

Human Security, Political Parties and Democratic Sustainability in Nigeria's Fourth Republic

¹Aduku Akubo A. and ²Yakubu Umoru Adejo

¹Centre for Inter-African and Human Development Studies (CIDES) Jos, Plateau State, Nigeria.

²School of General Studies Federal Polytechnic, Kaura Namoda. Zamfara State, Nigeria.

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the concepts of human security, political parties and democratic sustainability in Nigeria's fourth republic. In doing this the nexus between human security, which is a departure from the state centric notion of security (survival of the state), to human centric security (survival and welfare of the people), was interrogated. The paramount place of the political parties were x-rayed, detailing most of the functions that are expected of political parties as critical institutions of democratic governance. The paper recommends that programmes and policies of political parties are to revolve around human security, since the welfare and development of the people is very key to the survival of any democratic experiment.

Keywords: Human security, political parties, democracy and Nigeria.

INTRODUCTION

A society without security threat is a dead society since security crisis is a reality of human existence and therefore a means of understanding social behaviour (Egbefo and Salihu, 2014: 177)[1]. Since the end of the Cold War, security studies have broadened to take into account a wide range of non-military threats ranging from poverty to environmental concerns rather than just national defence. Security scholars, backed by international organizations and a growing number of national governments, have developed the concept of „human security“, focusing on the welfare of ordinary people against a broad range of threats[2].

The issues of human security and peace are indispensable in the life of every nation. For far too long, in many parts of the world, especially in our continent (Africa), governments had placed much emphasis on the security of the state, and our very scarce resources were committed to military and regime security, at the expense of human security (Jonathan, 2014)[3]. National security (of which human security is a component) is the podium of democracy and if democracy loses security imperatives, it

has lost its core essence (Adu, ND). National security Attah (2006:14 cited in Adu, ND) observed will be endangered when the economy slumps, when the citizens can no longer maintain their accustomed standard of living, when employment opportunities are no longer available, and when the country is corrupt. The concept of national security must be expanded to include protection against all major threats to human survival and well-being, including threats posed by severe environmental degradation and massive human suffering. The change from national security to human security can be seen as security in an "extended" sense[4].

In May 1999 Nigeria's return to civil rule was accompanied with fresh hopes and latent optimism. This optimism is predicated on the fact that democracy would guarantee freedom, liberty, and equity and enhances security of lives and property, which would indeed reposition development trajectories to sustainability. Regrettably this optimism seems to be a mirage. Nigeria is presently rated as one of the poorest Nations in the world with debilitating youth's unemployment. Majority of the population seem to lack access to pipe borne water, health care facilities, electricity and affordable quality education (Nwanegbo and Odigbo, 2013)[5]. Nigeria's democracy (even though it is evolving) remains nascent and its unity challenged by intractable threats to lives and property (Fayeye, 2012: 190)[6]. Nigeria had continued to struggle with the delivery of democratic governance and democracy dividend - social welfare, justice, equity, and equal access to resources and power. Often times, it seem as if the transition from military to civilian rule has been simply cosmetic due to the not too impressive scorecard of civil governance thus prompting scholars to aver that Nigeria is yet to attain the status of a democracy[7].

Political parties play very critical roles in democratization of any nation. Central to the successes and failures of electoral politics is the cardinal and strategic functions of this all important and an integral organ of democratization which is core to its development. The dawn of the Nigerian fourth republic which has witnessed renewed and sustained activities of political parties which is the most complex and critical institutions of democracy but undoubtedly has either shapened or stagnated the sustenance, deepening and consolidation of democracy (Akubo and Yakubu, 2014: 79)[8]. A review of Nigeria's experience with party democracy since 1999 when the military handed over power shows that the electoral system is riddled with defects while political parties are a parody of themselves. The cumulative effect is a democratic system that leaves a lot to be desired (Tyoden, 2013: 1)[9]. A return to democratic rule after several years under the yoke of military (mis)rule which was marked by much suffering, infrastructure decay, and institutionalized corruption. The hope of the common man for a just and an egalitarian society became rekindled with the institution

of a democratic government. Nigerians greeted the return to democratic rule with widespread jubilation and optimism as they looked forward to a new era of stability, peace, and prosperity. However, seventeen (17) years after, Nigerians are still anxious to see and enjoy “democracy dividends” - social welfare, justice, equity, and equal access to resources and power (Olu-Adeyemi, 2013: 167)[7]. If the truth will be told, our experience with democracy has been unenviable to say the least[9].

In this democratic dispensation, the issue of security has remained topical and indeed constituted a serious course for concern not only to the private but also to public individuals in the country. Succinctly put, the security question has, in recent times, emerged as a key concept in Nigeria’s struggle for good governance, sustainable democracy and development (Nkwede, 2011)[10]. Despite successive attempts by Nigerian government to address the cankerworm through public policy alternatives such as regional and state mechanisms, federal character principle, inter alia, the security problem still remains a thorny issue in the country and has taken a staggering dimension (Nwekede, 2013)[10]. Our development must be people-centred, people-driven and anchored on human security[3].

Nwekede (2013)[10] amplifying Claude Adejumbi and Kehinde (2007)[11] views said he identified four characters of the Nigerian state that have disabled it from effective response to the security issues. These are the coercive nature of the state because it has been an exploitative state. Secondly, the Nigerian state is quite indifferent to social welfare, thirdly, the state has an image of a hostile coercive force, as a result of its colonial origin as exacerbated by its post-colonial abuses; and fourthly, its lack of autonomy. Consequent upon the above, the state was not seen as a protector of public interest and as such deserves no respect and loyalty. Apart from the above reasons, it can safely be argued that the efforts to build a virile democracy in a heterogeneous culture with fear of political domination and perceived insecurity, social injustice and absolute neglect to the principles of rule of law have resulted to several unrests, frustrations, deep seated hatred, insinuations and killings which indeed culminated to the current security challenges Nwekede (2013)[10]. We recognize human security as encompassing firm guarantees for human rights and good governance, that translate into expanded opportunities for economic security, food security, health and education security, environmental security, and personal and community security. A firm commitment to human security holds the promise of an end to persistent conflicts, insecurity, poverty, disease, terrorism and other scourges that undermine the attainment of our dreams (Jonathan, 2014)[3]. Hence, the focus of this work is on Human Security, Political Parties and democratic sustainability in the present political dispensation (The Fourth Republic). To this we turn for a critical analysis.

CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATION

HUMAN SECURITY

Human security is the latest in a long line of neologisms-including common security, global security, cooperative security, and comprehensive security- that encourage policymakers and scholars to think about international security as something more than the military defence of state interests and territory. Although definitions of human security vary, most formulations emphasize the welfare of ordinary people (Paris, 2001: 87). The idea of „human security“ continues to stir debate among scholars in international relations and development studies. One reason for the popularity of this concept lies in the attempt to understand the changing functions of security forces in recent decades, in which the international community has expanded peacekeeping operations following both intrastate and civil wars[2].

The concept of security has for too long been interpreted narrowly: as security of territory from external aggression, or as protection of national interests in foreign policy or as global security from the threat of nuclear holocaust. . . . Forgotten were the legitimate concerns of ordinary people who sought security in their daily lives (UNDP 1994: 22)[12]. The original notion of human security emphasized that a distinctive aspect of the concept was that it was „people-centric“ rather than state-centric (Inglehart and Norris, 2012: 76)[2]. Interventions have broadened in scope well beyond the provision of blue-helmet security to cover challenges of overcoming human suffering, economic destruction, social reconstruction and securing agreement for new constitutional settlements. The expansion has been fuelled by widespread concern that societies deeply divided by conflict and violence, where longstanding autocracies have collapsed, are breeding grounds for terrorism, organized crime, weapons proliferation, humanitarian emergencies, environmental degradation, genocide and political extremism[13].

Human security views the security of individual human beings to warrant higher priority than the security of states. It is guided by the four freedoms formulated by Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1944 when he was President of the United States: freedom of expression, freedom of religion, freedom from want and freedom from fear. The governments of all states have assumed responsibility for the security of human beings - in their own state and globally - since they signed the UN Charter and conventions on human rights (Anonymous).

According to Ogata (1998)[14] (former) United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees he affirms that:

“Several key elements make up human security. A first essential element is the possibility for all citizens to live in peace and security within their own borders. This implies the capacity of states and citizens to prevent and resolve conflicts through peaceful and nonviolent means and, after the conflict is over, the ability to effectively carry out reconciliation efforts. A second element is that people should enjoy without discrimination all rights and obligations - including human, political, social, economic and cultural rights - that belonging to a State implies. A third element is social inclusion - or having equal access to the political, social and economic policy making processes, as well as to draw equal benefits from them. A fourth element is that of the establishment of rule of law and the independence of the justice system. Each individual in a society should have the same rights and obligations and be subject to the same set of rules. These basic elements which are predicated on the equality of all before the law, effectively remove any risk of arbitrariness which so often manifests itself in discrimination, abuse or oppression.”

Fayeye (2012: 190) citing Akintunde, (1967) and Ademola, Azeez (2011)[6],[15],[16] argued that: Broadly, security is seen as freedom from danger or threats to a nation's ability to protect or defend itself, promote its cherished values and legitimate interest and enhance the well-being of its people (Akintunde, 1969)[15]. However, Ademola, Azeez (2011)[16] shows that in modernising society, security means development. It is not military force, though it may involve it. Security is not traditional military activities, though it may encompass it, neither is it military hardware, though it may include it. Security is development and without development, there can be no security. This perspective emphasises human security. It implies the maturation of the

structures and processes that can engender and guarantee political space and sufficient conditions for the realisation of personal, group and/or national aspirations [6].

Human security is a movement away from traditional and state-centric definition. It encompasses the personal and communal state of being secured from a wide range of critical and pervasive threats, including but not limited to all forms of violence, injustice and violation of human rights[6].[17].

Espiell (cited in IDEA, 2006)[18] likewise explicitly draws connections between the idea of security as a human right and democracy.

He underscores the importance of reasserting what he calls „the absolutely essential relationship between human rights, democracy and the rule of law“. Human rights, he affirms, can have no real existence without democracy, and there is no democracy without human rights. The present concept of the rule of law, a law-based state, implies not only a state where there is law, but a state that acknowledges the existence of human rights and is limited by all the consequences of accepting democracy. That very clear and very precise view of security as a human right and the basis of democracy, he recalls, is forgotten in antidemocratic and totalitarian regimes, where the notion of security of person ceases to exist and concepts of „national security“ become synonymous with the security of the state against individuals, viz. not a human right, but a right of the state, and a non-democratic state

Annan (1998)[19] posits that security means far more than absence of conflict but that lasting peace requires a broader vision encompassing areas such as education, health, democracy and human rights, protection against environmental degradation and proliferation of deadly weapons. Annan (1998)[19] noted that there is no security amidst starvation, peace building without poverty alleviation and no true freedom built on the foundation of injustice. These pillars that form the concept of human security are said to be interrelated and naturally reinforcing. The former prime minister of Great Britain, Tony Blair (ND) asserted, security requires much more than hard power and sophisticated weapons. It also requires an appreciation for the complex ways in which our political, economic, and social institutions help make us feel secured. More-so, an individual who has not satisfied his or her basic needs like food, clothing, health care,

housing, education and work can hardly be called secure-no matter how much weaponry the individual may have at his disposal.

Mostly, two contending perspectives tend to provide the basis for the conceptualization of human security. One is a neo-realist theoretical framework, which is predicated on the primacy and centrality of state in conceptualizing security. It tends to explain security from the standpoint of state primary responsibility. Within this context, Buzan (1991)[20] argued that the „straitjacket“ militaristic approach to security that dominated the discourse during the Cold War was “simple-minded” and subsequently led to the underdevelopment of the concept. For him, human security includes political, economic, social and environmental threats including those that are militaristic. Thus, Buzan (1991)[20] illustrated a tripartite concept analysis of security based on international system, state level and individual level but submitted that sovereign states should remain the most effective security provider.

The second approach is a postmodernist or pluralist view that seeks to displace the state(s) as a major provider of security but rather places greater emphasis on non-state actors. Advocates of this approach tend to argue that the concept of security goes beyond a military determination of threats. According to Booth (1994)[21] states and implicitly governments must no longer be the primary referents of security because governments which are supposed to be the “guardians of their peoples” security” have instead become the primary source of insecurity for the many people who live under their sovereignty. As a result, Booth (1994)[21] further argued that human security is ultimately more important than state security. While concurring with Both, Nwabueze (1989:2)[22] posited that economic security of the individual is or should be of far greater concern to the government and society than the security of the state. Human security includes not only protection against criminality but also the peoples” right to basic social services (basic education, primary health care, water and sanitation, nutrition and reproductive health) and to preventive as well as relief and rehabilitation measures with respect to disasters.

“Human security, in its broadest sense, embraces far more than the absence of violent conflict. It encompasses human rights, good governance, access to education and health care and ensuring that each individual has opportunities and choices to fulfil his or her potential. Freedom from want, freedom from fear, and the freedom of future generations to inherit a healthy natural environment -- these are the interrelated building blocks of human - and therefore national - security[19].

“Human security refers to the quality of life of the people of a society or polity. Anything which degrades their quality of life - demographic pressures, diminished access to or stock of resources, and so on - is a security threat. Conversely, anything which can upgrade their quality of life - economic growth, improved access to resources, social and political empowerment, and so on - is an enhancement of human security (Ogata, 1999)[23]. “Human security can be said to have two main aspects. It means, first, safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression. And second, it means protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life - whether in homes, in jobs or in communities. Such threats can exist at all levels of national income and development”[12].

UNDP (1994)[12] report proposed seven major components of human security: economic security; food security; health security; environmental security; personal security (safety from such things as torture, war, criminal attacks, domestic violence, drug use, suicide and traffic accidents); community security (the survival of traditional cultures and ethnic groups); and political security (the enjoyment of civil and political rights, and freedom from political oppression). Human security was also envisaged in the report as *universal* (applying to all people and societies), *interdependent* (where diverse types of threats are linked together), *preventative* (where the primary concern is to ameliorate and reduce the causes of insecurity) and *people-centred* (focusing upon individuals, not just relationships among nation-states). The report also introduced the important notion of *subjective* security - what makes people feel safe - referring to

„human security as people see it“, in contrast to objective indicators of income inequality or armed violence[2].

Human security means in its most simple expression, all those things that men and women anywhere in the world cherish most: enough food for the family; adequate shelter; good health; schooling for the children; protection from violence whether inflicted by man or by nature; and a State which does not oppress its citizens but rules with their consent (Frechette, 1999)[24].” In policy terms, human security is an integrated, sustainable, comprehensive security from fear, conflict, ignorance, poverty, social and cultural deprivation, and hunger, resting upon positive and negative freedoms (Ginkel and Newman, 2000: 79)[25]. The term human security...focuses on the concept of security on human survival, wellbeing and freedom.” “...we conceptualize human security as the objective - the ultimate ends - of all security concerns. In this schema, other forms of security, such as military security, are not ultimate goals. Rather, these other forms of security are simply means for achieving the ultimate objectives of human security[26].

Jennifer et al (2000: 37)[27] sum up the concept of human security thus:

“Human security is an underlying condition for sustainable human development. It results from the social, psychological, economic, and political aspects of human life that in times of acute crisis or chronic deprivation protect the survival of individuals, support individual and group capacities to attain minimally adequate standards of living, and promote constructive group attachment and continuity through time. Its key measurable components can be summarized as: a sustainable sense of home; constructive social and family networks; and an acceptance of the past and a positive grasp of the future. It is suggested that these components can be best measured by trends in their inverse indicators (social dislocation, dynamic inequality, and discount rate)

For MacLean (ND) “In broad terms, human security shifts our focus from traditional territorial security to that of the person. Human security recognizes that an individual’s personal protection and preservation comes not just from the safeguarding of the state as a political unit, but also from access to individual welfare and quality of life. But human security does not merely “envelope” matters of individual benefit (such as education, health care, protection from crime, and the like); this is because these

matters could be thought of as part of the objectives of sovereign states. Rather, human security also denotes protection from the *unstructured violence* that often accompanies many aspects of non-territorial security, such as violence emanating from environmental scarcity, or mass migration. Therefore, just as traditional notions of territorial security involve the structured violence manifest in state warfare, human security also attends to the issue of unstructured violence. Arowolo and Aluko (2012)[28] argue that human security is potentially open to operationalization, within the limits of the available data, by focusing upon the most *severe* threshold of a range of life-threatening risks. They offer a definition that is intended to include only essential elements that are „important enough for human beings to fight over or to put their lives or property at great risk“ Arowolo and Aluko (2012)[28]. They identify five key indicators of human security: poverty, health, education, political freedom and democracy.

We must emphasize that human security and peace are intertwined. Peace is not just the absence of violence or war. Peace encompasses every aspect of social tranquillity and wellbeing. The peace we strive for is a state marked by the absence of severe human want and avoidable fear. In our lifetime, this peace is attainable, in our nations and our continent[3].

POLITICAL PARTIES

Political parties are critical institutions of democratic governance and indeed, important pillars of democracy (Simbine, 2002, 2006 cited in Simbine 2014: 130)[29]. Political parties are key institutions in the political process of any democracy (Muhammed- Bande, 2014: 60)[30]. They are traditionally the most significant intermediary organization in democratic societies. Students of political parties have commonly associated them with democracy itself (Orji, 2014: 1)[31]. They are the main vehicles for organizing political representation, political competition, and democratic accountability. They engage in political recruitment, structure electoral choices, link the state and civil society, influence the executive, formulate public policy and facilitate

coalitions (Muhammed- Bande, 2014: 60)[30]. Political parties, as “makers” of democracy, have been so romanticized that scholars claim that neither democracies nor democratic societies are thinkable without them (Omotola, 2009)[32]. Indeed, democracy is unthinkable in the absence of viable political parties.

Parties are expected to participate in the political socialization of electorate, contribute to the accumulation of political power, facilitate recruitment of political leadership and serve as a unifying force in a divided polity (Omotola, 2010: 125)[33]. Political parties remain important, if not essential instruments for representing political constituencies and interests, aggregating demands and preferences, recruiting and socializing new candidates for office, organizing the electoral competition for power, crafting policy alternatives, setting the policy making agenda, forming effective governments, and integrating groups and individuals into the democratic process (Diamond, 1997: xxiii). Parties help aggregate citizen interests. They connect individuals with common interests with political leadership and governments. Without parties, it is difficult to see how individual citizen interests can come together to nominate candidates, elect leaders and determine public policy[34].

In the view of Galadima (2014: 100)[35] he was critical and detailed in his explanation of political parties: he maintained that:

Political parties are very essential to democracy, especially as they are the compelling forces of any representative democracy. Political parties perform functions which are necessary for the democratic process. Parties mediate or arbitrate between a pluralistic society and its political institutions of government as well as organized political campaigns in order to mobilize voters to participate in an election. Parties also recruit political personnel by selecting and nominating candidates who stand for public office in an election. They aggregate a plurality of interests into a reasonable number of political alternatives or policy options, and thus channel conflicts between government and opposition. Parties enable people to generate a plurality of opinions in public debate, elaborate projects or proposals for society and governments and give the people the opportunity to ventilate their grievances as well as convey their aspirations and support. A political party relay on manifestoes and programmes to present their official positions on issues of importance and identify those issues they acknowledge as salient. The goal of a political party is to win election.

DEMOCRATIC SUSTAINABILITY

Originally, the concept of democratic consolidation or put differently democratic sustainability (these two concepts are intertwined and sometimes used interchangeably and will equally be used in this work to mean the same thing) was to mean an identifiable phase in the process of transition from authoritarian to democratic systems that are critical to the establishment of a stable, institutional and lasting democracy (Ademola, 2011: 308)[16]. Democratic sustainability is a product of a combination of factors or conditions operating together. An accumulation of these facilitating conditions therefore offers the prospects of democratic survival and deepening to be enhanced[36].

According to Nwolise (2006 cited in Nwolise 1985)[37],[38] sustainable democracy requires that:

- Elections are conducted peacefully, freely, fairly and regularly.
 - An incumbent democratic government defeated in office through a free and fair electoral process should accept the results.
 - The society enjoys longevity of regular democratic elections and government. □
- The society progressively develops its capacity to nurture and consolidate democratic culture and democratic governance.
- There should be no threats to abort or actual abortion of democratic governance and culture.

Sustaining any democracy requires renewal and continual review. A democratic system can be incomplete or partial and open to manipulation by political elites. Moreover, democracy is not only about elections. It is also about distributive and social justice. If democracy fails to provide for justly distributed socio-economic development, human security is likely to be threatened (International IDEA, 2006: 13). Democracy in Nigeria is not only growing at a very slow trend but also oscillates between stagnancy and backwardness, thus degenerating into a crisis level where democratic ideals become threatened and governance becomes privatised, if not personalised, by the powerful. This, indeed, impairs the pace of political stability, deepens the root of political gerontocracy and strengthens sectional political hegemony.

Present democracy in Nigeria is crisis-ridden and suffers from several problems which include but not limited to the following: democracy is being practised within inefficient and non-viable rules (Arowolo and Aluko, 2012: 804)[28]. Security is the probability that a system can be sustained, a human system, a social system, a state system, a world system and a democratic rule[39].

LITERATURE REVIEW

Since the end of the Cold War, security studies have broadened to take into account non-military threats, such as environmental scarcity and degradation, the spread of disease, overpopulation, refugee movements, nationalism, terrorism and nuclear catastrophe, rather than focusing narrowly on external threats to states. Valid measures of perceptions of human security have become essential, both to understand the determinants of human security among ordinary people and to analyze their consequences (Inglehart and Norris, 2012: 92)[2]. Seven billion people have been living on earth since October 2011. Around one billion people are hungry. This scandalously skewed distribution is further exacerbated by armed conflicts, but also especially by the impact of global warming. Human security and sustainable development for billions of people are thus being violated. Around one billion people do not have enough water, while two billion are suffering from insufficiently treated water. Lack of knowledge, insufficient investment and armed conflicts are the underlying reason. Overcoming hunger and shortage of water is a daily task and will remain a task for the next few decades. Hunger and water shortage outweigh all other global problems and challenges (Anonymous).

Protests ignited throughout the world - in the Middle East, Africa, Latin America, Spain and Russia. These protests unite desires for freedom and for social justice. Freedom of expression and freedom from want are inseparable. The Occupy movement expresses the protest of the many against the economic power of the few throughout the world. The protests are directed at non-democratic rule, but they also pose a challenge to democratic parties. Social democratic governments and opposition parties

are often unable to meet and fulfil legitimate demands and hopes. Protest movements are calling for the legitimisation of political rule through free elections, especially in states in the Middle East as well as in Russia. The democratic legitimisation of political processes forms the linkage between societal movements and democratic parties (Anonymous).

The health of any democratic system depends on the institutions sustaining it. The subsisting electoral system and the nature of political parties in any given society are the pillars of democracy in that society (Tyoden, 2013: 2)[9]. This is so because of the role the two plays in not only defining the nature of democracy in the society, but also its sustenance and consolidation[9].

Audu (ND, citing Briggs, 1990:313, Cletus 2004:206, Murray and Viotti (1994) contends that:

The crudest expression between security and the socio-economic and political structure is expressed by the cliché about the choice between the guns and butter. More butter for the populace rather than guns to defend their peace. No matter how much we spend for arms, there is no safety in arms alone. Our security is the total product of our economic, intellectual, moral and military strength. The emphasis here is that too much emphasis on military hardware does not necessarily determine national security. In Nigeria, the long years of military rule naturally concentrated on the military imperative and thereby neglecting the non-military option (Human Security) and this created a volatile atmosphere to peace and security. Cletus alluded that the concern of security in its military-strategic dimensions, particularly in terms of defending political independence and sovereignty, has pushed most third world countries, including Nigeria, towards military buildup. He further added that the failure to resolve their social, economic and political problems is one of the single factors that have led to their present security dilemma. The term security goes well beyond military consideration; security can be understood both as a defence against external or internal threats as well as the overall socio-economic well-being of society and the individuals who comprise it.

HUMAN SECURITY, POLITICAL PARTIES AND DEMOCRATIC SUSTAINABILITY: THE NEXUS

Probably the nexus between national security (of which human security cannot be divorced) and democratic rule is like addressing the fundamental question-National security, whose security? If democracy is centred on the people and the people is said to mean the poor, disadvantaged, or the many, it therefore implies that national

security must be people-oriented. Synergy between ... security and democratic rule, the linkage between ... security and democratic rule is that of mutual transmissibility of impacts and repercussions[1].

Furthermore, it is expedient to note that one of the fundamentals of a democratic rule is constitution and constitutionalism; and of the three key obligatory responsibilities the Nigerian constitution outlines for its government in terms of relationship with the Nigerian people, the issue of security is most conspicuous. Thus, section 14:2b of the 1999 constitution states that “the security and welfare (Human security) of the people shall be the primary purpose of government” (Bamgbose *et al.*, 2012)[39]. If we agree that security connotes freedom from danger or anxiety, it is within this context that it must be viewed as the inalienable right of human beings that must be guaranteed under democratic rule. The above implies that there is an organic relationship between (democracy) security and welfare (Adu, ND). Democracy is threatened whenever there is woeful lack of socioeconomic services to the people and that sustainable and people-oriented reforms- education, health etc. make, it possible, in theory and practice, for democratization process to thrive and obtain popular support and participation, hence the political parties are always using undemocratic strategies to win election (Anonymous, ND: 1). If democracy is centred on the people and the people is said to mean the poor, disadvantaged, or the many, it therefore implies that for national security to be achieved to avoid crises, it must be people-oriented[1].

Democracy is in crisis worldwide at the very time when there needs to be a renewed emphasis on democratic practice as the key to the attainment of 21st century human security aims. Democracy matters for human security because well-designed and inclusive political institutions and processes are the key to both preventing violence and managing conflict constructively, and because respect for human rights and public participation are essential for meeting human development objectives (International IDEA, 2006: 4)[18]. The organic unity of democratic rule and security (Especially human

security) is very imperative. What is often under emphasized hitherto is the place of security in a democratic rule. Political parties are key players in a democracy and their behavior, violent or otherwise have huge consequences for democratic stability and consolidation. Understanding the nature and dynamics of the political party - violence nexus is central to the management of the politics of violence and violence in politics in Nigeria (Charles Soludo (2005)[40]. No democracy can be built on violence -ridden environment. Democracy loses its essence without security friendly environment because it is the pillar of democracy (Adu, ND: 14). The suffusion of violent conflicts in competitive politics and party political behavior is ordinarily aberrant. Political parties should be the institutional platform for mediating and reconciling differences and managing conflicts. Democratic values and procedures underscore civility, peaceful association, participation, accountability, consensus - building and non- violent protests in the management of societal and political difference and conflict[41].

The security of the citizens is the primary duty of any government. National security is the podium of democracy and its values for the people. As such, there is no factor that provides meaning and legitimacy to democratic rule than security (Most especially human security). It is the protective umbrella of all other sectors of the democratic system. It is also the pillar of political order, stability and development in all segments of societal values and aspirations. In strategic context, democracy and security (by extension human security) are correlates because both are people- centred. The chief end of every democratic government is to provide an assured welfare and security of its people. The survival of democracy is therefore dependent, among other things, on the dynamics of national security. It is expedient to note that the synergy between security and democracy is inseparable to the extent that if democracy loses its security essence, it has lost its core values (Adu, ND).

Sources of insecurity lie in exclusion and lack of access to power and resources. The concept of human security emphasizes the protection of people from grave threats to their lives, safety from harm and violent conflict, and empowerment against such

social threats as disease or crime. Democracy enables the protection of peoples through institutional safeguards, equality before the law, and the advancement of human rights. Democratic practice links the empowerment of people to critical developmental outcomes such as education, health care, and opportunities for livelihood. There is a certain imbalance in international efforts to build democracy today (International IDEA, 2006: 6)[18]. The current emphasis on democratic elections (Which has at its core, political parties) may strengthen certain kinds of political regime and the competition between political parties, but it does not guarantee state responses to collective needs, the participation of civil society in decision-making processes, or the social and political accountability of the ruling classes in developing and transitional societies (International IDEA, 2006: 6)[18]. The question of how democratization may contribute to the realization of human security is key: the reduction of inequality, the furthering of rights, free expression and mobility [18].

Human security can no longer solely have a military meaning, that it is also a matter of human rights, of good governance and must encompass economic development, social justice, environmental protection, democratization, disarmament, and respect for human rights and the rule of law (Annan, 2001)[17]. Democracy depends on parties to survive, since the structure of elections right from citizens participation to candidates' selection and presentation of competing political programmes is done by political parties. It is on this note that political parties occupy a special place in the democratic equation. All parties are engaged in intra party conflict rather than embarked on programmes that would benefit the masses (Isigwe, Paulinus Obinna (2012)[42]. Modern democracy is party democracy; the political institutions and practices that are the essence of democratic government in the Western view were the creations of political parties and would be unthinkable without them[43].

The Nigeria's fourth republic began with the reintroduction of democracy in May 1999. This came about with ambivalent feelings of hope and disdain as if democracy has truly come to stay or a mere flash in the pan. At the initial stage, the old brigade

still took over the mantle of leadership and they never seemed to have learnt from their past mistakes, hence, the nascent democracy was first injected with the old virus of theft, corrupt practices and cliché of business as usual which eventually sowed the embers of challenges that the fourth republic has to fan till the present time (Bamgbose, Moshood and Shamsideen, 2012: 68)[39]. In systems that have very high levels of resource rents available, such as Nigeria, politics is dominated by issues concerning the distribution of resource rents, not ideology. Voters select parties on the basis of credible promises to deliver natural resource rents to regions, localities, and groups of individuals; parties attempt to maximize political power. In political systems with opposition parties, incumbents make offers on resource rents in a Darwinian fashion, attempting to gain a minimum winning coalition to maintain power[44].

The security of a country does not depend solely or primarily on the country's military capacities but on the strength and reliability of the various interrelated linkages which could ensure and sustain democratic rule. Socio-economic development and human security forms the bedrock of national security because it is the security of the ordinary man and woman in a society especially in a democratic rule that translates into the security of the nation (Adu, ND: 15). Democracy cannot thrive in an atmosphere of instability and insecurity. It is only in a genuine democracy can citizens control or influence government decisions and actions. It is therefore, truism to say that "good democratic government is the only guarantee for stability" (Adu, ND: 15).

Socioeconomic programs are core in democratization processes; education, health etc constitute the starting point in the foundation of sustainable democratic strategy. Broad-based economic prosperity sustains democracy, whereas widespread poverty and ignorance undermine it [45].

The current democratic effort in Nigeria is taking place within the context of massive economic decline and erosion of living standards of most Nigerians by the economic policies of self centred leaders (Bamgbose, Moshood and Shamsideen, 2012: 75)[39]. Socio-economic paraphernalia of people's lives and other activities are better

organized in a democratic way (Kukah, 2003:214-242)[46]. People must therefore come first in democratization process. The prevailing socio-economic issues that dominate Nigerians and democratization have been the condition of health care, education and other essential services. In the first place, health and education determine, to a large extent, all other services and the condition of the democratization processes. In other words, without sound and meaningful education, without adequate health care facilities for the people, democratization process is bound to fail and sustainable democracy and democratic tenets would be a mirage (Bamgbose, Moshood and Shamsideen, 2012: 75)[39]. The poverty level of the people could engender social unrest and insecurity in the state, promote economic decline necessitated by the egocentric and self focused economic reform packages of several leaders. Even, it has the capacity of tainting or blindfolding peoples, electoral behaviour (including formulation, composition, membership and selection of candidates in the political parties) and thereby makes people easily susceptible to bribe and unhealthy electoral practices thus throw the society to legitimacy crisis. It is the rampant amorality and corrupt practices which stand in the way of Nigeria democratic process[39].

The primary sources of national security are not centred on external defences but on internal cohesion based on the provision of satisfactory socio-economic services by government. Put differently, it is not the amount of defence budgets on military hardware that determines the security of a nation but more crucially on socio-economic budgets directed at the people's well-being. Unfortunately, Nigeria has been spending large sums on orthodox sector security without taking cognizance of people's socio-economic condition which invariably threatens any government, especially democratic government.

HUMAN SECURITY, POLITICAL PARTIES: IMPLICATION FOR DEMOCRATIC SUSTAINABILITY

African countries in most cases do not face major threats: with respect to their external security. Most of the security challenges they face are internal, and these are of two kinds: threats to personal or human security as a condition of decent livelihood;

and those having to do with public order. The current state of human security, peace and development in our dear continent presents a picture of hope as well as challenges. For over a decade, Africa has consolidated on its democracy, and many countries have exited military dictatorship. There is now a heightened commitment to the tenets of good governance, and the rule of law[3].

Nigeria has always sought security, peace and development. We are steadily developing a strong and vibrant democracy. There is enthusiastic participation across the Nation, with a purposeful government and active opposition parties (Jonathan, 2014). There can be no doubt that, in a new democracy like Nigeria, Political Parties are central to democratic consolidation and sustainability. To play this role, effective regulation is key. This is because their role in democratic consolidation and sustainability is sometimes undermined by their determination to capture and hold power. Indeed, their quest for power could sometimes become patently dysfunctional [34].

A major concern is the high level of unemployment among the youth, especially those that are educated and skilled. No priority for human security is more important for African countries than a sharp focus on creating jobs for this teeming youth population. Skills acquisition, entrepreneurship development, encouraging the youth to go into agriculture as a business, and providing them with access to cheaper financing to fulfil their dreams, are all needed to harness and unleash the power of our youth to secure our collective future[3].

If we improve governance and accountability systems, we must reduce the cost of governance and increase more of the national resources on the governed (Jonathan, 2014)[3]. The starting point is the requirement for a new political and legal culture, which anchors politics on the demands and dictates of liberal morality. Ethic, accountability, transparency, tolerance, participation, inclusiveness, separation of powers, and the rule of law, under constitutional or limited government, doing this will involve viewing the triadic relationship between politics, law and morality as a seamless

web (Lumumba-Kasongo, 2005)[47]. In particular, we need to reduce the cost of elections (of which political parties is the nucleus) and electioneering and shift greater focus on ensuring that the dividends of democracy are delivered to our peoples (Human security) [3].

Good governance popularized by democrats is measured using four criteria. These are accountability, transparency, participation and respect for the rule of law. Nigeria adopted the World Bank/ IMF development theory of downsizing the state so as to allow her play a minimal role in economic activities. The state goal is to “release the economic potential of the people” and “liberate market forces”. Nigeria is ranked among the low income countries in the world (MacEwan,1999)[48]. Countries in this category are characterized by high percentage of population who live in extreme conditions that include extreme poverty and hunger, a large number of children who remain out of school, gender inequality, and high incidence of child mortality. It is estimated that 121 deaths occur per 1000 live birth as a result of common disease such as acute respiratory infections, diarrhoea, measles, and malaria. There is also high incidence of maternal mortality which can be as high as 1000 per 100,000 live births[49].

According to the statistics drawn from the (Revised National Health Policy, 2004:2 cited in MacEwan,1999)[48] it reveals that:

Nigeria ranks low in these indices when compared with other low income countries and some countries in the Sub Saharan Africa. For example the 2003 world development report indicated that, the percentage of the population which had access to improve source in 2000 was 62 in Nigeria, as compared to 73 in Ghana, 81 in the Cote D' ivore, and 63 in Benin. In 2007 the figure for Nigeria dropped to 53%. The report also indicated that Nigeria ranked low in the percentage of her population with access to improved sanitation facilities. 72% of Ghana's population and 79% of population of Cameroon had access to improved sanitation facilities as compared to Nigeria's 54. In 2000, Nigeria's Overall health system performance was ranked 187 among the 191 member States by the World Health Organization (WHO). The cumulative implication of the above statistics is that the socio-economic determinants of health i.e. poverty, Hunger, Gender inequality, lack of education, access to clear and environmental degradation had not been decisively addressed and required urgent intervention

In the execution of its mandate, the security sector has to contend with the following pathogens of insecurity identified by Nwolise (2006 quoted in Fayeye, 2012: 193)[37],[6] as being capable of aborting the democratic process. They include

- Military coups and rule of force which overthrow the democratic orders and can spiral violence or war
- Electoral fraud which can generate violence and lead to war
- Intra-party and inter-party conflicts which generate political intolerance and political assassinations; armed politics including thuggery and activities of ethnic militias
- Inability of political gladiators to play the political game according to the rule
- Unwillingness of political leaders and gladiators defeated in free and fair elections to accept their defeat
- Manipulations of ethnic, regional or religious cleavages by politicians
- Terrorism engendered by electoral injustices; and rebellions, insurrections, revolution or civil war generated by unbearable socio-economic hardships facing the people, unjust sharing of national resources including political positions etc.

Nwolise (2006)[37] aptly proposed that the Nigerian government and people must work hard against six basic elements that threaten sustainable democracy and national security.

- Armed politics especially thuggery, assassination and personal militia which frighten opponents and intimidate voters.
- Armed trafficking fuelled by cross-border crimes
- Inability or refusal of politicians to play the political game according to the rules. □ Mass illiteracy and political ignorance
- Economic, Ethnic-cum religious manipulation by politicians

Poverty of politics and politics of poverty is another factor. The rich political actors in Nigeria target the already feeble and disenchanted mind of the poor to secure their

election victory. Politics has been so monetised to the extent that an average, credible Nigerian cannot afford its exorbitance (Arowolo and Aluko, 2012: 805)[28]. Politics, therefore, becomes avenue to create and sustain poverty through looting of funds meant for developmental purposes. Leadership ineptitude and promotion of personal aggrandisement at the expense of national interests grievously affect democracy in Nigeria and makes the dream of attaining good governance impossible [28].

Democratic institutions in Nigeria are very fragile and are often unable to protect and promote sustainable democracy. Interregnum misrule of the military weakened the democratic institutions like judiciary and legislature. Flagrant disrespect for and disobedience to the constitution has become a feature that is conspicuous in Nigerian democratic experience, coupled with weak or lack of political will and capacity to punish electoral offenders. Other crises facing democracy and good governance in Nigeria include: dependent and weak judicial system; poverty and ignorance; corruption; citizenship, settlers/strangers crisis; absence of internal democracy in political parties; political intolerance and winner-takes-all syndrome; inexistent deep-rooted ideology in political parties; self-serving legislature and so on [28].

Even in democratic systems with legitimate political competition, natural resources dependence translates into authoritarian government by making democratic sustainability and consolidation difficult. When state capacity is weak and the state cannot enforce the law, incumbent politicians have a large amount of discretion in the allocation of resource rents, which is allocated to voters in return for political support (Jensen and Wantchekon, ND: 8). If the opposition is unable to break this incumbency advantage, resource rents will translate into one-party dominance, such as it is in Nigeria. Opposition parties are often forced to resort to non constitutional means to combat the incumbency advantage. Opposition parties might use riots and other means to vie for political power, causing political unrest in resource-dependent countries (Jensen and Wantchekon, ND: 8).

The key mechanism linking authoritarian rule and resource dependence (with adverse implication for human security), both in democratic transition and democratic sustainability and consolidation, is the incumbent's discretion over the distribution of natural resource rents. This mechanism is clear in most sub-Saharan Africa countries (and its core in Nigeria), where weak political institutions allow incumbent politicians to distribute resource rents for political gain. Odedokun (1990 quoted in Jensen and Wantchekon, ND: 8)[44] finds that the budgetary procedures of Nigerian states from 1980-1983 (a trend which has extended into the current dispensation) show a pattern of utilization of federal allocation changes during election years in favour of consumption expenditures and against capital expenditures.

In Nigeria where resource abundance is pertinent it leads to democratic authoritarianism for one of the following reasons: (1) it could allow an already dominant or authoritarian party or a coalition of parties to extend its level of popular support and consolidate its hold on political power making both democratic transition, sustainability and consolidation more difficult (2) it could generate incumbency advantage and political instability, which could incite the incumbent to adopt repressive policies towards the opposition and the masses

If election is the most crucial harbinger of the democratic process in a modern society, have we yet witnessed the rudiments of democracy when election, which is already a formal feature of democracy elsewhere in the world, is but a sham in Nigeria? When political parties cannot respect their own constitution regarding primary election (they Hire thugs to intimidate and eliminate opponents and equally pay delegates to win primaries) and membership when government organizations cannot obey court orders, etc?

Regular, free and fair elections (with which political parties is the fulcrum), rights to organize, civil liberty organizations are essential in the foundations and sustenance of democracy. But beyond these essential political and democratic forms, there are other substantial issues bordering on and related to the socio-economic

conditions of the people. Since a democratic socio-economic development strategy puts people in a position to effectively partake in decisions of political power over their socio-economic lives, it certainly suggests that whenever people discover that their lives are in jeopardy, either through the role of the state or the direction of market forces, they will respond to the situation in a democratic fashion (Anonymous, ND: 4). As such, a society founded on democratic tenets will respond and deliver dividends of democracy and development to the citizens and thus enhance their dignity and power, Socio-economic foundations of democratization of course involve overall growth within the economy and concomitant increases in the quality and quantity of goods and services available to the people (MacEwan, 1999:2)[48].

Furthermore, it also involves continuous improvement in the basic standards of living of the great majority of people, propelled and accomplished through equitable or equal distributions of income, "the preservation and repair, of the physical environment, the maintenance and strengthening of social community, and broad participation in the decision-making about political, social and economic affairs" [48].

Socio-economic issues (that is the basis of Human Security) as relate to health and education statistics certainly betray a woeful lack of adequate social services in Nigeria's democratization processes. If placed against other measures of social well-being like housing, power, energy, environmental degradations, public transport and social security, it would reveal similar scenario or even worse. For democracy to survive, therefore, there is the need for a range of social services, provided continuously to people, to constitute a starting point for the formation and sustenance of a democratic strategy (Anonymous, : 6). More than anything else, the greatest obstacle to the nascent democracy is the pervasive insecurity of lives and property, as evidenced by the spate of armed robbery attacks, assassinations, ethnic and religious conflicts, coupled with the seeming helplessness of security agencies to handle criminal acts. The situation is worsened by the increasing number of unemployed Nigerians some of whom are ready recruits for criminal activities (*Nigerian Tribune*, 2002).

Political parties play very critical roles in democratization of any nation. Central to the successes and failures of electoral politics is the cardinal and strategic functions of this all important and an integral organ of democratization which is core to its development (Akubo and Yakubu, 2014:)[8]. To consolidate democracy or ensure Democratic sustainability, Omolara Akinyemi (2013)[49] suggested that political parties are expected to exhibit the following features: they must be composed of likeminded people whose world views are similar, they must promote a set of programmes embodying the version, mission and manifestoes of the party and designed to meet the needs of the public; they must be mass based, which helps to legitimise them; they must evolved gradually and systematically over time, with identifiable leaders who constitute their rallying points; they must exhibit characteristics of internal democracy in their operations. Once political parties exhibited these features for a considerable time the democratic process can be characterized as consolidated or sustaining.

Democracy is a basis for a socio-economic development strategy. The situation in Nigeria since 1999 has ironically left a large proportion of Nigerians in material poverty and degradation. Democratization process can only survive or thrive if people have social consciousness and responsibility about their socioeconomic setting with an objective to continuously produce positive social, economic and political benefits to fellow human beings and society at large. These aspects may be absent in Nigeria as socioeconomic wellbeing of the people; core to democratization and democracy, would require redefinition in terms of quality, quantity and standard (Anonymous: 13).

It is difficult for democracy to succeed in current social and economic conditions. Access to basic resources is needed to promote active participation in the political process and belief in the political system. Africans (Nigerian by extension) must firmly establish the systems of checks and balances which will limit the chances of personalization and individualization of power, corruptions, military ambitions, political charlatanism and opportunistic politics. Political participation should guarantee the protection and collective security of citizens. One thing to be carefully observed and examined is

whether Africa's multi-partism contributes to opening the wounds of political intolerance and to the exaggeration of ethnic and religious differences. African democracies should be guided by principles of cultural diversity, social equity and equitable access to resources. It is only through a strong social state that alternative democratic practices can be fully articulated[47].

Nwolise (1985)[37] postulates that a country may have the best armed forces in terms of training and equipment, the efficient custom men, the most active secret services agents and the best quality prisons, but yet be the most insecure nation in the world as a result of defence security problems with bad government, alienated and suffering masses, ignorance, hunger, unemployment or even activities of foreign residents or companies. Also, Paris, Roland (2001 cited in Omolara, 2013: 3)[49],[50], posits that any society that seeks to achieve adequate military security against the backdrop of acute food shortages, population explosion, low level productivity and per capita income, low technological development, inadequate and inefficient public utilities and chronic problems of unemployment has a false sense of security.

Quantitative cross-national research on the economic determinants of democracy and democratization generally consistently reveals that a country's level of economic development is associated positively and strongly with the extent to which the political systems (Including political parties) manifest properties of democracy. There is, therefore, a two-way causal relationship between the economy and sustainable democracy; the state of the economy is the determinant of enduring democracy, but democracy is a key pre-requisite for sustainable economic transformation. The message is: 'broad-based economic prosperity sustains democracy, whereas widespread poverty and ignorance undermine it (Ojo and Adebayo, 2009: 2)[45]. Democracy and indeed any form of government must deliver tangible economic benefits to the generality of the citizenry to be credible and sustainable (Whitehead, 1989)[51]. A democracy which is not founded upon a secure economic base is not likely to succeed because it lacks an essential condition of efficiency[51].

In a seminal article on 'What Makes Democracy Endure', Prezeworski (quoted in Ojo and Adebayo, 2009: 3) found the empirical evidence that:

Once a country has a democratic regime; its level of economic development has a very strong effect on the probability that democracy will survive ... democracy can be expected to last an average of about 8.5 years in a country with per capita income under \$2,000; 33 years between \$2,000-\$4,000 and 100 years between \$4,000-\$6,000 ... Above \$6,000 democracies are to live forever. No democratic system has fallen in a country where per capita income exceeds \$6,033. Democracy is endangered in Nigeria more than ever before. Poverty, want, and squalor are anti-democratic forces in the polity (Ojo and Adebayo, 2009: 6)[45]. Perhaps, the greatest manifestation of a weak state vis-à-vis sustainable democracy is that it cannot successfully administer a true and fair credible election which is the kernel of democracy. State capacity is one of the major prerequisites for democratic nurturing, sustenance, and consolidation [45].

In a nutshell the stronger the state in all ramifications, the better for deepening and sustainable democratic values in Nigeria. This can be achieved via the entrenchment of state institutions cum congruent political behaviour by the political elite (Ojo and Adebayo, 2009: 8)[45]. A choked system where human, religious and groups' rights are glaringly truncated is inimical to sustainable democracy (Ojo and Adebayo, 2009: 8)[45]. Democracy has not been endured in Nigeria simply because the economic numbers did not add up; whereas, democracy and indeed any form of government must deliver tangible economic benefits to the generality of the citizenry to be credible and sustainable [51].

Larry Diamond cited in Ojo and Adebayo (2009: 5)[45] argued that:

...Many new democracies in Latin America, Eastern Europe, Asia and Africa will probably breakdown in the medium to long run unless they can reduce their often appalling levels of poverty, inequality, and social injustice, and through market oriented reforms lay the basis for sustainable growth. Democratic theory holds that poverty, widespread illiteracy, and a deeply hierarchical social structure are inhospitable conditions for the

functioning of democracy. Democracy can best be said to be sustained or consolidated only when we have good to believe that it is capable of withstanding pressure or shocks without abandoning the electoral process or the political freedom on which it depends, including those of the dissent and the opposition [51]

CONCLUSION

Human security, Political parties and democratic sustainability in the fourth republic which is the focus of this work are basic concepts that are occupying the front burner in this dispensation. They are core to the democratic experiment. We have in this work juxtaposed or weld them together as concepts that are now intertwined. Human security which is a paradigm shift from the traditional concept of security which is "state centric" (revolves around the state) has as its emphasis the survival of the state and the territoriality but has now shifted to people centric (the clamour and agitation for people's welfare and development) is a concept that has people as core to its development. Political parties are equally concept that is people based and a basic component in any democratic engagement in any nation.

We have in this work observed that there is an interlocking relationship between human security, political parties and the sustainability of the current democratic experiment. The welfare and the improvement in the socio economic level of the people is far more potent in confronting the security threats than all the sophisticated weapons and well trained armies put together. If the democratic experiment must survive and be sustaining, all hands must be on deck to ensure that people's welfare and development is paramount on the agenda, most especially of the political parties.

REFERENCES

1. Egbefo, Dawood O. and Salihu, Hadizat A. (2014) *Internal Security Crisis in Nigeria: Causes, Types, Effects and Solutions* International journal of Arts and Humanities (IJAH) 3(4), S/No 12, Pp. 176 - 195

2. Inglehart , Ronald F. and Norris, Pippa (2012) *The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse: Understanding Human Security* Scandinavian Political Studies, Vol. 35 - No. Pp. 72 - 96
3. Jonathan, Goodluck Ebele (2014) *Mr President's Speech at the Centenary Conference On Human Security, Peace And Development* being an Address by His Excellency, President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan, GCFR On the Occasion of the Centenary Conference on the Theme: "Human Security, Peace and Development: Agenda for the 21st Century" Thursday, 27th February, 2014
4. Rothschild, Emma (1995) "What is Security" (1995) in *Daedalus*, summer 124, 3.
5. Nwanegbo, C. Jaja and Odigbo, Jude (2013) *Security and National Development in Nigeria: The Threat of Boko Haram* International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Vol. 3 No. 4 [Special Issue] Pp. 285 - 291
6. Fayeye, Joseph O. (2012) *The Role of Security Sector in Management of Conflicts and Promotion of Democratic Governance in Nigeria*: Current Research Journal of Social Sciences 4(3): 190-195, 2012
7. Olu-Adeyemi, 'Lanre (2012) *The Challenges of Democratic Governance in Nigeria* International Journal of Business and Social Science Vol. 3 No. 5 Pp. 167 - 171
8. Akubo, A. Aduku and Yakubu, Adejo Umoru (2014) *Political Parties and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria's Fourth Republic* Global Journal of Political Science and Administration Vol. 2, No. 3, Pp. 79 - 108.
9. Tyoden, Sonnie Gwanle (2013) *the Electoral System, Political Parties and Democracy in Nigeria: Critical Issues for Policy*. Nigerian Journal of Policy and strategy Vol. 18 No. 1, Pp. 1- 15
10. Nkwede, Joseph Okwesili (2013) *Democracy, Terrorism and the Paradox of Insecurity Vortex in Nigeria* Global Journal of Human Social Science Political Science Volume 13 Issue 7 Version 1.0 Pp. 42 - 51.
11. Adejumobi, S and Kehinde, M. (2007) "Building Democracy without Democrats, Political Parties and Threats of Democratic Reversal in Nigeria" Journal of African Elections
12. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (1994) *Human Development Report*. New York: Oxford University Press. Available at <http://www.undp.org/hdro/1994/94.htm> 08/02/15 UNESCO (2008) *Human Security Approaches and Challenges* France: UNESCO
13. Paris, R. & Sisk, T. D. (eds). (2009) *The Dilemmas of State-building* New York: Routledge.
14. Ogata, Sadako (1998) "Inclusion or Exclusion: Social Development Challenges For Asia and Europe." Statement of United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees at the Asian Development Bank Seminar, 27 April 1998. Viewed from <http://www.unhcr.ch/refworld/unhcr/hcspeech/27ap1998.htm> downloaded on 22/12/14.

15. Akintunde, J.O., *"The Demise of Democracy in the First Republic of Nigeria: A Causal Analysis"*, ODU: University of Ife (now Obafemi Awolowo University), Journal of African Studies, Vol. 4, No. 1 (July), 1967, pp. 6-8
16. Ademola, Azeez (2011) *Endangering good governance for sustainable democracy: the continuing struggle against corruption in Nigeria* Journal of Research in Peace, Gender and Development Vol. 1(11) Pp. 307-314
17. Annan, Kofi (2000) *"Secretary-General Salutes International Workshop on Human Security in Mongolia"* Two-Day Session in Ulaanbaatar, May 8-10, 2000. Press Release SG/SM/7382 available at <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2000/20000508.sgsm7382.doc.html> accessed on 08/27/14
18. International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA) (2006) *Democracy, Conflict and Human Security Policy Summary: Key Findings and Recommendations*: Stockholm, Sweden. (International IDEA)
19. Annan, Kofi (2001) *Towards a Culture of Peace*, 8 November 2001.
20. Buzan, B. (1991) *New Patterns of Global Security in the 21st Century*. International Affairs Vol. 67, No. 3, pp. 431-451
21. Booth, K. (1994) *A Security Regime in Southern Africa: Theoretical Considerations*: Southern African Perspectives No. 30, CSAS
22. Nwabueze B. (1989) *Social Security in Nigeria* Being a Lecture Delivered at the 10th Anniversary of Nigerian Institute of Advanced Legal Studies Lagos: August 28.
23. Ogata, Sadako (1999) *"Human Security: a Refugee Perspective."* Keynote Speech by United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, at the Ministerial Meeting on Human Security Issues of the "Lysoen Process" Group of Governments Bergen, Norway, 19 May 1999. <http://www.unhcr.ch/refworld/unhcr/hcspeech/990519.htm> 08/02/15.
24. Frechette, Louise (1999) *Statement by the United Nations Deputy Secretary-General to a high-level panel discussion on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Vienna International Centre (VIC), October 9, 1999* <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/1999/19991012.dsgsm70.doc.html> 10/02/15.
25. Ginkel, Hans Van and Newman Edward (2000) *"In Quest of "Human Security"* Japan Review of International Affairs 14.1

26. Graham, David T. and Poku Nana K. (2000) *Migration, Globalisation and Human Security* London: Routledge
27. Jennifer Leaning, M.D., S.M.H., and Sam Arie (2000) *Human Security in Crisis and Transition: A Background Document of Definition and Application*. Working Draft, Prepared for US AID / Tulane CERTI
28. Arowolo, D.E. and Aluko, O.A. (2012) „*Democracy, Political Participation and Good Governance in Nigeria*” International Journal of Development and Sustainability, Vol. 1 No. 3, Pp. 797- 809
29. Simbine, Antonia T. (2014) *Single Party Dominance and Democracy in Nigeria: The Peoples’ Democratic Party* in Obafemi, Olu, Egwu, Sam, Ibeanu, Okeychukwu and Ibrahim, Jibrin (eds.) *Political Parties and Democracy in Nigeria* Kuru: National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS) Pp. 130 - 152.
30. Muhammed- Bande (2014) *The Dynamics of Political Party Competition: Origin and Evolution* in Obafemi, Olu, Egwu, Sam, Ibeanu, Okeychukwu and Ibrahim, Jibrin (eds.) *Political Parties and Democracy in Nigeria* Kuru: National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS) Pp.60 - 77.
31. Orji Nwachukwu (2014) *Political Parties, Civil Society and Democracy* in Nigeria in Obafemi, Olu, Egwu, Sam, Ibeanu, Okeychukwu and Ibrahim, Jibrin (eds.) *Political Parties and Democracy in Nigeria* Kuru: National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS) Pp, 217 - 264.
32. Omotola, J.S. (2009) “*Nigerian Parties and Political Ideology*” in Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences, Vol 1, No 3, 612-634.
33. Omotola, J.S. (2010) *Political Parties and the Quest for Political Stability in Nigeria* Taiwan Journal of Democracy, Volume 6, No. 2: 125-145.
34. Deme, Mourtada (2014) *Political Parties: A Defence* in Obafemi, Olu, Egwu, Sam, Ibeanu, Okeychukwu and Ibrahim, Jibrin (eds.) *Political Parties and Democracy in Nigeria* Kuru: National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS) Pp. 12 - 18.
35. Galadima, Habu (2014) *Party Manifestoes and Programmes* in Obafemi, Olu, Egwu, Sam, Ibeanu, Okeychukwu and Ibrahim, Jibrin (eds.) *Political Parties and Democracy in Nigeria* Kuru: National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS) Pp. 100 - 129.
36. Oni, Ebenezer Oluwole (2014) *The Challenges of Democratic Consolidation In Nigeria, 1999-2007* International Journal of Politics and Good Governance Volume 5, No. 5.1 Quarter I Pp.1- 29

37. Nwolise, O.B.C., (2006) *National Security and Sustainable Democracy* In: Ojo, E.O., (Ed.) *Challenges of Sustainable Democracy in Nigeria* John Archers (Publishers) Limited, Ibadan.
38. Nwolise, O (1985) *Nigeria's Defence and Security System Today* in Uma Eleazu (ed.) *Nigeria the 25years*, Ibadan, Heinemann.
39. Bamgbose, J. Adele, Moshood B. Abdul-Wasi and Shamsideen Yusuf (2012) *State Actors, Democracy and Nigeria's Fourth Republic* Scottish Journal of Arts, Social Sciences and Scientific Studies Volume 1, Issue I. Pp. 68 - 76
40. Charles Soludo (2005) "The Political Economy of Sustainable Democracy in Nigeria" *New Age*, June 2, 2005. Lagos
41. Diamond, Larry (2014) *Developing Democracy*, Baltimore, MD Johns Hopkins University Press. Editorial Comment, (2002, January 5), *Three Years of Democracy*, Nigerian Tribune, 1, 10
42. Isigwe, Paulinus Obinna (2012) "*Consolidation of Democracy in Nigeria: Problems and Prospects*" Science Journal of Sociology & Anthropology, Volume 2012
43. Katz, R.S. (1980) *A Theory of Parties and Electoral System*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
44. Jensen, Nathan and Wantchekon, Leonard (ND) *Resource Wealth and Political Regimes in Africa*: Comparative Political Studies, Forthcoming
45. Ojo, Emmanuel O. and Adebayo, P. F. (2009) *Can Nigeria's Nascent Democracy Survive?* Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa Volume 11, No.1, 2009
46. Kukah. M. (2003) *Democracy and Civil Society in Nigeria*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books
47. Lumumba-Kasongo, T. (ed) 2005, *Liberal Democracy and its Critics in Africa: Political Dysfunction and the Struggle for Social progress*. London: Zed Books,
48. MacEwan, A, (1999) *Neo-Liberalism or Democracy? - Economic Strategy, Markets and Alternatives for the 21st Century*, Zed Books. London.
49. Omolara Akinyemi (2013) *Globalization and Nigeria Border Security: Issues and Challenges* International Affairs and Global Strategy Vol.11, 2013 available at www.iiste.org
50. Paris, Roland (2001) *Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?* International Security, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 87-102.
51. Whitehead, L. (1989) "*The Consolidation of Fragile Democracies*" in Robert A. Pastor (ed), *Democracy in the Americas; stopping the pendulum*, Holmes and Meier