



Public Administration & Management

Website: www.arabianjbm.com/RPAM_index.php

Publisher: Department of Public Administration Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria and Zainab Arabian Research Society for Multidisciplinary Issues Dubai, UAE



PUBLIC POLICY AND PRIVATISATION OF SECURITY IN NIGERIAN NASCENT DEMOCRACY

OBIORA, Charles Arinze

Department of Political Science, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam

OKONKWO, Clement

Department of Political Science, Madonna University, Okija

Corresponding author: nwaclemsoko@yahoo.com

Abstract

In recent years, the Nigerian state has been inundated with security challenges of gargantuan dimensions. The situation calls for an in-depth and critical study of its causes and implications on the Nigeria's nascent democracy and possible ways of tackling it. This study attempts to ascertain the impact of the policy of privatisation of security adopted by many state governments on the politics and economy of Nigeria. The study adopts data from secondary sources and as well utilises social contract theory of origin of the state to prove that privatisation of security in whatever guise it goes is antithetical to the principles of democracy and negates the principal role of the state which is, the protection of lives and properties of her citizens. The paper suggests that instead of abdicating from her responsibilities, governments should review her security policies through proper equipping of security operatives as well as registration, monitoring and supervision of private security agencies in the country.

Key words: Citizens, Enterprises, Economy, Institution, and State.

Introduction:

In the world over, the need for security cannot be over-emphasized as it cuts across the socio-political and economic fabrics of terrestrial existence. Essentially, it involves mostly the sustenance of life and property which are basically the fundamental needs of man. According to the social contract theorists, there was no sustainable security of life and private property in the "state of nature" which made life miserable, hence, Thomas Hobbes described life in this scenario as being solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short. The amorphous and unreliable condition appeared to have necessitated the emergence of the State under "social pact" which connotes the security of life and property of the parties in the agreement (Gaubu, 2003).

The state consists of a body of persons that make decisions; ideally the decisions ought to be in the interest of the general populace, which is where "public policy" comes in. It was what

constitutes the body, the procedures and processes by which the policy is formulated that agitated the minds of the political philosophers, whether by the assemblies of the elders (gerontocracy), the committee of the wealthy (plutocracy), the nobles (aristocracy), the experts (technocracy), and the general populace (democracy).

In recent times the modern world appears to have degenerated into a Hobbesian “state of nature” where the citizenry cannot find a reliable place to live and in fact, no secured place for good life. On daily basis, the news is replete with stories of civil wars, plane crashes, road accidents, kidnappings/abductions, and the worst of all, incessant suicide bombings. Consequently, many countries of the world however construed the concept of national security in different perspectives. Nnoli, (2006:1) for example describes such notions and the attendant actions or strategies adopted to actualise national security thus:

...on behalf of its Nazi, Germany sought to exterminate the Jews in the great holocaust of their time. In Rwanda, the Hutu embarked on genocide of Tutsis and moderate Hutus. The Serbs of Yugoslavia pursued a policy of ethnic cleansing of Albanians in Kosovo. The United States assisted reactionary forces in Chile to overthrow the elected socialist government of Salvador Allende. In 1972, thousands of people disappeared in Argentina and Chile. Saddam Hussein of Iraq used poisonous gases and chemicals to kill Iraqi citizens of Kurdish descent, massacred the Shiite population of his country, and used chemicals and biological agents against the Iranians during the Iran-Iraqi war. Stalin wasted thousands of lives in various gulags in the Soviet Union.

These actions were performed by the states in the name of national security of their respective countries. Nigeria as one of the countries of the world is not left out of these security challenges. In practical terms, security seems to be the second largest money-spinner in Nigeria surpassed only by oil and gas. This statement appears striking, especially given that Nigeria is Africa’s most populous country and the world’s seventh largest oil producer (Abrahamsen & Williams, 2005:2).

Although, available statistics and information makes the above claim impossible to be verified completely, there is no doubt that the private security industry has grown rapidly in recent years. Private security personnel are highly visible in the country, protecting businesses, homes and neighbourhoods. The security sector has thus become a major sector of the Nigerian economy as according to the best informed estimates, there are currently between 1500 and 2000 private security companies in Nigeria, employing excess of 100,000 people (Abrahamsen & Williams, 2005:3).

Frynas (2001) opines that several factors account for the size and growth of private security in Nigeria. Despite the country’s enormous wealth the broad economy has declined over the past two decades. While segments of the population have benefited massively from oil wealth, most Nigerians remain poor leading to extreme inequalities and a rise in crime and general insecurity. As a result, wealthy residential and commercial areas are increasingly being transformed into enclaves, and some form of private security is considered essential by the vast majority of households and commercial establishments that can afford it.

A report of the Human Rights Watch states that the situation was exacerbated by the condition and actions of state security organisations as the Nigerian police are often unable to enforce law and order. To a significant extent, the police themselves engage in criminal activities-particularly corruption and extortion and are often feared rather than respected throughout the society. This is particular true of the elite armed forces, the mobile police, whose nickname “kill and go”, gives a clear indication of many people’s continuing perceptions of its tactics, although some observers suggest considerable recent improvement in police community relations (Human Rights Watch 2003).

The Nigerian armed forces are also used extensively for internal security purposes, particularly in the oil-rich Niger-delta. Like the police force, the armed forces command little respect and trust among the public but are widely feared for their coercive capabilities (Gore & Pratten, 2003:27) As a result, of the volatile nature of the polity and the seemingly intractable security condition of the state, the popular view that the institution of security should be privatised to ensure adequate security of life and property of the citizens in the state prevails as many state governments have resorted to private security organisations in the provision of security.

However, the onus of the study therefore is to ascertain the compatibility of the public policy on privatisation of security and the principles of democracy in Nigeria. Tentatively, we aver that the privatisation of security is an aberration and antithetical to democracy as it can drag the Nigerian economy into a Hobbesian state of nature which is more or less a jungle where survival of the fittest reigns supreme.

Conceptual Analysis

Nnoli, (1994:5), views a democratic regime as political system which grants to all its citizens the regular constitutional possibility of replacing the government by peaceful means, if they decide to do so by a sufficient majority, it enables them to avail themselves of non-violent freely established parties and association of their choice, with none debarred, with a view to playing their role and as citizen, and which allows them in practice to enjoy fully all the common accepted civic rights, safeguarded by legal guaranteed written unto a body of law that has higher authority than the government and is submitted in the event of complaints to the judicial organ independent of the government. From this perspective, democracy cannot exist if a public sphere or political society is not recognised.

Gauga, (2003:425), on his part differentiates the principles and mechanisms of democracy to include: government by consent, public accountability, majority rule, recognition of minority right and constitutional government. Also, among the mechanisms are: more than one political party freely competing for political power, political offices not confined to any privilege class, periodic elections based on universal franchise, protection of civil liberty and independence of the judiciary.

In an ideal democratic setting, public policy is cherished because the body of persons that made up the representative government is instituted to make rules that will be in the interest of the general populace. As such, the reason behind this study is to ascertain whether the policy of privatisation of security in Nigeria is in the interest of the general masses, but before we delve into the study proper, it is of paramount importance for us to demystify the concept of public policy for easy comprehension of the whole paper.

As a result, Dror (1973:14), views public policy as a major guideline for action or a general directive for action. As he wrote:

...public policy in most cases, lays down general directives, rather than detailed instruction on the main line of actions to be followed.... it is thus not identical with the game-theory definition of 'strategy' as a detailed set of decisions covering all possible situation; as a general guide for action in contrast to tactics which is closer to what is meant by policy.

Furthermore, a policy has been defined as a purposive course of action followed by an actor or a set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of concern (Anderson, 1975). Dye, (1976), simplified public policy as 'whatever governments choose to do or not to do while according to Jenkins, (1978), policy is a set of interrelated decision by a political actor or group of actors concerning the selection of goals and the means of achieving them within a specific situation where those decisions should, in principle be within the power of those actors to achieve. Moreover, it is regarded as general rules, and regulation guiding practices or actions in a particular activity or problem area (Victor, 1976) In the other words, public policy refers to a pattern of resource allocation represented by projects and programmes designed to respond to perceived public problems or challenges requiring governmental actions for their solution (Abdulsalami, 1998:1). In line with the above views, Ezeani, (2006:290), sees public policy as a proposed course of action which the government intends to implement in response to a given problem or situation confronting it.

In another development, security as a concept in social science disciplines has defied a compromise of definition and as a result, many writers have done much to address the conflicting ideological perspectives bordering the definition of the concept (Eke, 2009:72). In the view of Scurua (1989), security is an ambiguous term which covers a number of things.

In response to the above, Lasswell & Kaplan, (1950), maintains that security is "high value expectancy". They stress the subjective and speculative character of security by using the term 'expectancy'. Their use of the term 'high' while indicating no definite level implies that the security seeker aims at a position in which the continued unmolested enjoyment of his values has considerably more than an even chance of materialising. Therefore, it is a state of mind of several individuals within which a range of physical leaderships rationalise their quest for security and maintain military power in order to be strong and effective in the pursuit of its interest (Trout & Harf, 1982:13).

Green, (1983:3), sees security as a state of relatively predictable environmental condition, which an individual or group of individuals may pursue its needs without deception or harm and without fear of such disturbance. Haftendom, (1991:3), argues that in the literature, "there is no one concept of security" because all definitions of the concept have their root in different historical and philosophical context. This means that security has objective and subjective levels of interpretation. At the objective level, security measures the absence of threat to life, liberty, property and core values, but at the subjective level, security measures the absence of fear, anxiety, tension or apprehension of being in danger of losing life, liberty, property, and core values. As a

corollary to the above, “no matter how much safety there is in the objective terms, unless there is confidence that such safety exist or will exist, there is no security. Even when no safety exists in objective terms, but there is confidence that it exists, then, there is likely to be security at least in short term. In this later case, one may speak of false security. For example, when Idi Amin of Uganda seized power in 1971, the Buganda felt safe because he ousted their enemy, Milton Obote, but it did not take long before Amin turned on them and began to kill and repress them (Nnoli, 2006:16).

More so, it is not a natural attribute but an environmental condition reflecting the society and its institutions. It is also a pervasive phenomenon and a response to a changing society, mirroring not only its social structure but also its economic conditions, its conception of law and perception of crime and its morality (Eke, 2009:56).

Privatisation according to Adam, Almond & Waren (1992:6), is a term used to describe an array of action designed to broaden the scope of private sector activity, or the assimilation by the public sector of efficiency-enhancing techniques generally employed by the private sector. Also, it is the commercialisation of public sector activity, that is, the subjection of micro-economic decision making to market forces (UNDP, 1991). Thatcher, (1993:676), opines that privatisation “is one of the central means of reversing the coercive and corrupting effect of socialism ... and is at the centre of any programme of reclaiming territory for freedom”. Therefore, by reducing state control, privatisation is believed or assumed to increase individual choice or freedom and enhance democracy (Almond, 1991). More so, privatisation includes any initiative that increases the role of market in areas previously considered the province of the state (national or local). This includes not only the sale of state assets, but deregulation and contracting out of public services to private providers (Harvey & Henig, 1997). According to Obikeze & Obi, (2004:267), privatisation is the divestment of government shares in enterprises thereby allowing the ownership, management and control to be in private hands.

In a broader perspective, Ezeani,(2004), states that privatisation is a deliberate policy of the government to stimulate economic growth and efficiency by reducing state interference and broadening the scope of private sector activities through one or all of the following strategies: (1) transfer of state owned assets private-ownership through sale of share, (2) encouraging private sector involvement in public activity, (3) private control or management of state-owned assets and (4) shifting decision making to agents operating in accordance with market condition.

By a way of joining the two terms, we conceptualise ‘privatisation of security’ as ‘the divestment or transfer of the State power of protection of the decisive fundamental right of the citizens to the individual or group member of the society in a given State. The idea seems to have been born out of neglect by the State of her contractual arrangement with the citizens. Also, Branovic, (2011:4), has observed that literature speaks of two different phenomena when it comes to the privatisation of security. In the first place however, it refers to armed non-state actors that might challenge the state by establishing local bounded modes of security which call state legitimacy into question. More so, privatisation of security refers to any private actor that provides security or acts in a way in which the state is usually assumed to act (Chojinacki & Branovic, 2010).

Theoretical framework

Social contract theory of the origin of the state is adopted as the framework of analysis in this study. This theory is tactically chosen because it has the analytical potentialities that provide us with the existential realities of the State. Indeed, it brings to the fore the cagey predicament of men during the state of nature which was ameliorated with the emergence of state. Also, the theory explicated the role of the personified state to the citizens who subscribed to the bond. This responsibility is more or less the provision of those needs that citizens cannot provide for themselves which is decisively security of lives and property. Therefore, the State as an embodiment of rules that govern the activities of individual in the society is ascribed necessary only if it satisfies the primacy and the usefulness of its engagement which is more or less geared towards protection of life and property of the members in the polity.

The proponents of the theory include Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), John Locke (1632-1704), Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), and Nicollo Machiavelli (1469-1527). The central proposition of this theory among others is that the society is threatened by the selfish actions and interests of all members, and to ensure security and protection of life, liberty and wealth or property, members entered into a contract not to inflict harm. Thus, the State and law came into existence as a contract to give vent to this agreement (Osegbue, Nwanolue, & Osegbue 2003:18).

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), wrote that the State should be conceived as a contract between a group of people to guarantee their mutual security and property. He started his thesis from the natural condition of humanity in the state of nature which was thoroughly unpleasant one, and argued that the acquisitive and aggressive activities of men were becoming chaotic and leaving people in fear of death. Hence, he described life in these circumstances as solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short. As a result, the State came into existence as a contract between the individual and the government to arrest the situation and recreate order; the individual gives up some of his liberties in exchange for the protection provided by the state. Thus, the only reason for the existence of the state was to offer security and prosperity (Gaub, 2003)

In another development, John Locke (1632-1704), argues that the State of nature was one of peace, goodwill, mutual assistance and preservation, under this State of Nature; individuals possess natural rights such as right to life, liberty and prosperity. But then, remains the absence of any organisation capable of protecting these rights to stop the society from degenerating into anarchy, thus, the need to secure these rights especially property rights propelled the individuals to enter into the contract of setting up the government or the common wealth (Gaub, 2003). Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), believes that all men were naturally good, insisting that where selfish individuals exist as argued by Hobbes was unnatural and the product of a perverted society. He also, argued that man was neither moral nor viscous, neither happy nor unhappy nor did he own property. Thus, the existential liabilities did not make for the type of vicious picture painted by the contract theorists. However, he sees the State as a social order which protects with the whole common force the person and goods of each member, and in which each, while uniting himself with all, may still obey himself alone and remain free as ever. (Gaub, 2003).

Nicollo Machiavelli (1469-1527), an Italian political philosopher believes that human nature is essentially selfish and this is reflected in its profound aggressive and acquisitive actions which threaten to translate into anarchy unless restrained by the efforts of the people. Hence, the State arises then to fulfil this felt societal need by using its monopoly of and apparatus of force to sustain

society. Axiomatically, the propositions of the theorists on the origin of the State differ in both the approaches and directions but centres on and/or revolve around a point, which is security of life and property of the individuals in the society. In any case, the social contract theory of the origin of the State is sagaciously utilised to form the basis for analyzing and explaining the inseparable link between the State and the security of life and property of the citizenry. It explicitly explained the propelling force that agitates the minds of the theorists to rummage over a way out of the shackles of orchestrated life of insecurity in the “state of nature”. (Gauga, 2003)

This chaotic and anarchic nature of humans which engender nasty, poor, solitary, brutish and short lives in the state of nature necessitated the emergence of the state and its corresponding laws to protect the individuals. In consonance with this, Aristotle, a Greek philosopher stated that “at his best, man is the noblest of all animals; separated from law and justice, he is the worst” This shows the importance of the State and law in our social existence.

Inversely, to think of privatising the security appears to be a kind of degenerating into the uncompromising and anarchic greed of the state of nature. The manifestation of this in Nigeria will be that the bourgeoisies and the political elite in the society will use the opportunity to control the security apparatus of the State to the detriment of the majority poor masses. Also, the capitalist system of production and the attendant inequality do not help matters in the circumstance, while democracy and its cherished principles which include among other propositions the “rule in the interest of majority” will be adversely severed.

By extension, the central state security apparatus such as the military and the police may be drastically reduced to a mere commodity at the beck and call of the bourgeoisie and the political elites who have the wherewithal to attract their services. Essentially, the commoditisation of security institution in the country will go a long way in exposing the poor masses as helpless prey to overbearing quest for primitive intimidation and accumulations by the merchant of loot (corrupt bourgeoisie) in the economy. This scenario will definitely drag the economy of the nation to anarchy.

Democratic Trends and Privatisation of Security in Nigeria:

Essentially, the state has the primary role of security of life and property of the citizens in the society. This security role of the State should not be peripherally or myopically conceived rather it should be substantiated by the fact that it cuts across the whole paraphernalia of the essence of her social existence.

As we had earlier stated democracy implies or connotes government by consent, public accountability, majority rule, recognition of minority right and constitutional government (Gauga, 2003:425). To begin with, government by consent implies “awareness”. Better still; the citizens are parts and parcels of the government which axiomatically is the personification of the state. The justification of this statement is that democracy gives the citizens conditional right to institute their government; the assumption here is that the representatives are the “will” of the people and vice versa. By implication, the pressing and decisive need of the general populace (citizens) is the primary and encompassing concern of the personified State (government). At this point, public accountability becomes imperative and the representatives assume the position of the manager of governmental affairs which essentially necessitates at the end of the day account of the steward.

Ideally, democracy connotes among others, government by the people, but for the fact that human nature does not allow uniformity in reasoning and understanding, the majority vote prevails. This prevalence of the rule does not in any way reduce or subject the minority to inhuman treatment whatsoever nor deprive them of their fundamental human right. In all, the principles, rules and regulations that govern the activities of the individuals in the society are codified in a body of rules known as the constitution. In fact, democracy in the real sense of it, accords the citizens an unfettered sense of belonging in their social, economic and political context of life.

In the other hand, privatisation of security appears to be one of the ideas globalisation apologists which accord individual actors a greater role in the economy. In this scenario, private individuals are allowed to own property and equally control industries in the economy. The contradictions and capitalist tendencies seem to have necessitated the acclaimed need for private security in Nigeria. Essentially if an economy incorporates an inter play of the government and individual in the ownership of means of production, correspondingly, it will equally absorb the idea of private security because the central motive that propel a rational capitalist is profit maximisation. As a result, the, (capitalists) will not ordinarily allow the hard earned capital to be at the surveillance of the seemingly corrupt cum epileptic government security apparatus. Hence, they look for private security which appears to be more serious and effective.

The need and the lucrative nature of security industries appear to have made both the national and international communities to venture into provision of security gadgets thereby enhancing the proliferation of the industry in the world in general and Nigeria in particular. The negative implication of this arrangement is not the major issue but rather the compatibility of and /or not of privatisation of security and the principles of democracy in the political economy of Nigeria. In all, the comparison and proper understanding of the propelling forces behind capitalists and democratic overtures to production setting in an economy seem to serve as a solution. In line with this, Laski, (2008:13) argues that;

“The motives for production in a capitalist society are in contrast with the theoretical end a democracy seeks to serve. In a capitalist society, the motive for production is profit for the owner of the instrument of production. In a democracy, the citizen seeks by the use of his political power, to use the authority of the state to increase the material well-being at his disposal.

From the analysis above, the economic motive of the two concepts are almost parallel but contradictory in nature. They oppose each other and in the long run may create confusion and suffocation for the poor masses who expected to get a chunk of the democratic dividend from the State while the capitalists are interested in silencing the democratic creed in their bid for primitive accumulation of wealth. Consequently, the security apparatus will be monopolised by the private individuals who can afford it, thereby making the poor masses apparent subjects of total insecurity in a place where their fundamental human rights are supposed to be assured.

The table below demonstrates the areas of contradiction between capitalism which is the brain behind privatisation of security and democracy.

Table 1: Contradictions of Democracy and Capitalism

Democracy	Capitalism
Communitarian	Individualistic
Classless society	Classified society
Majority interest	Interest of the few
Benefit for many	Benefit for few by exploitation of many
Optimistic	Pessimistic/Nihilistic

From the table, it is observed that democracy needs the participation of the general populace in decision making over production while in a capitalist economy, the same is individualistic. Also, in a democratic setting, the society is classless unlike the capitalist arena where classes of the haves and the have nots feature. Majority interest is projected in a democratic system as against the interest of the few being protected in the capitalist economy. The policies of the government are beneficial to the public, but in a capitalist enclave, the benefit is for the few through an exploitation of many. Finally, one of the decisive principles of democracy is optimism by believing that through cooperation, things will be better, while capitalism is pessimistic about cooperation believing that competition is the best way to achieve economic turn-around.

Privatisation of Security and Economic Crisis

It is not an understatement to say that it is counterproductive for a nation to be pursuing or embarking on privatisation for the sake of privatisation. Undisputedly, developed nations might adopt it as a matter of policy but the same may not augur well for developing countries whose teeming population are wallowing in abject poverty. Privatisation as an economic policy may prove to be a tremendously effective mechanism for economic growth. It is imperative that other non-market variables like national security (maritime security, in this instance), enforcement and surveillances are considered in evaluating whether a given nation should privatise its public utilities and indeed the extent of such privatisation (Kader, 2013)

The biblical adage that if the salt loses the taste, it is valueless occurs here. Drawing from this, the divestment by the State of its contractual responsibility (security of life and property) is tantamount to what Milliken & Krause (2002), describes as “modern democratic and interventionist states” thus: “those countries lacking the capacity to provide a stable environment and collective goods fall on the scale of modern democratic and interventionist states”. To stress further, Rotberge, in Schneckener, (2004:5-9) proposed a multistage typology of statehood by differentiating between strong, weak, failed and collapsed states, indicating that there is a continuum of failure that can be measured.

To Rotberge, (2004), the main criterion for classification is the performance of states in the supply of political goods. These goods encompass “expectations conceivably obligations, inform the local political culture, and together give content to the social contract between ruler and ruled that is at the core of government and citizenry interactions”. Furthermore, there is a hierarchy of political goods in which the provision of security is a necessary precondition to reach positive effect in the field of authority and welfare (Konrad & Skaperdas, 2005). In other words, collapsed state is therefore, an extreme version of a failed state, characterised by an inability to execute territorial and institutional authority that can lead to the ad hoc provision of political goods by other actors (external public or private). Nevertheless, transferring security risks in Nigeria to private

companies, implies that Nigeria seems to have joined the committee of failing states in the world as classified by Rotberge, (2004). The table below illustrates the failing states in the world:

Table 2: List of Failing States in the World

Afghanistan	Croatia	Nigeria
Albania	Ethiopia	Peru
Algeria	Georgia	Philippines
Angola	Guatemala	Rwanda
Azerbaijan	Guinea-Bissau	Sierra Leone
Bosnia	Iraq	Somalia
Burundi	Cote d' vore	Sudan
Cambodia	Lebanon	Tajikistan
Columbia	Liberia	Uganda
Congo Brazzaville	Mozambique	Yugoslavia(Serbia+ Kosovo)
Congo Kinshasa	Nepal	

Source: culled from Zeljko, (2011:18) Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF).

The table above has many cases, but for brevity and discussion, Albania and Somalia will suffice. Albania for example, experienced an episode of political instability between 1996 and 1997. As a consequence of the collapse of pyramid investment scheme which resulted in the lottery-uprising and a change in government, the capital of Albania and Southern half of the country were engulfed in fighting, looting and rioting. For the years 1996-1997 Albania was coded as a complex of political instability, composed of adverse regime change accompanied by violence and a revolutionary war (Zeljko, 2011:18) In the other hand however, Somalia experienced all types of political instability which was caused by ethnic war, revolutionary war, regime change, genocide and politicide in 1990-1991 (Milliken& Krause, 2002).

Table 3: Region of the world and their number of failing States and the percentage

Region	Number of States	Percentage
Africa	15	47
Americas	3	9
Asia	7	22
Europe	5	16
Middle East	2	6
Total	32	100

Source: adapted from CDAF occasional paper no 24.

From the table, nearly half of the countries are located in Africa, followed by Asia and Europe: the numbers for latter are mostly due to the collapse of Yugoslavia and related emergent new sovereign states such as Croatia and Bosnia.

Privatisation of Security and Nigerian Nascent Democracy

Obviously, an all round security is one of the fundamental and decisive economic needs of man. As noted earlier, it involves food security, life and property. In line with this, Ake, (1981:1), maintained thus:

...to begin with, economic need is man's most fundamental need. Unless man is able to meet this need he cannot exist in the first place. Man must eat before he can do anything else-before he worships, pursue culture or become an economist. When an individual achieves a level of economic well-being, such that he can take the basic economic necessities, particularly his daily food for granted, the urgency of economic need loses its edge. Nevertheless, the primacy remains, the fact that one is not constantly preoccupied with, and motivated by, economic needs, shows that the needs are being met; it does not show that they are not primary importance.

In order to ensure adequate security of the basic needs of man, they enter into an agreement; and as a result, "state" emerged. Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), has however, described this state as "Leviathan" a body that all individuals in the society will submit their right and power of protection to, so as to protect all and sundry in all domains of activities. Therefore, social contract theorists explore more of the theory of the origin of the State.

Inversely, the privatisation of the contractual role and the essence of the State is an aberration and are equally contradictory to the principles of democracy which appears for now to be the best political practice in the modern world. This finding is conceived from a careful comparison of the economic interest of democracy and capitalism. Also, the privatisation of security which accompanies the capitalist mode of production which was projected by the globalists as cure-it-all medication appears wanting in Nigerian economic system because of her level of socio-economic development. In consonance with this, Anugwom, (2011:5), opines that:

...the proponents of privatisation theory often argue that such developed nations as United States, Britain and most other countries in Europe have a large section of their economy in private hands. While this may be so, the fact remains that these economies are developed and the citizens have economic buoyancy to play in privatisation league unlike Nigeria where the economy is still developing and poverty is widespread. In this state of things however, the question of what to privatise, how, when and to whom becomes a problem.

From the above views, privatisation of security in Nigeria evidently portrays her as one of the failing states of the world and this scenario will uncompromisingly drag her socio-economic system back to "state of nature" where survival of the fittest becomes a creed. As a result, when security of lives and property are commoditised, it shall be at the beck and call of the economic bourgeoisies who have all it takes to command its services, thereby exposing the poor masses to security challenges.

Conclusion

Having discussed the phenomenon of public policy on privatisation of security in Nigeria and its compatibility with the principles of democracy, we observe among other things that the privatisation of security is in contrast with the principles of democracy and that it may not engender economic growth. In the course of the study, we discovered also that the privatisation of security must bring about socio-economic crises, which will stem from the convergence of the security apparatus of the state in the hands of a few bourgeoisies who command the wherewithal to do so. Essentially, the manifestation of this is in line with the aphorism which maintained that 'he who pays the piper dictates the tune'. By extension, it will be a paradox of security for insecurity whereby the acclaimed security of the haves appears to be insecurity to the lives and properties of

the have-nots. Against this backdrop, we suggest some principles that will help to avert the impending anomaly under the recommendations.

Recommendations

The policy makers should recall the fundamental reasons for emergence of the state which is security of life and property of the individuals in the society. Essentially, for the state to carry out this assigned role, it has to effectively reorganise its security institutions. This does not imply mere fortification but, rather the practical efforts of general overhaul of the security system.

The government should recruit more of educated citizens into the police and army who should undergo rigorous training so as to equip them properly. The training should be channelled towards general knowledge of the security needs of the state and how to realise them.

The remuneration of the forces should be made attractive and equally commensurate as it will to help reduce corrupt practices. In the other way round, in as much as we advocate for the general control of security apparatus by the State, we still suggest an inter play of private security companies and the State. To achieve this, the security agencies should device clear and stringent rules and regulations that will govern the existence and operations of selected private security agencies.

The police should endeavour to be friendly with the law-abiding citizens. This will go a long way in upholding the maxim that stated that 'police is your friend' This can be achieved when the police stop their unnecessary molestation and intimidation of people who did not commit anything just to extort some money from them because they (police) are armed with authority.

Finally, the citizens should also contribute their quota to the security efforts of the government by being security conscious as well as reporting any element of criminal activity to the nearest security post. This combination of security efforts will enormously make caricature of the privatisation plan of the security sector in our fledgling democracy.

References

- Abraham, R. & Williams, M. (2005). "Globalisation of Private Security", *Country Report Nigeria, January. Pp1-18.*
- Adams, Etal (1992). "Government and Competitive Free Enterprises" in A. Warren (ed) *Fundamentals of the Economic Role of Government.* New York: Greenwood Press.
- Ake, C. (1981). *A Political Economy of Africa,* Lagos: Longman Nigeria Plc.
- Anugwom, E. (2011). "From Babangida to Obasanjo: The State, Rent-Seeking Behaviour and the Realities of Privatisation in Nigeria," *International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology,* vol. 3 (7) pp.32-42.
- Chojinacki, S. & Branovic, Z. (2010). "New Modes of Security. The Violent Making of and Unmaking of Governance in War-Torn Areas of Limited Statehood" in R. Thomas & L. Ursula (eds), *Governance without a State? Policies and Politics in Areas of Limited Statehood.* New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dror, E. (1973). *Public Policy Making Re-examined,* London: Macmillan.
- Dye, V. (1976). *Understanding Public Policy.* Englewood Cliff, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

- Eke, O. (2009). "Political Economy of Community Policing under Nigerian's Security Dilemma" *Journal of International Politics and Development Studies*, Vol. 5 Nos. 1&2.
- Ezeani, O. (2004). "Privatisation of Labour in Africa" *African Journal of Politics and Administrative Studies*, Vol. 1 no.1.
- Ezeani, O. (2006). *Fundamentals of Public Administration*, Enugu: Snaap Press Ltd.
- Frynas, J. (2001). "Corporate and State Responses to Anti-Oil Protest in Niger Delta" *Journal of African Affairs*, 100 (398), pp.27-54.
- Gore, G. & Pratten, D. (2003). "The Politics of Plunder; the Rhetoric of Order and Disorder in Southern Nigeria", *Journal of African Affairs*, 102 (407) pp. 211-240.
- Green, G. (1981). *Introduction to Security*. (3rd ed). Boston: Butterworth Publishers Inc.
- Gauba, O. (2003). *An Introduction to Political Theory*, New Delhi: Macmillan India Pvt Ltd.
- Haftendorn, H. (1991). "The Security Puzzle: Theory Building and Discipline Building in International Security". *International Studies Quarterly*, vol 5th March.
- Human Rights Watch (1999). *The Price of Oil-Corporate Responsibility and Human Rights Violations in Nigeria oil-producing communities*, New York: United Nations.
- Jenkins, K. (1978). *Policy Analysis: A Political and Organisation Perspective*, USA: Martin Robertson.
- Konrad, K. & Skaperdas, S. (2005). "The Market for Protection and Origin of the State", CES-IFO working paper 16
- Laski, H. (2008). *A Grammar of Politics*, New Delhi: Surjeep Publications.
- Milliken, J. & Krause, K. (2002). "State Failure, State Collapse, and State Reconstruction: Concepts, Lessons and Strategies", *Development and Change*, 33(5): 753-774.
- Nnoli, O. (2006). *National Security in Africa: A Radical Perspective*, Enugu: PECREP Book.
- Obi, E.A & Oddih, M. (2006), "Democracy and Political Participation in Nigeria 1999-2006", *ANSU Journal of Politics and Administration*, Vol. 1 no.1pp21-35.
- Obikeze, O.S.A & Obi, E. A. (2004). *Public Administration in Nigeria: A Developmental Approach*, Onitsha: Book point ltd.
- Osegbue, C, Et al (2003). *Politics: An Introductory Text*, Onitsha: Bookpoint Ltd.
- Rockley, L. & Hill, D. (1981). *Security: Its Management and Control*, London: Business Books Ltd.
- Rotberg, R. (2004). *When States Fail, Causes and Consequences*, Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press
- Schneckener, U. (2004). *States at Risk, Fragile Staatenals Sicherheits Problem*, Berlin: SWP Studies, 43
- Scurua, G. (1989). *Peace for Indian and Pacific Oceans*, New Delhi: Allied Publishers Ltd.
- Thatcher, M. (1993). *The Down Street Years*, New York: Harper Collins
- Trout, B. & Harf, J. (1982). *National Security Affairs: Theoretical Perspectives and Contemporary Issues*, New Brunswick, USA: Transaction Books.
- United Nations Development Programme (1998). *Human Development Report*, Lagos: Nigeria.
- Zeljiko, B. (2011). *Privatisation of Security in Failing States: A Quantitative Assessment. (DCAF)*.