

THE IMPACTS OF POLITICAL VIOLENCE AND TERRORISM ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROCESSES, GOOD GOVERNANCE AND ON NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

¹Akwara, Azalahu Francis & ²Akpan, Nse Etim

¹Department of Political Science, Federal University Ndufu Alike Ikwo, Abakaliki, Ebonyi State, Nigeria. (akwaraakwara@gmail.com; akwara.francis@funai.edu.ng; afakwara@yahoo.com). (+2348038032062; +2348072412414) (Corresponding author).

²Department of Political Science, Federal University Wukari, Wukari, Taraba State, Nigeria (nseakpan04@yahoo.com)

ABSTRACT

This study examines the issue of separatist insurgency and terrorism in Nigeria and its impact on socio-economic processes, good governance and on Nigeria's foreign policy. Insurgencies create bad images for a country; leads to losses of lives and property; loss of revenue and inflow of foreign investments into a country. The Nigerian case has in addition to the above problems escalated unemployment, poverty and underdeveloped the country. The study observes that the failure of the present administration in Nigeria to deal decisively with the menace has been seen as an indicator of poor political leadership and absence of good governance. The paper recommends that the country should adopt proactive foreign policy choices and economic policies that would boost employment, reduce poverty and reduce religious intolerance, and step up collaboration with other members of the international community in tackling insecurity and insurgency in Nigeria.

Key Words: political violence, terrorism, separatist insurgency, foreign policy, underdevelopment, good governance.

INTRODUCTION

Nigeria as an independent country has faced numerous challenges which have impeded its process of economic growth and overall development of the country since 1960. At present, some scholars have surmised that the country is almost in a state of war. A report jointly issued by a United States based non-profit organization, (Fund for Peace) and the 'Foreign Policy Magazine', as quoted in Ukana (2011) ranked Nigeria the 14th most unstable country among 177 countries in the world. The report went on to categorize Nigeria with nations that are either coming out of civil war or countries torn apart by sectarian violence such as Somalia, Sudan, Chad, Afghanistan, Iraq, Guinea Cote d'Ivoire, Pakistan and Yemen (Ukanah, 2011:xvii). In fact, Nigeria's current state of insecurity and by extension instability has only rendered her experience in the 30 month civil war as a child's play. The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in 2005 had in a statement indicated that Nigeria could break up by 2015, a development which attracted negative comments and reactions from Nigeria's political leaders and citizens.

On its part, the World Bank's (2006; 2007) published reports that ranked Nigeria 15th among the war-torn and "fragile states" in the world, And in the same league are such countries as Burundi, Congo, Guinea Bissau, Papua New Guinea, Sudan, Haiti, Somalia and Zimbabwe. Equally, the American Bi-partisan Centre on May 12, 2011 listed Nigeria among the world's fragile states apparently sitting on a keg of gun powder waiting to explode. The reasons for these listings are not far-fetched. The country is besieged with diverse potentially explosive problems and challenges which threaten her unity and corporate existence. The recurrent ethnic tussle and claims of autonomy by various ethnic groups in the country, the brazen and daring posture of the Niger Delta militants which became unbearable during the Yar'Adua's administration in 2007, inter-religious crises and various communal clashes are all indications that all is not well with Nigeria.

However, with the Niger Delta militancy put in abeyance courtesy of state amnesty granted the militants, other burning issues seems to have persisted which point to the fact that there is leadership failure and by extension lack of good governance. These include lack of infrastructural development, poverty, crime, massive unemployment, illiteracy and poor health and maternal facilities for the citizenry. Yet of all these problems and threats, the most contentious and devastating issues afflicting the Nigerian state are the twin national embarrassment of political violence and terrorism; and separatist insurgency by the Boko Haram – a Hausa/Fulani Islamic group in Nigeria. Political violence has remained a recurrent decimal in Nigerian polity since independence. It is therefore a common scenario that after every general election in Nigeria, people are killed, properties are destroyed, and inter-ethnic relations are strained.

In fact, these acts of violence date back to the first republic between 1960 and 1966 when violence arising from elections engulfed the nation particularly in the then Western Region, which eventually led to the first military coup and subsequent demise of the republic. This trend has remained with changes only in the violent attributes of Nigeria's political culture where political violence has assumed an extremist terrorist nature. This development buttresses the fact that there exists a linkage between the violence which trails every election in Nigeria and the terrorist menace engulfing the country today. The terrorism and insurgency seem to have completely put the nation in reverse with the emergence of a terrorist and insurgency group called "Boko-Haram in the fore front of terrorist attacks. Boko-Haram is believed to have emanated from a political thugery group in North-Eastern Nigeria where the arms and ammunitions procured by politicians for their thugs have now become weapons of post electoral killings, bombings and massive destruction, terrorism and insurgency. Its incessant cases of bombings and killings have had adverse effect on Nigeria's development and its foreign relations.

In addition to escalating political instability and uncertainty in Nigeria, terrorism also has a large effect on economic activity as the capital stock (human and material) of the country is reduced. It promotes increases in counter-terrorism expenditures thereby drawing resources from productive sectors for use in security. It has an adverse effect on specific industries such as tourism and it reduces the expected return on investment. Terrorism may also portend large movements of capital across countries if the world economy is sufficiently open. It is in such cases that corporate (international) investors rate terrorism as one of the essential factors influencing foreign investment decisions (Ojukwu, 2011:15).

In Nigeria, the menace of political violence and terrorism has manifested in various forms. These include incessant burning of houses and properties, political assassinations, hostage taking and

kidnapping, blasting of oil pipeline, illegal oil bunkering, sporadic attacks and shootings at relaxation spots and places of worship, bomb explosion and most recently suicide bombing as recorded in the case of the Police Headquarters and the United Nations building both in Abuja. The oil related atrocities, hostage taking and kidnapping are rampant in the Niger Delta region and the victims have predominantly been foreign oil workers, though the government amnesty programme has succeeded in stemming the tide for some time now. That of bomb explosion holds sway in the Northern part of the country where the activities of the Boko-Haram sect is quite intense. For all it takes, the consequences of both political violence and terrorism are ill winds that blow the country no good particularly in the context of her foreign relations and image in the comity of nations.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

When political violence occurs, foreign embassies are quick to issue travel warnings for their citizens intending to visit a country, some of whom may be tourist or potential investors. Similarly, subsequent increases in proportion of insecurity in the country as a result of terrorist attacks and insurgency would lead to a drastic reduction in the number of international investors coming into the country while some foreign companies who had been in the country years before the escalation of the acts of violence would relocated to other countries where they are sure of stable peace and security. In fact, most countries of the world are quick to accord a pariah status to terrorist prone countries while some others view doing businesses in such countries as bad business. It is therefore the purpose of this paper to examine how the prevailing dimensions of terrorism and general insecurity in Nigeria have affected the country's foreign relations particularly her foreign policy choices, socio-economic processes and good governance in the country.

THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

Violence or the threat of violence during elections is a universal phenomenon. Individuals and groups throughout history, have, in one form or another, resorted to political violence as a tactic of political action to achieve some political gains. In Nigeria and elsewhere, violence has been used by groups seeking power, by groups holding power, and by groups in the process of losing power (Anifowose, 1982:22). Violence has been pursued in the protection of order by the privileged, in the name of justice by the oppressed and in fear of displacement by the threatened (Enojo, 2010:89).

Theoretically, political violence in any political system poses two fundamental questions. The first one is from what sources and by what process does it arise? The second one is how does it affect the political and social order and by implication to this paper, foreign policy choices? A careful look at the discussion of political violence in Nigeria will however confirm the general disagreement over the meaning, origins and causes of violence. According to Enojo (2010: 93), one of the major disagreements over political violence which demands explanation is the psychological disposition of the individuals involved in violent act and the role of the social system and inter-group relations in shaping the appearance and character of political violence. This explanation requires some models but it must be noted that none of the theories can singularly explain all the factors that lead to political violence. By implication, a multi-causal explanatory framework is necessary to understand why men rebel before and after elections operating under the guise of ethnicity and religion. In fact, this understanding informs the adoption or recognition of the fact that political violence results from many factors working in combination.

Enojo (2010:93) went further to identify four models (i) The Systemic - Structural Model (ii) The Group Conflict Model (iii) The Relative, Rising Expectation and Frustration Aggression Model and (iv) The Elite Model as those that can be used in the explanation of political violence. An elaborate explanation of these models is only subject to further research but for the purpose of this paper, a summarized explanation will suffice. In line with this, the systemic-structural model is predicated upon the assumption that political violence during elections occur principally because of the breakdown of consensual norms and the inability or unwillingness of the agencies of social control to restore those norms. Accordingly, the central thesis of this line of thought surmised Enojo (2010:93) is that political violence flows directly from the political system and is likely to occur, provided the following hypothesis or assumptions are present (a) when there are cases of political alienation (b) when the ruling elite lacks the cohesiveness to exercise their reform or when they lack legitimacy (c) when there are such things as large-scale changes in social structures and processes, when such trends as industrialization, urbanization or modernization are experienced, new classes or groups with conflicting interests are created.

The Group Conflict Model identifies political violence during elections as a product of the struggle for power among groups within society. It primarily directs attention to cleavages within society, such as ethnic, racial, religious or regional split. The broad emphasis here is on reinforcing cleavages as opposed to cross-cutting ones. The central assumption of this model is that violence is often a consequence of conflict between different actors within a given political system.

The Relative deprivation or, the frustration of rising expectations model is the most fundamental and generally accepted behavioural framework in the understanding and explanation of political violence in both social and natural sciences and is also referred to as the psychological approach. The major assumption of this model is that aggression is always a consequence of betrayed expectations and desires. People engaged in political activity primarily for the purpose of authoritative allocation of values or in their quest for power, order and justice. When they get less than they expect from the system, they become violent.

Finally, the Elite Model which is also the political economy approach covering the 'Dependency' or Underdevelopment' theory as well as political analysis seeks to explain causal relation of neo-colonial dependence to underdevelopment and by extension, political violence before, during and after elections. The model has found explanations in the works of scholars like Claude Ake, Frantz Fanon, Bade Onimode, Walter Rodney, Andre Gunder Frank and Samir Amin. The main thrust of this theory is that economic exploitation of African economies as a result of the integration of these economies into the international capitalist system characterized by unequal economic relationship and exploitation. Consequently, African states are often politically manipulated and unduly stressed that during elections, violence is expressed as a way of showing displeasure at political elites. But this theoretical orientation cannot explain political violence in the Nigerian polity while the earlier three can.

It is significant to note that political violence associated with elections and electoral process in Nigeria started with the 1959 federal elections designed by the British to facilitate the transition from colonial rule to independence. The problem intensified with the 1964 general elections. Even before the elections were held, it was clear from the extreme positions taken by the two major alliances of political groups, that is the Nigerian National Alliance (NNA) and United Progressive Grand Alliance (UPGA) that no matter which of the two groups won, the results will be hotly contested.

Thus, electoral contestations are equally not new in Nigeria's political lexicon as electoral tribunals and regular courts are inundated with petitions after every election till date.

CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS: POLITICAL VIOLENCE

Political violence could be regarded as a forceful way of seeking or using power and rebellion against political authorities without regards for laws, lives and properties Anifowose (1982:22). Akinwunmi, (2004:138) submits that political violence is the use or threat of physical act carried out by an individual or individuals within a political system against another individual or individuals and or property, with the intent to cause injury or death to persons and or damage or destruction to property; and whose objective, choice of targets or victims, surrounding circumstances, implementation, and effects have political significance, that is aimed at modifying the behaviour of others in the existing arrangement of power structure that has some consequences for the political system

It can equally be said to be violence which arises as a result of political activities particularly elections and could be used interchangeably with electoral violence. Political violence manifests in different forms in Nigeria and are caused by intra-party and inter-party feuding, lack of transparency and internal democracy in political parties particularly during the nomination of candidates for elective positions, perceived electoral fraud or manipulations of election results after general elections and excessive use of thugs during elections among others.

For a better understanding of political violence in Nigeria, it is better to categorize them into three broad categories namely: those that took place during and after the elections organized by the colonial governments in Nigeria in 1922, 1951 and 1959; those that arose during and after elections organized by the military regimes in 1979, 1991, 1993, 1999; and the violence that arose during and after elections organized by civilian governments in 1964, 1983, 2003, 2007 and 2011. Among these three categories, the latter appears to be more violent and crisis-ridden compared to the former (Enojo, 2010:86).

Like the colonially supervised elections, the 1979 and 1991 general elections presided over by the military were not beset by the problem of political violence. It can therefore rightly be argued that military regimes in the country have organized relatively violent-free elections, even though such elections suffer from the problem of credibility as the case of the 1999 Presidential elections. The logic behind this success is the excessive powers wielded by the military in coercing citizens to operate within the bounds of the existing laws and decrees (Ibrahim and Egwu, 2007:32).

TERRORISM

Terrorism is an ancient 'enemy' with roots in many cultures and followers in many creeds. A war against such an enemy is unlikely to be quickly brought to a successful conclusion. Certainly terrorism has been waged by a variety of individuals or groups. It has been a favorite tactic of national and religious groups, by groups on both the left and the right of the political spectrum, by nationalist and internationalist movements. It has been directed against autocratic as well as democratic regimes although political democracies have been the most frequent target. At times, it has been an instrument of last resort for movements of national liberation whose political attempts to change the system have failed, and at other times, it has been deliberately chosen by such movements before other such political options have been attempted. States have sponsored terrorism outside their own frontiers

and have used terrorism as a weapon against their own citizens. Terrorism has become paradoxically, both an instrument designed to force radical social and political changes and an instrument of oppression in seeking to prevent such changes (Combs, 2003:8).

Terrorism in the most widely accepted contemporary usage of the term is fundamentally and inherently political. It is also ineluctably about power, the pursuit of power, the acquisition of power, and the use of power to achieve political change. Terrorism is thus violence or equally important, the threat of violence, used and directed in pursuit of, or in service of, a political aim. Historically, the word “terrorism” was first popularized during French Revolution. In contrast to its contemporary usage, at that time terrorism had a decidedly positive connotation. The system or régime de la terreur of 1793-94 from which the English word came, was adopted as a means to establish order during the transient anarchical period of turmoil and upheaval that followed the uprisings of 1789, and indeed many other revolutions. Hence, unlike terrorism as it is commonly understood today, to mean a revolutionary or antigovernment activity undertaken by non-state or sub-national entities. The régime de la terreur was an instrument of governance wielded by the recently established revolutionary state. It was designed to consolidate the new government’s power by intimidating counter revolutionaries, subversives, and other dissidents whom the regime regarded as ‘enemies of the people’ (Hoffman, 2006:3).

There is no consensus on the exact definition of terrorism. For many, terrorism is a form of political violence which probably approximates to insurrection and rebellion leading to anarchy and political protest (Ukaogo, 2004:96). For others, terrorism is simply a strategy and a process comprising several phases. It may also be seen as a revolution (Lodge, 1988:1). Seen also as a moral problem, the issue of identifying and defining terrorism is the more complex and complicated as one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter (Lodge, 1988:2). The difficulty here arises from the divergent conceptual and ideological underpinnings from where the concept is viewed. The moral questions and dilemma further makes the whole issue more complex as a given country could take a terrorist strike as ‘legal’ or ‘an end justifying a means’ while a second country could ascribe criminality to the same action (Ukaogo, 2004:97).

A glaring manifestation of the dilemma of terrorist explanation is the disagreement between the Arabs and the Israelis which thickens with every passing day. To the Israelis, every suicide bomber is a terrorist irrespective of the justifiability of the action. Thus, pro-Palestinian organizations like the Hamas and the Hezbollah with specialty in bomb throwing and grenade lobbing are terrorists. On the other hand, the Arabs see the continued denial of separate homeland to the Palestinians including the 1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon as terrorist actions. In fact, to them, the 1982 invasion remains the worst terrorist act in the Middle East and must be avenged (Oricha, 2003:12). All these divergent views and perspectives therefore frustrate every effort at a consensus understanding and appreciation of terrorism.

Equally, the American government departments present another classic manifestation of the confusion trailing terrorist actions. The American State Department classifies 4,447 cases of terrorism from 1968 to 1977, but the Central Intelligence Agency (C.I.A) regarded only 2,690 of the above figure as terrorist actions. This variation in the classification of terrorist acts present a clear picture of the confusion arising from efforts to identify terrorist actions as it is understandable that from this departmental analysis, both agencies are yet to come to terms with who a terrorist is. It is certainly difficult from the above that divergent abstractions over definition would create problems

and confusion concerning interpretations in a decidedly multi-dimensional sphere of global politics (Ukaogo, 2004: 98).

Terrorism is the deliberate and systematic murder, maiming and menacing of the innocent to inspire fear for political ends. In the latter part of the 20th century, the phenomenon became popularized as one of the features of world politics and conflict. Hitherto, terrorism is used by individuals, single minded small groups, state agents and broad insurgent movements to seek some political and military results perhaps considered difficult or impossible to achieve in the usual political forum or on the battlefield against an army (Harmon, 2000:32). Terrorism is not only confined to anomalous circumstances or exotic systems. It is also potential in ordinary institutions as well as in unusual situations. It has been variously described as both a tactic and strategy, a crime and a holy duty, a justified reaction to oppression and an inexcusable abomination (Walter, 1972:23) Reigns of terror are not properly understood if they are conceived exclusively as ephemeral state of crisis produced by adventurous events or as alien forms of control. Systems of terror usually defined as ‘abnormal’ by the conventions of western social and political thought may be generated under certain conditions of stress by ‘normal’ political processes (Ojukwu, 2011:16).

Terrorism is a deliberate criminal act targeted at individuals, groups or the state, with the aim of inflicting injury, harm or even death, for the purpose of achieving a particular goal or objective. It can take different shapes or form. For example, religious terrorism mostly occurs when members of a particular religious faith perceive imminent danger to their beliefs or religious values while political terrorism can also be directed towards addressing imagined, perceived or real threat to group identity and survival (Golder, 2004:270). Merari (1994:16), for instance, describes terrorism as the use of violence by sub-national groups or clandestine state agents for realizing political (including social and religious) goals especially when the violence is intended to intimidate or otherwise affect the emotions, attitudes and behavior of a target audience considerably larger than the actual victims. To Wilkinson (1974: 34), terrorism as a type of unconventional warfare, is designed to weaken or supplant existing political landscapes through capitulation, acquiescence or radicalization as opposed to subversion or direct military action.

The terrorist attacks in great nations like the United States of America and the United Kingdom in 2001 and 2005 respectively brings to the fore a future in which our societies are among the battle fields and our people among the targets. The September 11th terrorist attacks on the United States were not only tragic and horrific, but were also followed by other major attacks such as the attacks on: the tourist facilities on Bali in 2002, the siege of a middle school in Breslain, Russia, Madrid attack in 2004 and the London transit system attack in 2005 (Lutz and Lutz, 2008: 22). These attacks resulted in major casualties and have provided outgoing evidence that terrorism is a continuing problem and ravaging fire for many societies around the world. Terrorism has a connotation of evil, indiscriminate violence or brutality. Thus, to label a group or action as terrorist is to seek to suggest that the actors or the violence is immoral, wrong or contrary to obvious basic ethical principles that any reasonable human being might hold (Ojukwu, 2011:16). In some context, terrorists may be conceived as, freedom fighters, revolutionaries, rebels, resistance fighters, members of democratic opposition or national opposition or national liberation soldiers (Endlers and Sandler, 2006: 17).

Terrorism in Nigeria has a different personality compared to what happens in other parts of the world. This is the case because Nigerian terrorists most often do not have identifiable and charismatic leaders but they have objectives which they believe can only be achieved through clandestine and

covert guerrilla war on the Nigerian State by bombing churches and other places of worship, facilities belonging to international organizations like the United Nations building in Abuja, state institutions such as the Police Headquarters in Abuja and some schools and relaxation spots among others.

In fact, religious terrorism seems to be the high point of terrorist activities in the country and they manifest in various forms including bomb throwing, assassinations, sporadic shootings into public gatherings where numerous lives are lost, kidnappings and hostage taking as well as suicide bombing. The most pronounced is the Boko Haram sect which has wrecked havoc not only on the psyche of Nigerians but on the security apparatus of the Nigerian State as efforts to clamp down on them has so far not yielded any positive result. Their activities are anti-state, against democratic norms and the overall development of the country with far reaching implications for the country's foreign policy (Onuoha, 2010:36).

FOREIGN POLICY

This is a strategy or planned course of action related to external relations developed by the decision makers aimed at achieving specific goals (Frankel, 1975:3). Foreign policy is equally a set of connected ideas and thoughts, which often is the product of mental reflective activities and processes, which embodies judgment, choices, decision, evaluation, systematic insight, appreciation of objective realities revolving around the milieu and seeking solutions. It is the category which deals with defence, security, international political relations and international economic relations (Ofoegbu, 1980:3). The concept expresses self-interest strategies chosen by the state to safeguard its national interests and to achieve its goals within international relations milieu. Foreign policy is presumably something less than the sum of all policies which have effect upon a national government's relation with other national governments (Abia, 2000:81). It is one of the fundamental concepts in international relations which is influenced by a country's national interest and thus deals with the relations between one actor in the international system and others in the same system. These actors may be states, international organizations or some types of individuals (Akpan, 2003: 411).

However, what constitutes the national interest of states vary according to the perception of its leaders. In Nigeria, what constitutes the national interest has remained a matter of intense disagreement among scholars and decision makers alike. Nevertheless, the framework provided by Olajide Aluko (1981) and Olusanya and Akindele (1986), gives a fairly inadequate guideline on aspects that seem to be beyond argument in Nigeria's national interest. Aluko (1981: 265) lists three issues which he refers to as 'vital' elements of Nigeria's national interest. These are self-preservation of the country, the defence and maintenance of the country's independence and the economic and social well-being of the people. In addition to these are other issues which Aluko describes as not constituting 'core' or 'vital' interest. These are defence, preservation and promotion of the ways of life of Nigerians, especially their democratic values, enhancement of the country's standing in the committee of nations, especially in Africa, and the promotion of world peace.

For Olusanya and Akindele (1986: 2), Nigeria's national interest are (i) the defence of the country's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, (ii) the restoration of human dignity to black men and women all over the world, (iii) the creation of the relevant political and economic conditions in Africa and the rest of the world, (iv) the promotion and improvement of the economic well-being of the Nigerian citizens and (v) the promotion of world peace and justice. An analysis of the perspectives of Aluko as well as Olusanya and Akindele show a striking similarity in almost all the elements. Thus, while it is true that there is no general agreement on what constitutes Nigeria's

national interest, and for that matter which elements are ‘core’ and which ones are ‘peripheral’ as earlier stated, it is nevertheless in the words of Aworawo (2003: 387) correct to affirm that the issues discussed above are sufficiently all-embracing to encompass the main elements.

A Country’s foreign policy - the ‘international relations policy’ - is a set of political and economic goals that seeks to outline how a country will interact with other countries of the world. Thus, foreign policies generally are designed to help protect a country’s national interests, national security, ideological goals and economic prosperity. It consists of decisions and actions which involve to some appreciable extent, relations between one state and others. It is a set of explicit objectives with regard to the world beyond the borders of a given social unit and a set of strategies and tactics designed to achieve those objectives. This implies the perception of a need to influence the behavior of other states or international organization. The aim is to ensure that such states or international organization maintain the existing pattern of behavior especially if the influencing state perceives such as contributing to the achievement of its own objectives, or to change the present pattern by initiating a new set of policies, or by altering or halting the implementation of existing ones (Frankel, 1975: 4).

Foreign policy decisions are targeted towards entities external to the state unlike domestic policies. Thus, the process of foreign policy decision making is influenced by factors that are not only internal to the state initiating particular policies, but also by pressures from sources that are external to it. Hence, in the view of Ojukwu (2011:19) two environments of foreign policy are identifiable. These are the domestic influences on foreign policy which include a country’s geography, economy, demography, political structures, military, political parties, lobbies and interest groups as well as public opinion. To this could be added the country’s political processes. In essence, a country’s location, topography, its terrain, climate, size, population and distribution of natural resources will not only affect socio-economic development within the country, but will also determine the country’s needs in relation to other states. The external environment expresses the interests of other actors in the system which can come in varying dimensions such as multinational corporations and political terrorists. The idea behind the pressure may be to impact positively on the country’s socio-economic and political development or to negatively affect such a country. The truth however, is that countries must be stable and secured to be able to pursue the onerous task of positive and sustainable development. That is why the issue of political violence and terrorists activities poses a great challenge to the Nigerian state and has the capacity to make or mar her relations with other countries in the international system.

IMPACTS OF POLITICAL VIOLENCE AND TERRORISM ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROCESSES AND GOOD GOVERNANCE IN THE NIGERIAN STATE: A DISCOURSE

The twin menace of political violence and terrorism has posed serious challenges to the corporate existence of Nigeria as a country. There is a causal relationship between electoral contests and political violence as the former begets the latter. The reason behind the high level of violence during and after elections can only be explained within the character of the political class in the country which has expression in their ‘rent-seeking’ and ‘rent-collection’ behavior. In fact, our political elites have turned Nigeria into an instant source of primitive wealth accumulation once they grab political power, a development which explains their state of desperation in seeking political power. Politics is seen as a vehicle for making quick and easy money and as such incumbent office holders are desperate to hold on to power by all means while those outside power are equally desperate to get into public offices by all means. This generates a situation of force and counter force and as the

local adage goes, “when two elephants fight the grass suffers”. This development paints a vivid picture of the state of political violence in Nigeria and offers an explanation to the cannon fodder posture of the ordinary Nigerian once such violence erupts as they have been banished to the position of the grass in this recurrent fight. In fact, the struggle to control the apparatus of the state becomes intense because such control guarantees wealth, power and authority and makes politics the only ‘viable industry’ in Nigeria.

The incidence of political violence dates back to the pre-independence Nigeria as the 1959 elections designed by the British as a transitional vehicle from colonial rule to independence was not devoid of violence. It however became more pronounced during the post independence era particularly the 1964 general elections. Before the elections proper, the foundation was laid for violence by the manipulation of electoral laws by the ruling party, the Nigerian Peoples Congress (NPC) which resulted in the call for a boycott of the elections by the opposition. As captured by Dudley (1982:82), the electoral officers were terrorized into absconding from their offices, candidates with opposition were declared unopposed in almost all regions of the country and as envisaged by many, the results of the election was not only rejected, but the opposition especially in the Western Region resorted to violence to contest what they perceived as the reverse of their mandate by the ruling NPC. This situation gave birth to arson of intense magnitude, looting, killings, massive destruction of properties and total breakdown of law and order beyond the control of the central government. The period also introduced two new vocabularies into the country’s political lexicon namely “operation wetie” and “wild-wild-west”. While the former depicts the use of petrol to wet opposition members and their properties with petrol before setting them ablaze, the latter captures the description of the nature and intensity of wanton destruction of lives and properties in Western Nigeria by the then Prime Minister Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa. Consequent upon this, a state of emergency was imposed in the Western Region, while the crisis affected the legitimacy of the new civilian authority it subsequently led to the military intervention in Nigerian politics on January 15,

From the above development, one would have thought that the political class in Nigeria would have learnt some lessons that could help stem the tide of political violence in the country in subsequent elections, but this was not the case as developments during and after subsequent elections in the country unveil. The next election was the 1979 general elections which came after 13 years of military rule and at the end of the transition programme initiated by late General Murtala Mohammed and concluded by General Olusegun Obasanjo who took over from Murtala after Murtala’s assassination on the 13th of February, 1976. Few cases of political violence were recorded in some parts of the country with some contesting the outcome of the elections. Skirmishes were recorded in Borno State where violence erupted between the National Party of Nigeria (NPN) and the Great Nigeria Peoples Party (GNPP) resulting in the death of 39 people. There were also violent inter-party clashes in Kano which resulted in the burning down of a radio station, government secretariat and the death of many party supporters.

The April 2011 election received commendations on the successful conduct and peaceful atmosphere by the international observers during the national and presidential elections. In their opinion, the conduct of the election was at least fairer those of 2003 and 2007, but very unfortunately the negative reactions which followed were violent in nature. However, Halliru (2012: 89) submits that several factors were responsible for the escalation of political violence during that election. According to him, these factors were ethnic and religious agitation, reckless manipulation of the electoral process, imposition of candidates by the political elites, poverty, intolerance and injustice. Violence erupted in Northern Nigeria immediately after the announcement of the presidential election result which

confirmed the victory of the ruling Peoples' Democratic Party (PDP) headed by President Goodluck Jonathan. Some muslims contested the authenticity of the results while some felt it was authentic. Thereafter, some youths reacted on April 17, 2011, the day after the presidential election, with supporters of General Buhari, a Northern Muslim, who alleged that the ruling party had rigged the election in support of President Jonathan, a southern Christian. This allegation resulted in politically motivated violence in which several people were killed, Four days later, the Human Rights Watch, reported that about 800 people were killed and over 65,000 people were found to be temporarily internally displaced. In Kaduna state alone over 500 people were said to have been killed in southern parts of the state, with over 180 people also killed in the northern part respectively. The violence and massive destruction spread to other towns with the burning of some villages in the areas between Muslims and Christians, while in Bauchi State about ten Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) ad-hoc staff who were serving members of the National Youth Service Corps (NYSC) were killed.

For terrorism, the story is not different as some aspects of the menace in particular kidnapping has wrecked untold grief to numerous families in the country. Most Nigerians have tended to see terrorism as a recent phenomenon in the country whereas this is far from the truth. The country had a clear incidence of terrorist assault in the aftermath of the crisis that accompanied the annulment of the June 12, 1993 Presidential election believed to have been won by business mogul and philanthropist late Chief Moshood Abiola popularly called MKO, of the defunct Social Democratic Party (SDP). This incidence witnessed the hijack of a Nigerian Airways plane which was forced to land in Niger. The terrorist demanded the revalidation of the result of the annulled Presidential election in favour of the presumed winner Chief MKO Abiola and his subsequent swearing in as President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. In fact, prior to this, there had been an incidence of death through parcel bomb of Mr. Dele Giwa, the Editor-in-Chief of Newswatch magazine in October, 1986 which the bulk of Nigerians believed was state or government sponsored given certain altercations between the high profile journalist and some officials of some agencies of state (Okereke, 2009:66).

However, of recent and most worrisome, terrorist attacks have manifested in various forms and increased tempo in the country. Thus, while some countries experience bombing and hijacking of airlines, some device the use of missiles and land mines. In Nigeria, hostage taking, abduction, kidnapping and bombings as well as oil pipeline vandalization are rampant. The menace of kidnapping and hostage taking started in the Niger Delta in the South-South geo-political zone of Nigeria as a means of drawing the attention of government to the plight of the peoples of the zone neglected in the oil exploitation and exploration activities in the oil-rich area but has since blossomed into a lucrative business mostly in the South Eastern states. The menace has also expanded in scope to cover other victims outside its original coverage of foreign oil workers as children, toddlers, women and influential Nigerians are not spared the traumatic experience of kidnapping. At the last count, Nigerians from different works of life had been kidnapped and various sums of money extorted from relations of victims, the list of which this paper cannot exhaust. With relief coming the way of Nigerians courtesy of the amnesty programme of the Federal Government for the militants who were involved in the act, Nigerians have recently been confronted by other dimensions of terrorism.

Bomb throwing in strategic places became another terrorist manifestation as Nigerians in Abuja were confronted with bombings on October 1st, 2010 around the Eagle Square when cream of Nigerian

people and some foreign dignitaries had gathered to mark the 50th independence anniversary of Nigeria. Reports and investigation showed that about 15 people died while several others were seriously injured in the incident. It is worthy of note that this incidence occurred despite warnings by both the United States and the United Kingdom of the impending attacks. This was closely followed by the Christmas day bombing of the Catholic Church in Madallah, in the outskirts of the Federal Capital Territory where scores of people were killed and numerous others wounded. The city of Abuja was thrown into mourning again with the bombing of the Police Headquarters by a suicide bomber who lost his life and that of a policeman in the process. The blast led to the burning of many cars and the destruction of the building among other damages. This was followed closely by the blast on the United Nations Headquarters building in Abuja with many lives and properties worth millions of Naira destroyed by another suicide bomber. Nyanya, a suburb of the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja had its share of bomb blast in two closely recorded incidences, the first on the 14 of April, 2014 at about 6.45am when two bombs exploded in a popular motor park killing 88 people and injuring 200 others while the second blast around the same motor park on May 2 claimed 12 lives and injured 30 others. As usual, the Islamic sect Boko Haram claimed responsibility for both blasts.

The case of Kano and Kaduna remain most worrisome. Numerous blasts have been recorded in Kano city but the one on the 18th of March, 2013 stands tall amongst them. In this incidence, a bus packed with Christian civilians who were Southern Nigeria bound was bombed in a bus station with at least 60 people killed and injuring about 65 of them. It was reported that a Volkswagen Golf loaded with explosives and driven by three suicide bombers rammed into one of the five buses, which was being boarded by civilians mostly Christians, to East and South Nigeria and the ensuing fire engulfed the other four buses which also had passengers in them. In a similar vein, a multiple blast killed at least 24 people in the same place in July same year while a bomb blast ripped through a street of bars and restaurants killing 5 people including a suicide bomber and wounding scores of others. Most recently, an unspecified number of people have been killed while several others were injured in an explosion along Maiduguri road opposite NNPC filling station in Hotoro area of the town. All these blasts have however been attributed to the Islamist sect Boko Haram which remains the main terrorist group in the country (Ameh, 2014:6).

In Kaduna State, the story is not different as numerous people have lost their lives and many others injured in various incidences of terrorist bomb blasts. In a multiple bomb blasts in the State, a church was bombed on the 17th of June in the Wusasa area of the state leaving 19 people dead and more than 80 injured. On the 24th of June, another blast killed 12 people in the Sabon Gari area of the State while a third blast was reported in Kaduna, the state capital with no immediate record of deaths. However, the blasts of 24th July, 2014 will go down in history as one with the highest number of casualties. At least 82 persons were killed, and several others injured in two bomb blasts in Kaduna, targeted at former head of state, General Muhammadu Buhari (rtd) and an Islamic cleric, Sheikh Dahiru Bauchi. Both men, however, escaped unhurt. In a statement he issued immediately after the incident, General Buhari declared that it was an assassination attempt and narrated how the suicide bomber tried to carry out the deadly assignment. Kaduna State Governor, Alhaji Mukhtar Ramalan Yero, in response imposed a 24-hour curfew on Kaduna town after the blasts.

The above explosions would vanish into oblivion when compared with similar incidences recorded in the North Eastern States of Borno, Yobe and Adamawa which ultimately led to the imposition of state of emergency in the three states. In Maiduguri, the Borno state capital, bomb explosion has remained a regular feature with scores if lives lost and several thousands of Nigerians in that state

nursing different categories of injuries. On February 2014 alone, several attacks were recorded beginning with the attack on Bama near the border with Cameroon, where Boko Haram struck and killed at least 98 people. On February 12, a large Boko Haram force attacked the town of Konduga and killed 39 civilians. While on February 15, the Sect killed 106 people when it raided the nearby town of Izghe. Two days prior, Boko Haram insurgents killed nine Nigerian soldiers in an ambush in the village; the terror group returned on February 23 and razed what remained of the village.

In fact, the list of attacks in Borno would be endless as it has even been reported that the terrorist sect, Boko Haram has taken over a greater part of the state and has crowned its effort with the abduction of the about 300 school girls of Government Girls Secondary School, Chibok in June this year. The bulk of the girls are yet to be rescued till date. Mubi, a commercial town in Adamawa State has not known peace as the Islamist sect Boko Haram has taken over the town sacking and displacing the entire population and turning Nigerians into refugees in their own country.

Yobe State has had a fair share of terrorist attacks with the recent one being the killing of 49 students of the Government Technical Science College, Potiskum in an early morning blast while the students were waiting for the Principal's Monday morning address in the Assembly Hall. Several others were also said to have been injured. This came on the heels of a previous attack on another co-educational Government College in the town of Buni Yadi where Boko Haram set student's hostels ablaze killing no fewer than 43 persons and injuring scores of others. Other towns and cities in the state have not been spared the agony of these terrorist attacks which has turned a once very peaceful country into a theatre of gory killings and insurgency.

These acts of violence have reduced the level of economic activities in the country especially in the geographic regions where the violence and terrorist attacks are rampant. Most businesses have closed shops and most of the survivors have relocated from the regions to other regions where insurgency and terror are minimal or absent. The relocation involves exodus of human and material resources which would have developed the affected areas of violence as the losses in human and material terms are unquantifiable. Since the acts involve the destruction of infrastructural facilities in the societies involved, rebuilding such facilities have not been easy due to lack of resources. The acts therefore retard the development of infrastructural facilities.

Due to the strategies employed by the terrorists, fighting or eliminating the perpetrators is always difficult for the government. Issues of human rights are raised by the international community and human rights groups after government forces attacks on the insurgents and these question the capabilities of the government to rule well, and even the legitimacies of the governments at all levels in the country. Good governance involves the protection of lives and property but where the government fails to provide these, it legitimacy is questioned. Moreover, the attacks reinforce ethnic and religious prejudices among the citizens and victims of the attacks; lead to a loss of a sense of national identity; impede national integration and democratic governance as the government is seen as incapable of dealing with the situation.

THE IMPACT OF POLITICAL VIOLENCE AND TERRORISM ON NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

The reduction of the world into a global village courtesy of globalization has come with both positive and negative consequences for nations in the international system. In fact, what can rightly be described as "illicit globalization" has manifested itself in various forms ranging from human and

drug trafficking; illegal trade in small and light weapons; to trans-border banditry and terrorism. Similarly, the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the Pentagon and the World Trade Centre in the United States of America have generated far reaching consequences for most countries in the world and Nigeria is not left out of the effects of these developments particularly, with the attempted bombing of an American airliner en route to Detroit from Amsterdam by Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab, a Nigerian student in the United Kingdom on the 25th of December, 2010. Again, the increasing acts of political violence, kidnapping and other conflicts resulting from the political process has equally not helped the country's relations with other members of the international community including international organizations as the United Nations, African Union, the Commonwealth of Nations, the ECOWAS, etc.

The attempt by Abdulmutallab was to change the face of Nigeria's interaction with other countries of the world outside getting the tag of being a terrorist destination. In league with the raging war by Boko Haram on the Nigerian state and the assertion of a possible linkage between the Islamic Sect, Boko Haram and Al-Qaeda as well as other international terrorist organizations, Nigeria's image in the comity of nations have dimmed further with grave consequences for our foreign policy. As a matter of fact, Nigeria has had extensive diplomatic relations and friendly ties with both African countries and the Western nations since independence in 1960. The country had also been able to pursue her national interest and in the process asserts itself as a leading country in Africa in its foreign policy goals with special emphasis on economic diplomacy and the need to attract foreign investments into the country. These lofty ideals and objectives of her foreign policy seems to have vanished into insignificance with the emergence of the terrorist acts that is fast becoming a recurrent decimal in the state of affairs in Nigeria. From the above, the first impact of political violence and terrorism is the loss of respect and self-esteem by the Nigerian state in the international community. There is no contradiction in the fact that no nation will be favourably disposed to establishing a bilateral relation with a country that is conflict prone, politically unstable and an acclaimed terrorist destination. Nigeria's image abroad has drastically reduced as a result of the persistent acts of violence and uncontrollable terrorist and criminal acts. Not only are Nigerians travelling abroad subjected to some level of inhuman treatment as a result of these issues, some countries have need to place a travel ban on the country for their citizens willing to visit Nigeria with the resultant decline in the number of visitors particularly tourists and genuine investors coming into the country and the attendant loss of foreign exchange associated with such visits and investments. This poses grave danger for a country that is craving for development.

Closely related to the above, is the issue of the exodus of numerous companies and businesses from Nigeria particularly the multinational corporations which are supposed to aid growth and development. These firms have closed shops and relocated to other countries deemed safe and secure as a result of the continuous terrorist attacks and other measure of violence prevalent in Nigeria. In fact, this spate of political violence and terrorism has the capacity of scaring foreigners from coming into the country to invest as well as stop foreign election monitors from coming to observe elections. It suffices to note that since the escalation of abduction, kidnapping and bombing in Nigeria, the country has lost its 6th position in the league of oil exporting countries. The position has been taken over by Angola that now top the chart as Africa's largest exporter of crude oil. Prior to the precarious situation, Nigeria used to produce a total output of 2.4 million barrels per day. Industry sources now put the average total oil production output at 1.4 million barrels while Angola produces 1.9 million barrels daily. The terrorist acts in the country have succeeded in killing the hen that lays the golden eggs as the most affected oil companies Shell Production Development Company, Chevron, the

Nigerian Agip Oil and the state-owned Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC) (Ojukwu, 2011:382) and their staffs have become targets of terror attacks and kidnaps.

If loss of oil revenue arising from insecurity is not enough setback for Nigeria, then the epileptic nature of power supply in the country is enough to slow down if not completely knock down and these affect the process of development. With the decline in oil production and an escalating rate of oil pipeline vandalization and other terrorist activities, it remains glaring that the target of even the 6000 megawatts of electricity set as at 2009 has not and will not be met, the privatization and unbundling of the state owned Power Holding Company of Nigeria (PHCN) notwithstanding. This is because the bulk of the investors are foreign nationals who have been forced to flee Nigeria as a result of insurgency and in addition, the dwindling production capacity of oil also affects directly the production of gas needed to power the electricity projects. The probability therefore is that the country will remain in darkness longer than anticipated given these identified problems that are caused by the heightened level of insurgency and general insecurity in Nigeria.

The next impact is the seeming failure of Nigeria's avowed commitment to economic diplomacy, a policy thrust aimed at wooing investors from other countries to invest in Nigeria. The escalating security problem in the country has frustrated this goal because instability and violence has led to balance of trade deficits especially in Northern Nigeria as both current and would be investors and traders have either reduced their trade and investment engagements in the country thus creating the lopsidedness and imbalance noticed in our terms of trade. It must be realized that economic diplomacy as a core objective of Nigeria's foreign policy is also one of the pivots of President Johnathan's Transformation Agenda, a development which casts a serious doubt on the realization of and success of such an agenda.

One of the glaring effects of political violence and terrorism on foreign policy is that most countries do not look at Nigeria as a serious minded nation to establish an economic agreement with. They have definitely lost confidence in dealing with the country. Hence most acts of terrorism have often times been politicized and facts distorted by government officials for personal gains. Apart from the economic effects of terrorism, the psyche of Nigerians has also been affected in their everyday life as visiting public places have become dreadful. The productivity ratio of the citizenry has also been reduced which has limited the country's growth and development, and many Nigerians are now suffering from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorders as a result of terrorist acts that have affected them psychologically (Venda, 2010:6).

As a corollary to the above, and given the fact that foreign policy has close linkages with domestic politics, Nigerians are banished to perpetual fear as citizens can no longer ascertain the next terrorist target or where the next act of violence is likely to occur. Domestic businesses have also gone underground particularly in the hospitality industry as visits to eateries and popular drinking and relaxation joints are observed in abhorrence by Nigerians, a development which has rendered a lot of people jobless in a country with an already very high rate of unemployment. In fact, the tourism industry is the worse hit as it has lost some of its foreign exchange earnings due to a high drop in the patronage of its activities. International organizations such as DFID, USAID, and UNICEF etc have also withdrawn supports from troubled spots in the country thereby making it difficult for the local population to access essential health and educational programmes which they benefited from in no small measure (Venda, 2010:6).

Finally, the spate of terrorism has turned Nigeria into a state of war as soldiers and policemen are drafted all over the country in the name of the provision of security for Nigerians even when the activities of insurgents continue unabated. The presence of these law enforcement agencies on the highways and other public places remain a source of intimidation of Nigerians who are subjected to thorough search in such places and to extortion. Added to this situation is the creation of road blocks within the cities and public highways with the resultant effect of delays in both inter and intra city movements in the country as well as waste of quality man hour which would have been used for productive ventures across the country.

CURBING POLITICAL VIOLENCE AND TERRORISM IN NIGERIA: THE WAY FORWARD

The most fundamental and basic means of stemming the tide of insecurity in the country is for our leaders to imbibe the tenets of good governance embedded in the principles of practical democracy. Good governance will allow for the provision of the real and not imagined dividends of democracy with a high tendency for the provision of infrastructure, creation of jobs for the teeming idle youths in Nigeria who form the bulk of those easily recruited for terrorist activities and other acts of violence. This is necessary because of the understanding that the “idle mind is a devil’s workshop” and that once the youths are engaged in meaningful and resourceful activities, the tendency for them to be drafted as thugs and suicide bombers would be drastically reduced. Provision of good governance will also address the high rate of poverty in the country which is at an alarming rate as indexed by swelling unemployed youths, lack of qualitative education and health facilities, poor quality of life and lack of basic social infrastructures that make life meaningful, issues that have all been implicated as some of the causes of insecurity in Nigeria. If schools are provided for the basic education of the people, hospitals and other health facilities, electricity, good roads and affordable housing scheme as well as security, then the possibility of curbing political violence and terrorism in the country would have been realized.

Following the above closely is the fact that terrorism in Nigeria has been attributed to violent agitations, lack of patriotism and religious intolerance. Nigeria needs to do more in order to restore its battered image; combating terrorism needs to be done with utmost sincerity and commitment on the part of government. The politics of exclusion which has been the bane of political interaction since independence needs to be addressed so as to discourage marginalization of minority groups. Many analysts of the foregoing terrorist situation in Nigeria have argued that for there to be headway in the fight against terrorism government needs to ameliorate the sufferings of Nigerians by addressing the core issues of neglect, poverty, marginalization, underdevelopment, and youth unemployment.

Similarly, there is need for our religious leaders to show more commitment to the inculcation of religious tolerance in their adherents since intolerance has been discovered to be one of the causes of insurgency and conflict in the Nigerian state. However, this gospel of tolerance should not be left in the hands of religious leaders alone as security must definitely be the business of all. This is where the National Orientation Agency (NOA) owes Nigerians a duty by making sure that the message of religious tolerance is taken to every nook and cranny of the country and possibly collaborating with the Ministry of Education in ensuring that it becomes part of the curriculum of social studies in our secondary schools.

The Almajiri situation in Northern Nigeria should also be addressed by government as there have been credible reports indicating that some of them have been recruited as foot soldiers by terrorist gangs just for a plate of food. It is heart soothing that the present administration of President Johnathan has launched a concerted programme for the education of the Almajiris by building schools for them. This lofty programme must be taken beyond rhetoric by ensuring that they actually enroll and benefit from the programme. Building and funding the schools is not enough, what the almajiris are taught in the schools should be properly supervised by the federal government.

Again, because terrorism is a global phenomenon, it is instructive that government should also adopt a global posture in tackling the menace. These call for the collaboration between Nigeria and other more experienced countries that have been able to contain the menace of terrorism, and co-opting the neighbouring countries whom many Nigerians believe are safe heavens for the terrorists, in the fight against terrorism. Thus, Nigeria needs a robust foreign policy framework that can tackle the menace of insurgency and this can be done through military cooperation with advanced countries that are more endowed technologically. There should be no room for the thinking that terrorism and other acts of violence are solely the internal affairs of individual countries as this has been proven beyond reasonable doubt.

Finally, government needs to be sincere in the fight against terror as its current vocal condemnation and window dressing attitudes when lives and property are lost on a daily basis is not acceptable. The leadership must learn to accept constructive criticisms, respect the rule of law and be tolerant of the views of the opposition. The fact remains that we need actions and not white paper drafting committees or fact finding missions. The military capabilities of the Nigerian state should be fully utilized and exploited by government in the fight against terror, while the current timid posture which has endangered Nigeria's development must be jettisoned without delay.

CONCLUSION

From all of the above discourse, it is realizable that political violence and terrorism does not augur well for any country's image, national interest and foreign policy. This paper has been able to capture in vivid and clear terms the impact of political violence and terrorism on Nigeria's foreign policy highlighting in the process the various oddities associated with these twosome menace. It discussed the various factors responsible for this spate of conflicts and insurgency in the country. Therefore, having known a number of these factors among which include, failure of good governance, issue of neglect, poverty, high rate of unemployment especially among the youth, and so on, what is expected is that the government in particular should brace up to its constitutional responsibilities by addressing these problems through critical appraisal of the suggestions advocated in this paper.

REFERENCES

- Abia, V. B. E. (2000) *Contemporary Issues in International Relations*, Lagos: Concept Publishers.
- Adeniran, T. (1983) *Introduction to International Relations*. Lagos (Nigeria) Macmillan Publishers.
- Akinwunmi, O. (2004) "Ethnicisation of Violence" in, Saliu, H. A. (ed.) *Nigeria Under Democratic Rule, 1999 – 2003*, Ibadan: University Press.
- Akpan, N. E. (2003) "Nigeria's Foreign Policy Since Independence" in, Osuntokun, A., Aworawo, D. and Masajuwa, F. (eds.) *History and Cultures of Nigeria Up to AD 2000*, Lagos: Frankad Publishers.

- Aluko, O. (1981) *Essays in Nigerian Foreign Policy*, London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Ameh, G. (2014) "Scores Feared Death as Bomb Blast Hits Kano" (November 14) *Daily Post*,
- Anifowose, R. (1982) *Violence and Politics in Nigeria: The Tiv and Yoruba Experience*, Enugu: Nok Publishers.
- Aworawo, D. (2003) "Nigeria's Foreign Relations, 1960-2003" in, Osuntokun, A., Aworawo, D., Akpan, N. E. and Masajuwa, F. (eds), *Issues in Nigerian Government and Politics*, Ibadan: Rex Charles Publications.
- Combs, C. C. (2003) *Terrorism in the Twenty-First Century*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Dudley, B. (1982) *An Introduction to Nigerian Government and Politics*, London: Macmillan
- Enders, W.S. and Sandler, T. (2006) "The impact of Transnational Terrorism on U.S. Foreign Direct Investment", *Political Research Quarterly*, 59 (4) 51731.
- Enojo, E. K. (2010) "Elections in Nigeria from 1999-2009: Issues and Challenges", in Egwemi, V. (ed.), *A Decade of Democracy in Nigeria, 1999-2009*.
- Frankel, J. (1975) *The Making of Foreign Policy*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Golder, M. (2004), *Confronting Terrorism*, New York: Routledge.
- Halliru, T. (2012) "How Ethnicity and Political Violence Threatens Democracy in Nigeria" *Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1 (2), May.
- Harmon. C.C. (2000) *Terrorism Today*, 2nd ed., London: Routledge.
- Hoffman, B. (2006), *Inside Terrorism*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ibrahim, J. and Egwu, S. (2007) *Defending the People's Mandate: Election 2007*, Abuja: Global Rights Campaign Project Publication.
- Lodge, J ed. (1988) *The Threat of Terrorism*, Brighton: Wheaf Sheaf Books.
- Lutz, J.M. and Lutz, B.J. (2008) *Global Terrorism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Merari, A. (1994) "Terrorism" *Encyclopedia of Human Behaviour*, Volume 4.
- Ofoegbu, R. (1980) *Foundation Course in International Relations for Universities*, London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Ojukwu, C. C. (2011) "Terrorism, Foreign Policy and Human Rights Concerns in Nigeria". *Global Journal of Human Social Science* 11 (3), Version 1.0, April.
- Okereke C.N. (2010) "Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) and the Question of Security in West Africa" *Africa Journal for the Prevention and Combating of Terrorism*, 1 (1)
- Olusanya, G. O. and Akindele, R.A. (1986) "The Fundamentals of Nigeria's Foreign Policy and External Economic Relations" in, Olusanya, G. O. and Akindele, R.A.(eds) *Nigeria's External Relations: The First Twenty Five Years*, Ibadan: University Press Limited.
- Onouha F.C. (2010) "The Islamist Challenge: Nigeria's Boko Haram Crisis Explained" *African Security Review*, 19. (2)
- Oricha, J. M. (2003) "Terrorism as an International Embarrassment", *New Soja*, Vol. 2737/43.
- Ukana, P.O.(2011) *In God's Name: The Story of Nigeria's Religious and its Brutal Killings*, Ibadan: Divine Press.
- Ukaogu, V. (2004) "Terrorism in International Relations: Dialectical Dilemma", *Nigerian Journal of Policy and Development*, Volume 3.
- Venda, T, I. (2010), "Terrorism and Nigeria's Foreign Policy: A Discourse", *Intellectualtourist* Accessed on 19 November, 2014 from <http://www.iiste.org/journals/index.php/IGS/article/download/6670/6813>.
- Walter, E. V. (1972), *Terror and Resistance: A study of Political Violence*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wilkinson, P. (1974) *Political Terrorism*. New York: Macmillan Press.