



Chief Editor

Dr. A. Singaraj, M.A., M.Phil., Ph.D.

Editor

Mrs.M.Josephin Immaculate Ruba

Editorial Advisors

1. **Dr.Yi-Lin Yu**, Ph. D
Associate Professor,
Department of Advertising & Public Relations,
Fu Jen Catholic University,
Taipei, Taiwan.
2. **Dr.G. Badri Narayanan**, PhD,
Research Economist,
Center for Global Trade Analysis,
Purdue University,
West Lafayette,
Indiana, USA.
3. **Dr. Gajendra Naidu.J.**, M.Com, LL.M., M.B.A., PhD. MHRM
Professor & Head,
Faculty of Finance, Botho University,
Gaborone Campus, Botho Education Park,
Kgale, Gaborone, Botswana.
4. **Dr. Ahmed Sebihi**
Associate Professor
Islamic Culture and Social Sciences (ICSS),
Department of General Education (DGE),
Gulf Medical University (GMU), UAE.
5. **Dr. Pradeep Kumar Choudhury**,
Assistant Professor,
Institute for Studies in Industrial Development,
An ICSSR Research Institute,
New Delhi- 110070.India.
6. **Dr. Sumita Bharat Goyal**
Assistant Professor,
Department of Commerce,
Central University of Rajasthan,
Bandar Sindri, Dist-Ajmer,
Rajasthan, India
7. **Dr. C. Muniyandi**, M.Sc., M. Phil., Ph. D,
Assistant Professor,
Department of Econometrics,
School of Economics,
Madurai Kamaraj University,
Madurai-625021, Tamil Nadu, India.
8. **Dr. B. Ravi Kumar**,
Assistant Professor
Department of GBEH,
Sree Vidyanikethan Engineering College,
A.Rangampet, Tirupati,
Andhra Pradesh, India
9. **Dr. Gyanendra Awasthi**, M.Sc., Ph.D., NET
Associate Professor & HOD
Department of Biochemistry,
Dolphin (PG) Institute of Biomedical & Natural Sciences,
Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India.
10. **Dr. D.K. Awasthi**, M.SC., Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Chemistry, Sri J.N.P.G. College,
Charbagh, Lucknow,
Uttar Pradesh. India

ISSN (Online) : 2455 - 3662
SJIF Impact Factor :4.924

EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research

Monthly Peer Reviewed & Indexed
International Online Journal

Volume: 4 Issue: 1 January 2018



Published By :
EPRA Journals

CC License





ADDRESSING CONTEMPORARY NIGERIA'S INSECURITY CHALLENGES THROUGH NEW SECURITY APPROACH

Adaora Osondu-Oti, Ph.D¹

¹Department of International Relations
and Diplomacy,
Afe Babalola University,
Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

*The traditional view of security prioritised defence and military security, with the aim of promoting regime stability domestically and as a means to affirming state positions and interests in the international arena. In other words, the idea of security centred on military activities and promotion of state's stability. Few decades towards the end of the 20th century, a new security approach called **human security** emerged. In this human security approach, different dimensions of security must be considered in order to achieve adequate and holistic security. The idea of the new security approach is that security should not focus exclusively on states but individuals should be at the heart of the security concerns. Thus, this paper examines the importance of moving beyond the military centered security to human security where the individuals are the primary concerns.*

KEYWORDS: *human security, economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security*

INTRODUCTION

In the post-Cold War era, security debate has broadened. Traditionally, security had focused on military activities, the control of military hardware, action against armed groups and networks and the reform of state military institutions. This old view of security prioritise defence and military issues with the aim of promoting regime stability domestically and as a

means to affirming state positions and interests in the international arena. More often, security only becomes paramount when armed groups within the state threaten the state stability or there are external threats; then the government start to employ the 'fire brigade approach' to security through the military to restore order.

Today, increasing attention is placed on a new security approach, which is called **human security**.

The idea of this new security is that security should not focus exclusively on states but also on individuals. In 1994, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) developed a very broad understanding of human security. The UNDP Human Development Report 1994 entitled *New Dimensions of Human Security*, was probably the first attempt to define human security in a holistic way. The 1994 UNDP Human Development Report described seven dimensions that human security should entail. The seven dimensions are economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security and political security. The human security idea is that threats and challenges to security transcend national defence, military, and conflict times to encompass all political, economic, environmental, health, social issues etc, that guarantee a life free from risk and fear. Proponents of human security agree that the individual rather than the state should be the referent object of security. The idea of human security reorients the analytical focus away from the state interests to that of human dignity. It shifts the focus away from the state and makes the individual the primary unit of analysis, who is meant to live under socio-economic and political conditions that seek to guarantee *freedom from fear* and *freedom from want*.

The overall goal of human security was to expand the concept of security, which had traditionally been interpreted narrowly as security of state from external or internal aggression and its 'fire brigade approach' to security only in times of conflict, to security of individuals from diverse threats which occur in everyday life. The importance of addressing other security threats beyond the physical threats or insecurity in conflict times is based on the idea that some crisis or for instance youth uprisings could not be distanced from such inattention to security issues like economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, among others.

For some years, Nigeria has been bedevilled with series of crisis; the height of it has been the youths taking up arms against the state. For instance, the Niger Delta assumed the character of a conflict-ridden region for more than two decades. The region was a theatre of violence following militants struggle and military operations until the Amnesty programme of the government in 2009, which has brought relative peace to the region. The Boko Haram group has also been unleashing great harm to the society. They have caused so much loss of lives and properties in the North by bombing of homes, churches, mosques etc. Nigeria is virtually turning into a state of siege. Conflicts, armed violence, guerrilla warfare, kidnapping, terrorism and even call for secession by some groups (example, the

Igbos call for Biafra state) have become an escape route by the youths. In all these crises, the deployment of military personnel and occupation of the conflict area by military and police, (often called the Joint Task Force) have been the government's main approach to tackling any armed groups or insurgents. Such approach is yet to produce positive results as armed groups, for instance, the Boko Haram has continue to destroy lives and properties in the Northern parts of the country, and have not for instance succeeded in returning all the kidnapped Chibok girls since 2014.

With various issues threatening the national unity, stability and security, despite the military centered approach, this paper seeks to examine the importance of adopting a shift from military centered security to human security approach. Thus, this paper argues that human security approach to security issues would largely tackle the root causes of insecurity, and as well avoid future violence. With the introduction as section 1, the remaining sections are as follows. Section 2 examines the traditional or military-centered security. Section 3 examines the new security approach (Human Security), and as distinct from the old security. Section 4 analyses the importance of shifting from military centered security to human security in the contemporary Nigeria's insecurity problem. Section 5 is the conclusion and recommendations.

TRADITIONAL SECURITY: ISSUES AND DEBATES IN LITERATURE

Security has been viewed primarily from the perspective of military activities and promotion of state's stability. This traditional view or state-centered security prioritised defence and military issues with the aim of promoting regime stability domestically and as a means to affirming state positions and interests in the international arena. For long, security has been equated with the threats to a country's border. Traditional conception of security is based on state's defense of **sovereign interests** by military means. Sovereignty has been designated as the independence and supreme power of states to exercise their power over their respective territories. It is what Milojevic (2000) termed 'the existence of exclusive internal competence of state which states must not interfere in.' Rousseau (1974) cited in Milojevic (2000) called it the existence of 'competence discretionaire' of a state. It is noted that a state is secured to the extent to which it is not in danger of having to sacrifice core values if it wishes to avoid war and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by victory in such a war (Debiel, 2004). The traditional conception of security was in line with the international law, where security has been seen as state security based on sovereignty and territorial integrity and protection (Oberleitner, 2005).

The state has been the prevailing entity for guaranteeing security, and state-centered theories have dominated discussions of international relations, especially since World War II (Dabelko and Dabelko, 1995).

Within this state-centered approach or 'old view of security', threats have been perceived as military challenges and have traditionally been countered with the use of armed forces. In this state-centered security, the term security has meant the effort to protect the state population and territory against organized force using 'organised military forces.' For Ayoob (1995), the state-centered security concept rests on two basic premises: first, that most threats come from the outside, and second, that these threats are primarily of a military nature, and thus, as a rule, call for a military response. In the classical formulation, security is about how states use force to manage threats to their territorial integrity, their autonomy, and their domestic political order, primarily from other states (Bajpai, 2000). More often, security only becomes paramount when armed groups within the state threaten the state stability or there are external threats; then the government would have to employ 'fire brigade approach' to security through the military to restore order.

Up to and far into the 1980s, security thinking both in the 'strategic community' and in the multilateralism-oriented field of peace and conflict research was dominated by a state-centered security concept focussing primarily on external threats to national security posed by military factors (Debiel, 2004). But the end of Cold War brought changes not just in the international system but in the way security is viewed, with focus on sovereignty of individual as the centre of security. There is a realisation that state security may well be a precondition for people's security, but achieving state security does not guarantee human security; state security only provides the framework within which the individual parameters of human security can be defined.

Indeed, it seems obvious that in today's world of rising nontraditional, nonconventional, and transnational threats, the protection of borders and the preservation of territorial integrity cannot be the ultimate goal of security (Oberleitner, 2005). The state-centered security with its only 'military-response' approach has been criticised as 'narrow' approach to security, since security has been seen as something that transcends solely the military responses to other threats. As Dabelko and Dabelko (1995) noted, the narrow focus on military threats and responses, or "high politics," has meant that other factors such as international economic transactions and the environment, or "low politics," have been considered

secondary issues for the security of states (Dabelko and Dabelko, 1995). Thus, the focus on individual/human security is imperative.

HUMAN SECURITY (The New Security Approach)

The new security can be explained as the new approach to security issues which is provided in the Human Security Approach. Human security mainly refers to the broadening of the security agenda to issues outside the military defense/armed violence centered security. It is increasingly being recognized in the international community that there needs to be a broadening of the way we think about security, which Ullman (1983) called 'redefining security.' The UNDP Human Development Report of 1994 redefined security based on seven dimensions with focus on individuals at the heart of security concerns. The 1994 Report maintained that Human security (with its focus on the security of the individual within society) needs to be given attention, and also added to the ideas of national security (with its focus on defence of the state from external attack). This is due to the realisation that threats today come not simply or even predominantly in the form of enemy troops, armed conflicts, but also in the form of poverty, environmental degradation, lack of economic opportunity, discrimination etc. These security issues can be destabilizing just as armed conflict is destabilizing.

History has demonstrated that the security of the state is not necessarily the security of the people, a clear example of which are the two World Wars, where civilians losses were great. With the end of Cold War, intra-state conflicts have dominated the stage with great number of civilian casualties, coupled with other environmental and economic threats that individuals face in a changing world. It has also been acknowledged that 'the concept and parameters of Cold War strategic thought do not adequately frame the emerging security challenges of the post Cold War era (Maclean, 2000). According to Debiel (2004) the end of the East-West conflict shifted the focus to multidimensional, often internally motivated conflict constellations, and the result was a broad consensus on the outdatedness of traditional security concept.

However, the idea of human security was first seen in the UNDP Human Development Report of 1993 though it was systematically defined as a concept in the UNDP 1994 Report. According to the former report, the human-centric world order needs five new pillars, one of which is the new human security perspective, which must emphasize individuals rather than merely national security. In general, the old security perspective has to shift in the following areas: from emphasizing merely national security to human security; from realizing security by force to human

development; and from concerning territorial security to concerning food, employment and environmental security (UNDP, 1993). Building on this, the UNDP Human Development Report 1994 put forward new definitions of human security in its report titled, 'New Dimensions of Human Security'; that rests on the idea that security should not focus exclusively on states stability but at individual as the heart of security concerns. The 1994 Human Development Report was probably the first attempt to define the concept of human security in a holistic way. The Report summed up four features of human security: (a) human security is universal, which means that states, strong or weak, and human beings, rich or poor, are all impacted by human security. (b) the integral parts of human security are interdependent, which means that when the security of the people somewhere in the world is threatened, all states might be involved; (c) early prevention is better than intervention aftermath; and (d) human security is human-centric (UNDP, 1994). There are also seven dimensions of human security as enunciated by the UNDP 1994 report, which are economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security and political security.

According to the 1994 UNDP Report, human security is two ways. First, human security means being free from suffering constant repression. Second, human security means being free from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the pattern of daily lives whether in homes, in jobs or in the communities. Closely associated with the idea of human security from the beginning was the consulting economist, Haq (1994), who explained the concept of human security in his paper titled, 'New Imperatives of Human Security.' To Haq (1994), human security is to be achieved through 'development, not...through arms.' There is also the argument that human security originated with the work of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). Fen (2002) noted that 'since the founding of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) in the nineteenth century, the notion that people should be protected from violent threats and, when they are harmed or injured and that the international community has an obligation to assist them, has gained widespread acceptance.'

The recent report of the Commission on Human Security (2003) defines human security as protecting fundamental freedoms that are the essence of life, which means protecting people from critical (severe) and pervasive (widespread) threats and situations. Protection from freedoms that are essence of life also means using processes that build on people's strengths and aspirations. It also means creating political, social, environmental, economic, military and

cultural systems that together give people the building blocks of survival, livelihood and dignity (Commission on Human Security Report, 2003). The idea of human security reorients the analytical focus away from the state interests to that of human dignity. It shifts the focus away from the state and makes the individual the primary unit of analysis, who is meant to live under socio-economic and political conditions that seek to guarantee *freedom from fear* and *freedom from want*.

Human security draws on the views of then US Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinus, Jr, who said:

The battle for peace has to be fought on two fronts. The first is the security front where victory spells freedom from fear. The second is the economic and social front where victory means freedom from want. Only victory on both fronts can assure the world of an enduring peace . . . No provisions that can be written into the Charter will enable the Security Council to make the world secure from war if men and women have no security in their homes and their jobs (quoted in Grimm 2004).

Basically, the 'human security' approach argues that threats and challenges to security transcend national defence, military, and conflict times to encompass all political, economic, environmental, health issues, etc, that guarantee a life free from risk and fear. Human security had been viewed as a potential theory responding to the growing situation of the 'insecurity of security' (McDonald, 2002). Human security, as a people-centred approach, enables a comprehensive identification of threats to the 'survival, daily life, and dignity of human beings,' and promotes efforts to overcome them (Sen, 2000). Food security, income security, health security, environmental security, personal security etc; these are the emerging concerns of human security all over the world (UNDP Human Development Report, 1994).

This new idea of security is no longer based on the traditional ideas of sovereignty, territory or military power, but rather on achieving freedom from fear and freedom from want of individuals. One of the foremost proponents of the human security paradigm in the 1990s was the Canadian government. In partnership with Norway, Canada and a number of other like-minded governments, the Canadian government sought to press the human security agenda, organizing meetings, pushing the idea of a 'people-centered' foreign policy. Canada's idea of human security is based on freedom from pervasive threats to people's rights, their safety, and their lives. The Canadian foreign ministry developed a 'Human Security Agenda' with the following five themes: protection of civilians; peace support operations; governance and

accountability; public safety; and conflict prevention (Walter 2012).

Canada, along with Norway, also sought to foster wider interest and commitment to human security by creating the Human Security Network, which currently has thirteen countries as members, and uses a variety of informal mechanisms, including annual ministerial meetings, to discuss and advance the human security cause. Human security has also guided the foreign policy of Japan. Japan has promoted and supported the concept in the United Nations. Japan is the founder (founded in 1999) and main donor of the UN Trust Fund for Human Security (UNTFHS), the promotor of the Commission on Human Security and the Friends of Human Security (FHS), which was established in the UN in 2006, co-chaired by Japan and Mexico and comprised of 34 Member States. Japan's idea of human security takes into account both the elements of freedom from fear and freedom from want, with more focus on freedom from want of individuals, empowerment and development.

In the 2005 World Summit outcome document the concept of human security received a "subheading" and was treated in paragraph 143, which stated:

We stress the right of people to live in freedom and dignity, free from poverty and despair. We recognize that all individuals, in particular vulnerable people, are entitled to freedom from fear and freedom from want, with an equal opportunity to enjoy all their rights and fully develop their human potential. To this end, we commit ourselves to discussing and defining the notion of human security in the General Assembly (cited in Krause 2007)

Although new in its present manifestation, the core principle of human security is that the individual rather than the state should be at the center of security policy. The UNDP report put the concept on the map in the United Nations, from which time it has evolved into a critical guiding framework for understanding and addressing some of the most complex security challenges (Kubo, 2009). The "new security" approach, which maintains that security policies should not aim only at preventing wars but should be transformed into policies that would bring about emancipatory change, has become widely accepted (Bilgin, 2008). However, making the individual the referent object of security has its criticisms. Within the UN, some states equate human security with attempts to impose alien and inappropriate Western conceptions of human rights on the developing world. Human security approach with its seven dimensions is seen as too broad, which could make achievement of its goals difficult, if not impossible.

Nonetheless, human security challenges our approach to security in at least two ways: it shifts the focus toward the individual, and it bases security firmly on common values (Oberleitner, 2005). According to Kubo (2009), there are five human security operational principles. These are:

- (a) **People-centered:** places individuals at the centre of analysis. It considers the broad range of insecurities that threaten the survival, livelihood and dignity of individuals.
- (b) **Comprehensive/multi-dimensional:** recognizes the multi-dimensional (in line with the seven dimensions of security enunciated by UNDP 1994 report) character of security threats both within and across borders
- (c) **Multi-sectoral:** proposes a greater understanding of the relationship between various threats and insecurities/vulnerabilities. There is also understanding of the relationship between security, development and human Rights
- (d) **Context-specific:** acknowledges that insecurities vary considerably across settings and at different times
- (e) **Prevention-focused:** examines root causes of insecurity; root causes through articulation of security threats from point of view of individuals and communities and seeks long-term solutions that address structural and behavioral conditions for security.

Rather than providing security for abstract entities the state, human security focuses on the security, the well-being, safety, and dignity of individual human beings (Oberleitner 2005), from a multi-dimensional perspectives. Basically, the idea of human security is that there is no secure state with insecure people living in it.

The Importance of Shifting from Military Centered Security to Human Security in Contemporary Nigeria's Insecurity Problems

Human security and national security are complementary concepts because both seek protection against harm. To organize and ensure human security, armed forces are necessary to restore order in times in violence. To provide for national security, the removal of threats, at home and abroad, is needed. The increasing intra-state armed conflict still presents a multitude of threats to individuals that necessitate military responses. Oberleitner (2005) pointed that it would seem overly ambitious to view human security as a substitute for national or state security; not only will the state continue to be the cornerstone of the international legal order, but there will still be threats

that fall within the traditional concept of interstate conflict. Even though the security of the individual depends on the security of the state, 'individual security is never purely and simply coterminous with state security (Bajpai, 2000).

While traditional security approach cannot be discarded, the shift to human security is important because human security takes into consideration both military and non-military issues: freedom from fear and freedom from want. While it is important that military activities is undertaken to quell all armed violence and armed groups, the root causes of insecurity must also be addressed. State must take into consideration diverse threats that confront individuals and that must have created the space for armed violence. For instance, the UNDP Niger Delta Human Development report (2006) noted that 'unemployment is high, especially among the youth; social services (education, health, recreation, etc) and physical infrastructure are poor everywhere', and these have continued to create the space for youth uprisings. As explained by the UNDP (2006) the problem of poverty in the midst of ballooning oil revenues spawned discontent and disillusion among the youths. It is important that diverse security threats are taken into account when security agenda of the state is being drawn. The 1994 UNDP Report has put forward seven dimensions of human security, which if not taken into consideration can pose a threat to security of individuals, and ultimately the society at large. The seven dimensions of security are

- a. Economic security: this refers to individual's assurance of basic income either through gainful employment or social safety net
- b. Health security: this refers to an individual's freedom from various diseases and debilitating illnesses and his or her access to health care
- c. Food security: this refers to physical and economic access to food for individuals at all times via his or her assets, employment, or income
- d. Environmental security: this refers to individuals living in a healthy physical environment spared from desertification, deforestation and other environmental threats that endanger survival. In otherwords, this refers to the integrity of land, air, and water, which make human habitation possible
- e. Personal security: this refers to an individual's freedom from crime and violence. It means securing individuals from physical violence and threats of all kinds, especially women and children that are more vulnerable.
- f. Community security: this refers to cultural dignity and inter-community peace within which an individual lives and grows

- g. Political security: this refers to protection against human rights violations.

Even though it is not expected that the seven dimensions must be addressed holistically at once, it is believed that steps must be taken to prioritise key security threats as it relates to different countries/states. In the contemporary insecurity problem in Nigeria where the youths have taking up arms and have engaged in guerrilla warfare (or 'so called terrorism'), economic security as one dimension of human security needs to be considered to avoid more uprisings or armed groups. Lack of basic means of income (employment) cannot be ruled out in the violent activities of Nigerian youths today. There is the saying 'that idleness is the parent of mischief.' As noted by the UNDP Niger Delta Human Development Report (2006), lack of work correlates to the highest incidences of youth restiveness and conflicts. Addressing the issue of economic security is one way of tackling the current Nigeria's insecurity from the basis. The argument of this paper is that 'security cannot be realized by prioritizing armed violence or employing only 'the fire brigade approach', but only within a broad framework which takes into account the importance of other security threats in line with seven dimensions of security (personal security, political security, community security, food security, health security, environmental security, and economic security) which affect individual persons.

Basically, human security has two basic goals: freedom from fear and freedom from want. The freedom from fear can be referred to as 'protection' from physical threats, mainly conflicts and wars, and that has been responsibility of the state in times of armed violence. Freedom from want is seen as the empowerment of individuals to be able to make informed choices. Empowerment is the strategy that would enable people to develop their resilience to difficult situations. In line with the freedom of want, security is directly linked to development of individuals and society as a whole, which is also tantamount to fulfilment of basic human rights.

By underlying the interface between security, development and human rights, and by placing the protection and empowerment of individual's and communities at the center of analysis and action, human security is at the forefront of advancing a new integrated, multi-sectoral and people-centered approach to the promotion of peace, security and development both within and across countries (Kubo, 2009). While some have argued that including all possible threats can be workable, others attempt to narrow the concept by choosing which hazards, or security subcategories, should be included (Liotta and Owen, 2006). For example, Japan has been pursuing the broad concept of

freedom of want in its national and foreign policy since 1999 when it established the Human Security Trust Fund in the United Nations. Governments like Canada have also taken up human security and formulated it in its foreign policy. On Canada's initiative, human Security Network was created as a coalition of the like-minded with the aim of advancing human security globally. On the national level, the Canadian and Japanese government provide an experimental ground for human security implementation by other states. Nigeria is yet to become part of the Human Security Network.

Shifting to human security is therefore important for Nigeria in this contemporary insecurity problem because human security approach does not only address broad security challenges but it is in line with human rights protection. The ultimate objective of human security is to protect and ensure three essential freedoms for individuals and communities: freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom to live in dignity (Pan American Health Organisation, 2011). Moreover, human security has its added values distinct from the state-centered security. Adopting human security has its advantages. Some of these advantages are:

- (a) It is an integrative approach, which brings together the multiplicity of challenges faced by individuals and communities and as such recognizes the inter-linkages between security, development and human rights.
- (b) It makes the individual the centre of analysis.
- (c) It makes no distinction among different dimensions of security- be it military, economic, environmental, health, community, political etc. It makes sure survival of individuals is not threatened from all quarters.
- (d) It protects, and at the same time empowers individuals- It does not stop at protection from fear or threats of physical violence, it goes further to empower individuals too
- (e) It recognises state-centered security is important but security should not stop at that but should be broadened to risks and threats that individuals face, which are not conflict oriented.

Given its multi-dimensional and people-centered approach, shifting to human security approach could go a long way in solving Nigeria's insecurity problem, especially in the case of armed violence to help address the present insecurity problems from the root. By bringing to the forefront the safety of individuals and communities, and their quality of life and their dignity, human security allows changes to happen that would otherwise have been shielded behind territorial sovereignty, political independence, and

national interest (Oberleitner, 2005). As Liotta and Owen (2006) concluded, human security is important because until we can ensure that people are safe not just from 'armed violence, but also from preventable threats such as unemployment/lack of basic means of income' then we have failed in the primary objective of security- to protect.

CONCLUSIONS

It is clear that military-centered security is not passé but it is not sufficient to ensure the security of individual persons. Military centered security has been more of 'fire brigade security approach' - it has often been employed in times of crisis or conflict; security only becomes important at the time of emergence, and hence military is deployed to restore order just like the fire service agents services are only needed in times of fire outbreak. Today, security has been redefined based on 'redefined threats' and this brought about new concepts of security in the international community. Security has broadened to include all threats- not just external or internal aggression or armed violence, but also economic, environmental, health and other security risks.

This New Security approach called Human Security with its added values of multi-dimensional and people-centered approach has become imperative in our contemporary society. For many years now, Nigeria has been bedevilled with conflicts, especially the uprising of armed groups. Militancy in Niger Delta once dominated the scene until October 2009 when Amnesty came into place, and currently Boko Haram is causing mayhem in the North, which is virtually turning Nigeria into a state of siege. The response has been primarily deploying military operations (the popularly known Joint Task Force) to restore. But this approach has not yielded much positive results.

This paper argues that there is a need to shift from the military centered security to human security approach. This new security approach with its emphasis on threats that confronts individuals is seen as a good approach that would to a great extent help address the present insecurity problem that comes in the form of youths taking up arms and engaging in guerrilla warfare. For instance, unemployment is seen as one of the major causes of youth discontents and militancy, making economic security as aspect that must be taken into account in addressing the contemporary Nigeria's insecurity problem. While the seven dimensions of security might be difficult to address holistically, steps must be taken to shift from state/military centered security to address any issue by prioritising key threats. The paper therefore recommends that for Nigerian government to address the root cause of insecurity (which this paper points out as economic insecurity). Priority must be set, with other human security threats

gradually considered in order to address the country's security challenges.

REFERENCES

1. Ayoob, Mohammed (1995), 'The New-Old Disorder in the third World', In Thomas G. Weiss (Ed.) 1995, *The United Nations and Civil Wars*. London: Boulder, pp. 13-30
2. Bajpai, Kanti (2000), 'Human Security: Concept and Measurement', *Kroc Institute Occasional Paper*, No. 19
3. Bilgin, Pinar, (2008), 'The Security Sector in Theory and Practise: From "State-Centered" Security to "Citizen-Centered" Security', In *Security Sector Governance: Turkey and Europe*, eds. Ibrahim Cerrah, DCAF-TESE, Series in Security Sector Studies- 4, Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces
4. Commission on Human Security (2003) 'Final Report of the Commission on Human Security.' New York: Commission on Human Security, <http://www.humansecuritychs.org> Accessed May 20, 2010
5. Dabelko, Geoffrey D and Dabelko, David D (1995), 'Environmental Security: Issues of Conflict and Redefinition', *Environment and Security*, Vol.1, No.1
6. Debiel, Tobias (2004), 'Extended Vs Human Security: The Need for an Integrated Security Concept for Development, Foreign and Security Policy', Paper Presented at the Third AFES-PRESS GMOSS Workshop on Reconceptualising Security in an Era of Globalisation during the Fifth Pan-European Conference, Netherland Conference Centre, The Hague, September 9-11, 2004
7. Fen, Osler Hampson (2002), *Madness in the Multitude: Human Security and World Disorder*, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2002, p. 17
8. Grimm, S. (2004), 'Human Security: Placing Development at the Heart of the EU's External Relations', Briefing Document, http://www.dochas.ie/working_groups/presidency/briefingpaper, Accessed May 5, 2012
9. Haq, Mahbub ul (1994), 'New Imperatives of Human Security.' RGICS Paper No. 17, Rajiv Gandhi Institute for Contemporary Studies. New Delhi: Rajiv Gandhi Foundation
10. Krause, Keith (2007), 'Towards A Practical Human Security Agenda', Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF), Policy Paper, No.26
11. Kubo Hitomi (2009), 'Training Manual: Human Security Regional Training Programme', United Nations: Office of the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
12. Liotta P.H and Owen Taylor (2006) 'Why Human Security', *The Whitehead Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations*, <http://www.journalofdiplomacy.org> Accessed September 2, 2012
13. Maclean, George (2000), 'Instituting and Projecting Human Security: A Canadian Perspective', *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.54, No.3
14. McDonald, Matt (2002), 'Human Security and the Construction of Security', *Global Society: Journal of Interdisciplinary International Relations*, Vol. 16, Issue 3
15. Milojevic, Momir (2000), 'The Principle of Non-Interference in Internal Affairs of States', *Journal of Law and Politics*, Vol.1, No.4, pp.427-447
16. Oberleitner, Gerd (2005), 'Human Security: A Challenge to International Law', *Global Governance*, 11 pp. 185-203
17. Pan American Health Organisation (2011), 'Human Security: Implications for Public Health', Technical Referent Document, <http://www.paho.org> Accessed August 20, 2012
18. Sen, Amartya (2000) 'Why Human Security', Text of Presentation at the International Symposium on Human Security Tokyo, 28 July. UNDP (2000) 'Human Development Report 2000: Human Rights and Human Development', New York
19. Ullman, Richard H (1983), 'Redefining Security', *International Security*, Summer, Vol.8, No.1
20. UNDP (1993), 'Human Development Report 1993', New York: Oxford University Press
21. UNDP (1994) 'Human Development Report 1994 New Dimensions of Human Security', New York: Oxford University Press
22. UNDP (2006), 'Niger Delta Human Development Report', Nigeria: UN House
23. Walter, Dorn (2012), 'Human Security: A Overview' Paper prepared for Pearson Peacekeeping Centre