target to inflict emotional and instrumental damages on individuals and government is led by the need to quick revenge on the hurts received from government. Instrumental damage has a long time target, which damages material and political strength of the opponent - government. The group effects of these long and short term goals of terror are to increase and reinforce commitment of members and increase leaders' and organisation's status. Terror groups are consistent in attacks, and aims at greater damage, like the recent attack in Abuja- Kaduna Train transit. While gaining commitment of members, their course, and recognition by government is negotiable. This gain is visible in Nigeria where Government both federal and state have secretly negotiated and paid ransom, and promised the Fulani Bandits and Herders piece of lands, RUGA ranching settlements, in every part of Nigeria. Government for these lost credibility and confident reposed on them to provide security. In many instances where kidnap and abduction of school children are involved in Northern States, parents boycotted government to pay ransoms to obtain safety of their children and wards. Material losses are calculated for both immediate, (remote) and long-term (distant) losses by government on the economy. Government, are forced to invest more on security and rebuild of damaged physical infrastructure, against other development sectors. Another angle to this is the financial losses by foreign investors, and tourists, who are scared away

by the level of insecurity. Government lost so much income on tourism in foreign exchange, while internal economy suffered setback.

Empirical appraisals theories and validation of governance of insecurity – in Nigeria

With this background on terror activities and the psychology explanation of terror, attempt to obtain operational definition is key. Laquaar, (1987), defines terrorism as “*the illegitimate or extra normal use of violence against Non-combatants to achieve political ends*” following the same line of thoughts, Moghaddam (2007), states “a politically motivated violence that is perpetrated by individual groups or state sponsored agents and intended to bring about feelings of terror and helplessness in a population in order to influence decision making and to change behavior”. These two definitions agree that terrorists are politically minded in their objectives, to adopt violence, which Moghaddam buttresses, intend to bring about fear and helplessness to victims. There definition supports the clam that “*one terrorist is another’s freedom fighter*”. In Nigeria’s milieu this may not hold through completely for the three terror groups that we review. It’s not clear whom these groups are fighting for. The Bandit groups claim that they are Fulani neglected Herders; meanwhile there is an Association of cattle breeders called Miyetti Allah. The Boko Haram an Islamic sect, riots over the killing and the maltreatment of their leaders, vowing to avenge against former President Goodluck Jonathan. This proclamation presently does not have a justifiable reason to keep existing, since Goodluck Jonathan is no longer the President and a fellow Muslim is the President. It is not obvious that most Muslims in the North nor Fulani’s are interested in their struggle. Politicians and Islamic religious leaders have all denounced claims that Bandits, Miyetti Allah, and the Boko Haram, are fighting the interest of the North. Nigerians from all ethnic groups cried out against insecurity in the land. There are research gaps; lots of questions still unanswered about these terror groups. Although they engage in what could be called terrorism, their genuine political undertone has not been ascertained as a lot is suspected to be shredded in secrecy by the government of the day and these terror groups. There has been leading revelations pointing towards Mohammadu Buhari’s governments involvement in mobilizing the Fulani warlord all over the Africa to come avenge his lose at the election polls in the event that the then President Goodluck Johnathan did not handover government to him. Arms and ammunition prepared for this raid were not returned due to broken promises of unpaid funds and lands to settle

nomadic Fulani's from all over Africa. These hired assassins and mercenaries demanding compensation decided on gun running the nation. Thus their involvements in all sought of crimes.

Another, conspiracy theory around Fulani's groups – Bandits and Miyetti Allah, gun running in the nation, is the that Fulani's are mobilized for Jihad and occupation of Nigeria and Muhammadu Buhari being a patron of the Fulani Nation is ensuring Fulani's realized their dreams using all State apparatus. For which he has appointed only his ethnic group only to head all the armed forces, the police and other highly sensitive ministerial portfolios. Buhari administration's interest to in statute RUGA rancher's settlements all over Nigeria is indeed a heavy pointer alluding to the claims. The research gap will raise further questions as to whether it is permissible to call gun running groups without clear political objectives terrorists?. If not would they be called criminals? Or would it be right to call these terror groups freedom fighters? Whatever way these are looked at or they could called, the question asked is why has Nigeria government given them such a huge respect and allowance to operate without a label? Nigeria's statement has not been known to label them as either terrorist, criminals and of course not as freedom fighters. Government's reaction or response to this situation of violence and insecurity may be basically underlined, in Jonathan White's (2017) observation that a person is politically and socially degraded when an organization is called a terrorist group. Routine crimes assume greater social importance, when they are described as terrorists and political movements can be hampered when their followers are believed to be terrorists? Government gain power when their enemies are called terrorists, and citizens lose freedom in the name of greater security when the threats of terrorism appear – “this is government's hostility”.

White's empirical worldview about terrorism, gives insight into one of this study's objective into study the governance of insecurity. Could the Nigeria's government be playing weak in order to undermine the security threats of these groups, or in-order to open links for settlements by not labeling them as terrorists or criminals gangs? Even though government has engaged these groups, in open military actions, the military assault has been very weak and poorly coordinated and covered with lots of controversies and compromise. This also provides and justifies the adoption of the definitions of Banks and James (2017) that terrorism is “*the calculated unlawful use of violence or threat of unlawful violence to inculcate fear, intended to coerce or to intimidate government or society in the pursuit of goals, which are generally political, religious, or*

ideological.” This definition states and recognizes that crimes committed under whatever guise is terrorism. With this understanding about governance, insecurity and terrorism, what governance of insecurity, means therefore is: *“All lawful and unlawful act committed by a government or private organisation in order to inflict fear for order or control and manage legitimacy through democratic and none democratic means. It is a legitimate or illegitimate use of force to demonstrate power, in order to generate order, people’s cooperation and participation as a condition for security and safety.”* From known empirical research findings and theoretical ideas, terrorism is not stated to relate to governance, although like Schmidt (1992) observed, terrorism is but a social construct, defined by different people within their social milieu, which vacillates within political and social realities.

The Nigeria security reality stipulates a precarious view of efforts towards security and safety of citizens. Whether the safety provided by terror groups or by legitimate organs, both unfortunately silenced citizens under the urgency and need for a sane and safe society. Nigeria’s reality provides citizens’ as victims of insecurity and governing style of hostility by government and terror by terror groups. They are sandwiched between two social contracts (choices) of illegitimate terror groups and legitimate governments organs. Citizens are tossed between forces of “authorities’ as “soft target” and ungoverned communities for years. Gough (1939), highlights the importance of social contract (as in this stance) represents the consenting of individuals and communities to either explicitly or tacitly surrender their freedom or submit to the authority in exchange for protection of their remaining rights or maintenance of the social order (Castiglione, 2015; Celeste 2019). For instance Hallalu Kachala leader of over 1000 bandits and gangs, confirms in one of his interviews with journalists from Daily trust newspaper in 2021, 26 February, stated that they have a contract in the Zamfara communities Shinkafi,

“Two years ago, a peace deal was struck between Halilu’s gang and communities in Shinkafi, leading to relative peace in the area. Shinkafi’s gain is however other communities’ woes. While Halilu provides security for Shinkafi area, warding off marauding thieves, the arrangement, according to locals, provided Halilu and his gang a haven from where they launch attacks on other places. In praising the current peace accord in Zamfara State, Halilu told Daily Trust that for two years he and his men have not been attacked, except in isolated negligible incidents.” **(Daily trust, 26 February, 2021)**

The "voicelessness" and dilemma of these communities have been neglected in research, while their perceived traumatic state have been assumed to be marginable or understood. In another report, some communities occupied by government, enjoyed national welfare, while food supplies are cut-off from reaching Bandits in the forest, citizens suffer, even though traders find ways of cooperating with bandits to supply food. This shows governance – and redefinition of legitimacy and social contract. The rights of individuals are often over ridden in times of emergency and terror, leaving individuals and communities with no options but survivals. Social contract theory must redefine to include transfer of legitimacy not withstanding who offers the protection, - legitimate or non-legitimate party. This also makes situation of voicelessness as a subjective situation. A situation where communities or individuals are either hopeless or oppressed depends on parties' mission and aims. Terror groups providing food and basic welfare assure safety to their captured communities in exchange for cooperation in the same way government does. Given a fair competition for loyalty from occupied communities, the fight to regain or retain legitimacy by government, is not based on assumed legality. Governments have more to prove to her citizens, captured and governed by terror groups. Therefore, the failure of relative deprivation of protection and safety by one party, gives legitimacy, power and authority to the other group. For individuals and communities, what is lost by one party is the gain of the other? Research needs to expand and prove this term of social costing, where legitimacy, power and authority social merchandise sold by citizens to illegitimate or legitimate parties in conflict. Governance, security, and the voiceless communities are all connected by natural claim of inheritance, which is not physical but social? Dignity, respect, and fundamental human rights are natural inheritance of citizens and these must be claimed from governments democratically appointed by citizens to secure it. This is valued in the given legitimacy gained by government, but this can be lost to a terror group who provides relative security to communities according to capture and compliance by communities. Voicelessness is also relative in gained and lost depending on the party in terror given legitimacy. This is dispositional on the part of community and parties in conflict. Sometimes neutrality is difficulty, because both government and terror groups will demand loyalty.

Conclusion, Implications and Recommendation for Further Research

The Nigerian terror case opens up a lot of controversies and theoretical gaps in the study of terrorism, which researchers and researches must cover. These gaps limited our way of viewing terrorism and the operations of terror groups. Terrorism and terrorist groups as agents of fear and fatal affliction on citizens to get at governments, is narrow as this study proves that terror groups are also competitors for governance. Former studies of terrorism are limited as it has not been able to capture governments' involvement beyond fighting and arresting terrorism. This study rather provides the realisation that government are liable to their insensitivity and could fight as equals for legitimacy with terrorist groups in ungoverned spaces or communities. Efforts in this paper, provides a result of the case in point where government's refusal to label terrorist as criminal and terrorists. The Nigeria terror experience proves that terrorists take power and turn them into authority to operate and continue to amass influence. The democratic approaches of government towards terrorist groups, leads to gained authority, and political recognition, providing power, and access to people and their funds, through ransom collection. Nigeria governments' disposition not to label terrorists, and negotiating and paying ransoms in order to broker peace, demonstrates the desperation of a democratic government to score political goals and stabilize its ego. This model of approach to desuade terrorist is a failed one and not to be enecourage.

Community people as victims, of the terror groups and terrorists; this study has shown are also victims of the governments. Government's relative deprivations of her citizens with little or no governing presence is exposed here as governments hostility. in show of force or any security measure from government or military action discomfoting community people must be seen as making a victim in the same light which terror groups have enforced their rules and order of relationship with the victim-community people. Legitimacy as said above must be seen redefined to accommodate the reality of victimised-communities and individuals, to include need for safety, and as a process, which is endless, and continuously sought and demanded by a group or established system requesting it for mutually inclusive goals. Legitimacy under reality of terrorism, as in the case of Nigeria, shows terror groups or terrorism deposing the idea, that all terrorist do is to justify their actions and seek to be heard by government and the world. Terrorism works not as under-dogs and illegitimate operating units of people, but can also aim to be a legitimate organ who governs their spaces in exchange of safety and security parallel to government. Defining Terrorism can therefore be reconstructed to include legitimacy challenge

between terror groups, and government. Terrorism therefore can be seen as “The outlaw process for legitimizing criminality, through the justification of ordinate hurt conditions, force, creation of fear, and destruction of safety for a realisation of inordinate ambitions”. Hostility therefore can be seen as “the legitimised means of regaining and retain of power and authority through force or otherwise to reinforce order”. It is now a matter of contest, and the aim for terrorism can also be for financial gains of terrorists in contrast to the general believe that terrorist do not aim at personal gains? The continuous and baseless reason for the demand of ransom even from people claimed to be fighting for, and wide illicit trade of arms and ammunition is a serious exhibit that terrorist have personal gains, which is the sustaining and life-wire of reinforcement of individual interests. The investigation recruitment process of members of terror gangs is grossly insufficient here to credit a conclusion here.

References

- Achumba I.C, Ighomeroho O. Akpor-Robaro, M. (2013), security challenges in Nigeria and the implications for business activities and sustainable development. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*.
- Adibe, J. (2012). "Beyond Boko Haram." Daily Trust (Abuja). September 1.
- Adibe J. (2014). "The Character, Impact and Trajectories of the 'New' Conflicts in Nigeria." Final draft written for the Brookings AGI Study on the Impact of Conflict on Agriculture in West Africa, March.
- Banks J. (2017), Failed citizenship and transformative civic education. *Sage Journals*, 46, 7.
- Beland, D. (2005). Insecurity, citizenship, and globalization: the multiple faces of state protection* *Sociological Theory*, 23, pp. 22-41
- Bongar, (2007), The psychology of terrorism: defining the need and describing the goals. In B. Bongar, LM. Brown, L.E beutler, J.N Breckenridge, & Zimbardo P.G (Eds) *Psychology of terrorism* pp. 3-12 Oxford University Press
- Castiglione, D (2015) "Introduction to the logic of social cooperation for mutual advantage – the democratic contract. *Political Studies Review* 13(2) 161-175
- Chomsky, N (2002), Media control the spectacular achievements of propaganda. 2nd editon, seven stories Press, New York, 12
- Crenshaw M. (2000), The Psychology of Terrorism: An Agenda for the 21st Century. *Political Psychology* 21.2 pp 405-420.
- Gough J.W (1936), *The Social Contract*. Clarendon Press Oxford
- Ikenga, F. A. & Efebeh, V. (2013), Boko Haram: A new wave of terrorist movement in Nigeria: Warri: Grace Communication International.
- Lesh R, Post, T. & Behr, M. (1987) Representation and translations among representation in mathematics learning and problem solving. *Problems of representation in the teaching and learning of mathematics* 21, 33-40.
- Lister M.J. (2012), Who are Refugees? [*Law and Philosophy: 32, 5 \(2013\), Page 645-671*](#)
- Moghaddam F. (2007), The new global American dilemma of terrorism, vol, 30, 3. Pp 373-380, international society of Political Psychology
- Mwangi Kimenyi, J. Adibe, Djiré, A.J. Jirgi, A. Kergna, T, T. Deressa, J. E. Pugliese & A. Westbury (2014), The impact of conflict and political instability on agricultural investments in Mali and Nigeria. Africa Growth Initiative Working Paper

- Norwood A, Ursano, R, Fullerton C, and Levinson T. (2007), Terrorism, trauma, and Mass casualty triage: How might we solve the latest mind-body problem. Biosecurity and bioterrorism-biodefense strategy practice and science
- Obi, N.J (2015), the role of small-scale enterprises in the achievement of economic Growth in Nigeria. International Journal of social sciences and humanities 3, 1-26
- Obi, P (2015) Nigeria is suffering from cumulative effect of leadership failure. Channels Television, Lagos Nigeria
- Schmid A.P (1992), Terrorism, democracy, terrorism and political violence. Volume 4, 4, 14-25. Western Responses to Terrorism.
- Uzodike N.O & Maiangwa, B.(2012), Boko Haram terrorism in Nigeria : causal factors and central problematic, African Renaissance Vol 9, No 1, 2012 Pp 91-11
- White J. (2017), Terrorism and home land security. Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Wilkinson, P. (1974), Political terrorism: Red Globe Press London
- UNESCO. International Bureau for Education 2021.
- United Nations Development projects, UNDP (2021) Nigeria's ranking in UN Human development unchanged, New York.
- World Bank (1989), Sub-Saharan Africa from crisis to sustainable growth Washington D.C