Global World System, Crime Transformation and the Travails of National Security: The Nigerian Experience

Osmond Agbor Otora
University of Calabar

Abstract

This paper explore how globalization enables the transformation of crimes by examining the direct ways in which the economic, technological and cultural variants of globalization and how armed groups have exploited the impact of globalization to undermine national security in Nigeria. It argues that while the international relations among nation-states is very strong, the world is not peaceful. In the wake of globalization and the explosion in communication technologies, new security related threats have emerged that transcend national boundaries. As a result, a new kind of war is being fought globally; this is because the primary threats to national security have changed fundamentally. Threats to national security no longer spring from territorial and ideological disputes between nation-states but from how far criminal networks have exploited opportunities offered by globalization to challenge nation-states sovereignty. By way of conclusion, the paper submits that the demise of the state is not a key component of the new paradigm despite argument to the contrary from the proponents of globalization. Rather two key aspects of the new threats are the uneven erosion of state sovereignty and the emergence of terrorist groups not only as significant global actors but major strategic threat to national security.

Introduction

A lively debate exists among scholars over the impact of economic interdependence on conflict and war. Liberals have traced the ways in which rising economic linkages create national interests and political constituencies that favor stable and peaceful relations; whereas realists have noted that statesmen often ignore considerations of economic gain and loss in decisions about war and peace. Such debates have cast a critical eye on the expansive claims of "globalization theorists" who argue that the decline of super power

hegemony and the rise of non-traditional security challenges such as terrorism, drug trafficking, and the environment are eroding the traditional national security orientation of nation-states.

Nigeria's national security faces a serious challenge and sometimes suggesting internal division which is fatal to the survival of the Nigerian state. With the growing complexities of ethno-religious expressions, Nigeria's national security is in serious dilemma and the security concern is heightened as the magnitudes of these manifestations had been overwhelming and continues to challenge the stability of the Nigerian state.

In Nigeria today, conflict seem persistent and intractable, moreover after decades of complacency, we seem to be finally grasping the fact that we are fighting for survival under the shadow of catastrophic dangers. Hence, discussions on Nigerian national security concept have evolved rapidly because the security environment in which we live is dynamic and uncertain; replete with diverse threats and challenges which are trans-national in nature with the potential to grow more deadly (Pandya and Laipon, 2008:39).

Emerging scenario of these trans-national threats which are irrespective of national borders comprises different risk factors that seem unending spanning from different transnational crimes such as terrorism, human and drug trafficking, money laundering etc, to widespread environmental degradation, diseases, climate change and even political policies of national sovereignties (Brainard and Halon, 2004). These risk factors continue to challenge the concept of national security which now pertains to people rather than territories on one hand and socio-economic development rather than military industrial complex on the other hand. To that extent, the notion of national security captures not only the traditional approach to security but human security as well.

As Tom Imobighe writes, national security is now perceived as total security – security of life and property, security of the economy and the economic resource areas of the country, security of food and raw materials resources, general health of the people, environment and national integrity, and preservation of all that society considers to be important and valuable within its borders and beyond (Imobighe 2000). Thus, with the advent of globalization and advances in communication technology, it has led to the dissolution of national borders which has further the increased vulnerability of nation-states to these threats and endangered their national security.

To that extent, this study would beam its searchlight on the Nigeria – Niger – Chad - Cameroon border, which is located in the northeast of Nigeria, and particularly notorious for all sorts of illegal trans-border activities including terrorism and insurgency. Since 2009, the border area has been under the threat of the Boko Haram insurgents who have not only grown in size and number but seem to have become better equipped and trained; more sophisticated and the scope of their brutality has become not only worrisome but overwhelming.

Theoretical Framework

In an attempt to explain the organizational structure of a terrorist and armed groups group such as Boko Haram, this study anchors o the Instrumentality theory of violence which adequately captures and explains the whole scale of explanatory variables and the dynamics that inform the reasons why terrorists operate and their methodology of operation. The Instrumental Theory of terrorism is thus associated with Crenshaw (1985); Betts (1982) and Mickolus (1976). The theory assumes that "the act of terrorism is a deliberate choice by a political actor and that the organization as a unit, acts to achieve collective values, which may engage radical changes in the political and social conditions (Crenshaw, 1985:13). Within this context, terrorism is meant to produce a change in the political status quo, not the destruction of military potential. Crenshaw further submits that non-state organizations using terrorist tactics are assumed to act on the basis and calculation of the benefit or value derivable from such an action; including the cost of the attempt and its failure as well as the consequences or the probability of success.

For Betts (1982), terrorists or insurgents actions may occur for several reasons. The value sought for is overwhelmingly important; costs of trying are low; the status quo is intolerable; or the probability of succeeding is high. Thus, they act in anticipation of rewards or out of desperation in response to an opportunity to threaten. This strategic perspective, according to Betts (1982), is a conceptual framework for the analysis of surprise attacks. Thus, Betts concludes that terrorism is an excellent strategy of surprise, necessary for small groups who must thereby compensate for weakness in numbers and destructive capability.

Arising from the above, it is evident that Nigeria is agog with security challenges. The Boko Haram Islamic sect believes that political leadership in northern Nigeria (particularly in the northeast region) has been dominated by a group of corrupt, false Muslims and the only way to seeks redress is to wage a war against them, and the Nigerian state generally, to create a "pure" Islamic state ruled by Sharia law. To achieve their aim, the Boko Haram sect have since 2009, planted bombs almost weekly in public places such as police stations, churches, shopping malls, motor parks, etc, in northeast region in particular and northern Nigeria in general, to instill fear in the mind of Nigerians. The group has also broadened its targets to include setting fire to schools in Maiduguri during the night, and as many as 10,000 pupils were forced out of education (Walker, 2012).

Conceptual Clarification

One of the paradoxes of the contemporary global system is the issue of security. In spite of the avalanche of insecurity, globalization thesis presupposes that nations -state's borders must remain open to movement of people, goods and services. But, at the same time, openness without credible control makes it possible for emerging threats of transnational crimes including terrorism, drug

trafficking, insurgency, etc, to thrive. As the threats multiply and proliferate, they in turn generate greater pressure on the state to adopt more aggressive measures to protect the lives and property of its citizens.

However, the contested concept of security defiles a universal consensus among scholars and analysts in international relations. Eselebor (2008) submits that, to safeguard the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, the object of security of the nation-state must remain paramount. Goldstein (1999) view national security as closely connected to the preservation of the borders of a state, to maintain sovereignty within its territory. Thus, the power to maintain sovereignty as assumed does not preclude military approaches nor does it detract from environmental, human or security parameters. The International Crime Assessment of the security climate of most African States including Nigeria reveal critical stages described as weak structures or institutions unlikely to meet its goals: porous borders, ample routes for smuggling drugs, weapons and other contrabands (International Crime Assessment 2000:34). At the moment, Nigeria is awash with sophisticated arms and ammunitions and other weapons of mass destruction in the hands of criminals and terrorists. Interestingly, majority of these illicit arms used in threatening the peace and security of the Nigerian States found their way into the country through the borders, be it land, air or sea; enabled by the forces of globalization the masks goods and services and transport them across national borders.

Historically, the concept of security has been categorized into two. These are the traditional and non-traditionalist conception. The traditionalist view favours the Cold War conception of security defined in military and state-centric approaches; while, the non-traditionalist approach have attempted to broaden the meaning of security to include such issues as socio-economic, environmental, feminist, and other threats. Their emphasis is on what could possibly endanger the survival of the citizens as well as the state.

The traditional approach to security can be viewed from the realist construct of security in which the referent object of security is the state. The dominance of this thought reached a frightening and feverish pitch during the Cold War, when states believed in the concept of balance of power among contending states in the East-West divide (Eselebor 2008: 4); driven by thinking based on bipolar politics, domination and hegemony. Emphasis was placed on defence against the real and imagined intentions of states to dominate one another and against the subversive activities of elements within national borders. In this framework, Okechukwu Ibeanu argues that defence and national security were privileged over everything else. The duties of nationals to the state were privileged over the responsibilities of the state to nationals. Ibeanu further postulate that assessment of external and internal threats and capabilities became the central concern of policy and security was defined in the narrow, militarist terms of the ability of the armed forces (Ibeanu 2008:4).

In other words, there have been two fundamental implications of Cold War security thinking in many third world countries as well as other regions of the world. First, national security is oftentimes confused with the security of those in power or the ruling class and the armed forces are used to suppress those who are perceived to opposed and threaten their power. Thus, it has been argued that the priority purpose of the armed forces "is the use of coercive forces to protect elected and legitimate regimes against opposition forces within the nation-state" (William nd: 6). In this sense, the misused ideology often created a situation in which the pursuit of national security became a major source of insecurity for citizens. Second, by elevating the military dimension of security, the pursuit of national security elevated the military into a position in which it became the dominant arm of the state (Ibeanu 2008: 5).

 In many cases, however, the military perceive itself to be a constitutive element of the state under the direction of the civilian government, but as external to it, an arbiter in political struggles. In this sense, states were deemed to be rational entities driven by the desire for absolute power which manifested its ugly consequences by the scramble for territories, spheres of influence and other clandestine activities least beneficial to mankind.

Stephen Walt, one of the leading exponents of the realist fame argues that security could be seen as the study of the threat, use and control of military force. It explores the conditions that make the use of force more likely, the ways that the use of force affects individual, states and societies, and the specific policies that states adopt in order to prepare for, prevent and engage in war (Walt 1991: 212). It is assumed that the greatest hindrances to national security are external components of threats. But in Nigeria for example, the problems have been from within as most conflicts are intra-state.

Responding to the challenges of intra-state conflicts, Mohammed Ayoob strongly believes that, intra-state conflicts arise as a result of political institutional underdevelopment. In his postulation, security or insecurity is seen in relation to vulnerabilities, both internal and external, that threaten to, or have the potential to bring down or significantly weaken state structures, both territorial and institutional, and even regimes (Ayoob 1997: 130). Ayoob contends that a problem must be sufficiently politicized to have the potential to threaten the survival of the state, its boundaries, political institutions or governing regimes. For him, the politicization of crude oil (and by extension the Boko Haram) in Nigeria has sufficiently threatened the corporate existence of the Nigerian state. But as Raymond Ausbrac's declaration reminds us, terrorism or insurgency occurs in a political context. The label of terrorism or insurgency immediately qualifies the actions and actors to whom it is applied.

In other words, the choice to call a political actor a 'terrorist' or a political act 'terrorism' often has a "prescriptive policy relevance as well as moral connotation" (Reveron and Murer 2009: 313). By evoking such labels as 'terrorists' or 'insurgents' it should be noted that such an ideology seeks to

combine both descriptive and symbolic elements, creating a kind of shorthand for evil. Reveron and Murer conclude that such label implies a preferred policy solution, one which often precludes negotiation. Therefore, if terrorists or insurgents "cannot be negotiated with or their presence cannot be tolerated, the label rules certain political elements to be outside the bounds of political discourse. The state may therefore, claim the right to eliminate such political elements because of the threat they pose to stability of the state" (Reveron and Murer 2009).

However, the non-traditional or human security approach is an emerging concept and it is aligned to modern thought about global security, with emphasis on human safety and survival. It is antagonistic to the traditional conception of security, though not discarding everything about traditionalist security perspective, but offers better alternatives in the post-Cold War era. In the aftermath of the Cold War, there have been far reaching conceptual changes in security discourse. Thus, the period has spawned changes about security thinking which emphasizes not national security but the security of nationals, not duties of citizens to the state, but the responsibilities of the state to citizens.

  In its postulations, the concept emphasizes that the referent objects should be the individual, where the integrity of mankind is upheld. In other words, the concern is not just about securing state boundaries and people in power, but about human security and the responsibility of both the state and the international community to protect people. (Ibeanu 2008: 5). Its main targets are diseases, poverty, natural disasters, violence, conflicts and landmines, rehabilitation of war victims, gender and human rights issues (Eselebor 2008: 6). These factors are classified as life threatening issues that effectively constitute security challenges to nation-states' globally and Nigeria in particular. Environmental degradation, struggle for control of scarce resources, bad governance and even energy appears to be a major push factor resulting in insecurities. Consequently, focus is placed not on threats and capabilities of nation-states, but on vulnerabilities of citizens and opportunities for overcoming those vulnerabilities.

Within this framework, Michel Klare and Daniel Thomas have contended that security needs to be expanded due to the declining significance of geographical boundaries. State actors are perceived as being unable to respond to global security problems. They conceived a security regime that would tackle security issues like money laundering, oil theft, illegal diamond trade, identity fraud, human trafficking, terrorism, conflicts and refugee issues among others. For them, global security is:

> distinguished by the believe that security involves more than protection against military attack … ecological, economic and demographic trends which pose serious challenges to developed countries… and even in the less-developed "South" where the threat

of armed attack remains constant, non-military trends pose equal or greater threats to people's security (Klare and Thomas 1994: 3).

Klare and Thomas view global security as closely related to human needs. Thus, the inclusion of global problems as human rights abuse, economic crisis and ecological threats are unique and both state and non-state actors are motivated to respond collectively to such emerging threats.

Ken Booth further lends credence to the human security conception and advocated the emancipation dimension in his argument:

> Emancipation means freeing people from those constraints that stop them from carrying out what freely they would choose to do, of which war, poverty, oppression and poor education are a few. Security and emancipation are in fact two sides of the same coin. It is emancipation, power and order, both in theory and practice that lead to stable security (Booth 1991: 593).

In other words, security in whatever form is a standard measurement of the viability of any state or nation. A state of insecurity means 'red alert' and that a risk factor has been identified, which must be contained. This is because, in the status of international law, every nation-state has the right to protect its territorial space and secure its citizens from any imminent attack… (Eselebor 2008: 8). Apart from military dimensions to security, security can be understood as a public policy of maintaining integrity and survival of the nation-state through the use of other means like economic, political, technology, religious, or the exercise of other diplomatic means either in times of war or peace.

The new thinking about global security and the associated challenges gained further prominence with Robert McNamara, who also postulated that:

> a nation that seeks to achieve adequate military security against the background of acute food shortages, population explosion, low level of per capita income, low technological development, inadequate and insufficient public utilities and chronic problems of unemployment has a false sense of security" (McNamara1968: 46).

In fact, Nigeria at the moment is not divorced from the above truth as posited by McNamara who was absolutely right in indicating that the survival of any nation-state cannot be primarily restricted to its military preparedness, but also in developing relative patterns of stable socio-economic and political growth. This position was strongly corroborated by Robin Luckham in his assessment of national security when he submitted that "it is not just the physical survival of the citizens and their state which is the issue, but also the satisfaction of needs of food, health, clothing, education and shelter among others" (Ate 1992: 257).

Okechukwu Ibeanu further asserts that the post-Cold War security thinking has led nation-states to look beyond their borders not in search of enemies who threaten, but for allies who co-operate. However, the sanctity of national boundaries are being challenged in the surge of transnational social, economic

and political forces, and narrow national thinking is giving way to broader regional approach. Internally, thus, citizens' vulnerabilities to both social and political forces have become the focus of policy (Ibeanu 2008: 5). Thus, issues of poverty, environmental protection, equity, freedom of the press and citizens' rights are being elevated over military issues. In addition, political opposition is increasingly seen not as a threat to the nation, but as genuine demands of the masses.

In other words, Section 9 (214) and (217) of the 1999 constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria provides for the establishment and maintenance of an army, navy, air force and other security agencies that are necessary for the purpose of:

Defending Nigeria from external aggression; maintaining territorial integrity and securing its borders from violation on land, sea and air; suppressing insurrection and acting in aid of civil authorities to restore order when called upon to do so; performing such other functions as may be prescribed (such as undertaking relief or welfare duties in such cases as national disasters, peace keeping etc) (Eselebor 2008: 12).

These are clearly national security objectives and the means to which these goals are attained can only be feasible if the strategic policies are right and dynamic. However, apart from military dimensions to security, national security can be explained to mean a public policy of maintaining integrity and survival of the nation-state through the use of other means like economic, religious, political, technology or the exercise of other diplomatic initiatives either in times of war or peace (Eselebor 2008). This conception informed Nwolise (1985) to explain that:

> A country may have the best armed forces in terms of training and equipment, the most efficient police force, the most efficient custom men, the most active secret service agents and best quality prisons, but yet be the most insecure nation in the world as a result of defence and security problem with bad governments, alienated and suffering masses, ignorance, hunger, unemployment or even activities of foreign residents and companies which are inimical to the stability of the country.

Nwolise's argument can be strongly buttressed by the fact that since 2009, the northeast border area of Nigeria-Niger-Chad-Cameroon has been fraught with the Boko Haram insurgency. The Boko Haram insurgents have not only grown in size and number but seemed to have become better equipped and trained, more sophisticated and the scope of their brutality has become not only worrisome and overwhelming but a major threat to National security. Yusuf Alli authoritatively submits that, their escapades in the northeast region of Nigeria have reached as far as Kayamla from the south of Maiduguri; Dikwa and Mafa from the east, and have destroyed almost all the island settlements at Lake Chad

and the commercial fishing towns of Baga, Doro, Kingara, Duguri, Daban Masara, etc (Alli 2014: 2).

On the southeastern front of Maiduguri, towards the border with the Republic of Cameroon, border towns of Konduga, Bama and international cattle market at Bankyi, socio-economic life in the area is completely destroyed, with no hope of recovery in the shortest possible time. The commercial towns of Damboa and Biu in the south of Maiduguri are not left out of the carnage of insurgency. Damboa, for instance, has been declared a caliphate by Boko Haram.

Globalization and its Dimension

Globalization has been conceptualized as an imprecise term. This is because from the pool of available literature, there seem to be little or no agreement on what is globalization beyond the indistinguishable theme of interconnectedness; a nexus between the global and the domestic, and an equally vague sense of change. Querine Hanlon simply defined globalization as a "sum of techniques" containerized shipping, satellite communications, and networked connectivity or put differently, as a process, a transformation, or even a revolution (Hanlon 2009: 125). However, in spite of the fact that the impact of globalization has not been uniformly felt, it has brought about greater independence and propels isolated peoples and regions into modernity with all its attendant benefits. Yet the dark side of globalization is its power to obliterate traditional cultures, weaken states' sovereignty and further widen the gap between the 'rich and the poor.' According to conventional wisdom, globalization is about breaking down national borders. Indeed, it is often argued that growing economic integration and interdependence lead to more open borders and more harmonious cross-border relations (Hanlon 2009). It is useful to distinguish some variants of globalization at this juncture.

The most over bearing aspect of globalization is economic globalization which its impact is widely acknowledged. Economic globalization encompasses large and rapid change in trade flows, investment, financial capital and labour all of which have contributed to create an integrated global economy. In macroeconomic theory according to Kieth Griffin, greater economic integration suggests a 'positive sum-game' where everybody benefits from greater efficiency in resource allocation, rising income and improved income distribution. Contrariwise, Griffin wondered why greater interpenetration of global economic markets has not resulted in a uniform spread of costs and benefits. Whereas, strong and industrialized states have seen their economies grow and their global market share increasing; weaker and unindustrialized states (especially the Third World countries) have not recorded any significant success (Griffin 2004: 790). Rather the result is the constant widening gap between the rich and poor states, a disparity that further undermines the

sovereignty, security and legitimacy of those states on the periphery of the globalised world (Hanlon 2009).

Technological globalization is the second variant which arises from the fundamental changes in communications wrought by the technology that brought the world the internet, open and free access to knowledge and information as well as instant communication. Armed groups have exploited these technologies to broadcast their massages across the globe to recruit, mobilize and to conduct and control covert operations (Hanlon 2009). The technologies of globalization have transformed armed groups, insurgents, terrorists and criminal syndicates into a formidable force whose activities are hard to trace and even harder to combat in terms of the security threats they generate.

The third variant is cultural globalization, often described as being synonymous with 'Americanization' or 'modernization,' the source of a new unbridled imperialism that had destroyed traditional societies and their way of life. In other words, the most extreme version of this argument sees globalization as a cultural raid aimed at global homogenization (Najjar 2005: 92). Through individually accessible networked communications such as personal computers, DVDs, cell-phones as well as movies, radio and television, cultural globalizations encompasses the transmission of other peoples cultures (Hanlon 2009: 126). Cultural globalization has made populations around the world to be profoundly aware and think of just how badly they live, especially when they cannot express themselves in the same way they watch others on television screens and other social media.

Finally, there is political globalization which broadly defines the impact of the above three variants on the state. Hanlon (2009) postulates, that this variant of globalization suffers the most from a lack of definitional clarity. The extreme case of political globalization is seen as a force that would ultimately destroy the state.

Globalization and the Transformation of Crime across Borders

Globalization has enabled the transformation of armed groups broadly defined to include terrorist, insurgents, militias, and criminal organizations, from regional challenges to a major strategic security threat. Globalization has heightened their organizational effectiveness, lethality and their operational ability on a truly worldwide scale (Hanlon 2009:124). Although the knowledge of the phenomenon of armed groups is not new, what is new is their ability to exploit the opportunities inherent in a globalized world.

The transformation of these armed groups is a key aspect of a newly emerging national security paradigm in the post-cold war security system. Connected by the instantaneous and virtually untraceable communications technologies of the modern age, armed groups find sanctuaries in the weak and

ungoverned spaces between states, while directing operations at the heart of the nation-state (Hanlon 2009).

Globalization, have important security implications. Most dangerously, a variety of threats have become global in scope and more serious in their effects as a result of the spread of knowledge, the dispersion of advanced technologies, and the movements of people. These same developments, combined with expanding global economic interactions, contribute to some of the problems and resentments that lie at the root of these security threats. But paradoxically, many of those same aspects of globalization offer new opportunities to achieve economic growth and democracy, thereby ameliorating the threats as well as some of their underlying causes.

The dangers were clearly manifested in the September 11th 2001 terrorist attack on the World Trade Centre (WTC) in New York City, which showed how the Al Qaeda organization was able to effectively exploit new communications technologies, global financial networks, and the ease of movements of people (Hanlon 2009). The response by the international community has also benefited from some of globalization's effects, primarily in technological advances in communications and in military weaponry. At the same time, it is too soon to say definitively, the result of these attacks may be to dampen some of the globalizing trends, as financial interactions receive greater scrutiny and security checks to limit the mobility of people.

In other words, the sheer volume, speed and geographic spread of the impact of globalization confer a degree of anonymity on those who participate. Querine Hanlon poignantly indicates that armed groups have effectively exploited this anonymity in three different ways. First, the sheer size of the global economy enables armed groups to mask their trade of legal and illegal goods, to move people and to evade detection. Second, the ability to communicate and operate anonymously over vast distances enables them to create linkages with other criminal groups having disparate ideologies, objectives, memberships and, operational structures. Finally, the heightened connectivity of the globalised world has enabled armed groups to transmit information and recruit on a transnational scale, masking their authorship and intensions amid the clatter of legitimate global interaction (Hanlon 2009:124).

Globalization has therefore compressed time and space as the technology of global transport now links the vast reaches in record time. Tracing the transportation of illegal goods requires highly sophisticated means of detection and highly reliable and anticipatory intelligence, both of which are frequently beyond the capacities of states security agencies in areas where armed groups operates. The degree and rapidity of worldwide transit further compound the detection and intelligence capacities of security agencies.

Armed groups have also exploited the sheer volume of trade and the compression of time and space to evade detection. Criminal organizations have benefited from the anonymity of the global market to move drugs and other

illegal cargo. For instance, terrorists, insurgents and militia groups can procure the necessary arms including large amount of weapons, and export their illicit goods, masking their shipments in the midst of the vast trade in legal goods (Hanlon 2009).

John Aquilla et al (2006) have argued authoritatively that the anonymity of globalization has created 'marriages of inconvenience' among groups with vastly different ideological and political goals. The result has been a shift away from "stand alone" to "transnationally interconnected groups" or what Hammes (2007) described as "mixed groups." Globalization, along with the rise of illicit global economy has also provided funding opportunities for non-state actors and other terrorist groups generally.

Querine Hanlon has corroborated these views and submitted that Hezbollah has forged alliances with criminal organizations to move drugs and provide transshipment protection in return for financial gains. For example, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Columbia (FARC) and the National Liberation Army (NLA) have forged partnerships with major drug organizations, protecting the coca cultivation, processing and shipment in areas they control (Hanlon 2009:127). However, the growing network of connected armed groups coordinate these activities and forge profitable relationships to procure goods and resources such as arms and ammunitions and expand their global reaches. Hanlon added that such linkages further conceal the origins and purposes of their activities and multiply exponentially the task of those charged with the responsibility to monitor and track them.

One of the major fallouts of the escalation of insurgency is global security crisis. In most cases, armed groups have metamorphosed into terrorist organizations resulting to violence and criminality as a means of influencing public policy. Williams (2008) has described them as Violent Non-State Actors (VNSAs) and as at 2006, the United States Directorate of National Intelligence listed about 387 of such groups around the world (Negroponte, 2006). According to Williams (2008), an important factor in the understanding of the rise of Violent Non-State Actors (VNSAs) including religious extremism, since the events of September 11, 2001, is globalization. Williams submits that not only has globalization challenged individual state's capacity to manage economic affairs, it has also provided facilitators and force multipliers for VNSAs. For William, global flow of arms, for example is no longer under the exclusive control of nation-states. Illicit arm dealers have become transnational players and have contributed to a diffusion of military power that has provided VNSAs with weapon capabilities that allow them to challenge government forces. In a similar vein, globalization has allowed Violent Non-State Actors to develop transnational social capital and to create alliance and generate support outside their immediate area of operations. Flowing from Williams (2008)' argument, it becomes obvious how globalization has aided the funding and coordination of Islamist fundamentalist and terrorist groups around the world.

In Nigeria for instance, Boko Haram has links with other Islamic groups within and outside Africa. Its activities and operations are coordinated from Mali with funding and training from a number of sources including a United Kingdom-based Al-Muntada Trust Fund while its membership has spread to other West African countries such as Benin, Niger, Mauritania and up to Cameroun and Chad which also provide sanctuary for the group members (The Nigerian Tribune 2012; Okpaga, Ugwu and Eme 2012). This has been made easy by the process of globalization.

Finally, the anonymity inherent in global connectivity has enabled armed groups to transmit information freely. This is because globalization has fuelled the expansion of chaotic connectivity with few institutional frameworks or standards to provide structure in the cyberspace (Cronin 2006). It is in this sense that while globalization facilitates global terrorism, terrorism itself is putting a break on globalization. "Global terrorism depends on the success of globalization. In fact one may well conceive of global terrorism as a facet of the global culture resulting from globalization" (Khan 2001); a dialectical unity of opposing forces. For this reason, Cronin contends that analyzing terrorism as something separate from globalization is misleading and potentially dangerous. Indeed, he maintains that globalization and terrorism are intricately intertwined forces characterizing international security in the 21st century.

Policy Recommendation

Some scholars and policy analysts have attributed insurgency and its attendant insecurity to abject poverty and lack of education. They argue that poverty not only causes extremism but that it also plays havoc in other scenarios such as the gruesome political and ethnic violence that are witnessed around the world on regular basis (Saeed et al 2012). Consequently, global agreements must be reached among states and their governments for cooperation in various areas in order to provide mass and qualitative education for their citizens, bridge socio-economic inequalities which in most cases result in aggressive behaviours among the less privileged and curtail international crime and terrorism and reduce global insecurity.

Globalization has provided enabling environment for free movements of persons and information through internet super highways and other means. This has resulted in events in one part of the world having effects on what happens in other parts. Also, global agreements must be mobilized among national governments for cooperation and collaboration in the areas of security, joint-border patrol, strengthening of common or integrated immigration services in order to control movements of humans, goods and services around the world. This will help curtail cross border crimes and international terrorism and reduce security threats and challenges. The urgency of this cooperation in security areas and issues is most prevalent in Africa and other Third World Countries where border security and immigration activities are porous and highly unregulated.

Finally, while we recognize the fundamental rights of the people to freedom of worship as enshrined in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, we propose that in the twenty-first century, the idea of secular states should be revisited, reconsidered and reconstructed with a view to the state controlling, moderating and regulating the philosophical ideologies, doctrines and teachings of various religious faiths. Violence breeds from the teachings of hate and intolerance being propagated by various religions. Thus, state's regulation and control of these teachings will curtail extremism and attendant insecurity.

Conclusion
State security is classical in nature and it largely represents aspects linked primarily to the idea of sovereignty, territorial integrity and issues of border security. New and emerging challenges demand holistic approach. This however, accounted for why state security conception is articulated initially in the Cold War militarist hegemony, and later in human security terms. Security being dynamic suggests that the unfolding relationship between the survival of the nation-state's sovereignty and stability is inextricably linked to the satisfaction of individual needs. This can be understood from the basic fact that vulnerabilities and threats to national security have been enabled by the pressures of the phenomenon of globalization, emphasizes a borderless society.

Globalization has been a key factor in both the transformation of armed groups (terrorists and insurgents) and the declining ability of weak states to counter them. Globalization has however heightened the operation effectiveness of these groups as well as contributed both the uneven erosion of state sovereignty and capacity to function well. Global effort to loosen restrictions on the movement of goods, people and ideas with the aim of expanding state capacity has also expanded the capacity of armed groups. The paradox of globalization is hinged on the conclusion that armed groups have uniquely metamorphosed and strategically positioned to exploit the benefits of globalization in ways the state, particularly the developing countries cannot. In fact, globalization has created a far more capable and lethal enemy within the nation-state.

References
Ayoob, M. (1997). "Defining Security: A Subaltern Realist Perspective" in Kraus Williams, M. C. (ed). *Critical Security Studies.* Minneapolis Mn: University of Minnesota Press.
Arquilla, J. *et al.* (2006). "Networks, Netwar and Information Age Terrorism" in Russel Howard and Reid Sawyer (eds). *Terrorism and Counterterrorisn: Understanding the New Security Environment; Readings and Interpretations.* New York: Mc Graw Hill.

Betts, R. K. (1982). *Surprise Attack: Lessons for Defense Planning.* Washington D. C: Brookings.

Booth, K. (1991). "Security in Anarchy: Utopian Realism in Theory and Practice" in *International Affairs.* Vol. 67, No. 3.

Crenshaw, M. (1985) "Theories of Terrorism: Instrumental and Organizational Approaches." A paper presented at the Defense Nuclear Agency's 10th Annual symposium on the Role of the Behavioural Sciences in Physical Security, April. Retrieved from www.psci.edu/jbook/crenshaw.pdf.

Cronin, A. K. (2006). "Cyber-Mobilization: The New Levee en Masse" in *Parameters.* Vol. 36, No. 2, p. 77.

Hanlon, Q. H. (2009). "Globalization and the Transformation of Armed Groups" in Jeffrey H. Norwitz (ed). *Pirates, Terrorists and Warlords: The History, Influence and Future of Armed Groups around the World.* New York: Sky House Publishing, pp. 124-134.

Eselebor, A. W. (2008). "The Challenges of Border Management and Collective Security in Nigeria." Conference paper delivered at the Society for Peace Studies and Practice held at the University of Abuja, Nigeria, 18th - 21th August.

Goldstein, J. (1999). *International Relations.* New York: Addison Wesley and Longman.

Griffin, K. (2004). "Economic Globalization and Institutions of Global Governance" in *Development and Change.* Vol. 34, No. 5, p. 790.

Ibeanu, O. (2008). "Oil, Environmental Conflicts and Security in the Coastal Zones of West Africa." A paper presented at the CDD-WACSOF Consultation on Conflicts in the Coastal Zone of West Africa, Calabar, June 6th - 7th.

Klare, M. T. and Thomas, D. C. (eds) (1994). *World Security: Challenges for a New Century.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

McNamara, R. S. (1968). *The Essence of Security.* New York: Harper and Row.

Najjar, F. (2005). "The Arabs, Islam and Globalization" in *Middle East Policy*. Vol.12, No. 92.

Negroponte, J. D. (2006). Annual Threat Assessment of the Director of National Intelligence Presented to the United States of American Senate Committee on Intelligence, February 2.

Nigerian Tribune, (2012). February 12.

Nwolise, O. B. C. (1985). "Nigeria's Defense and Security System" in Uma Eleazu (ed). *Nigeria: The First Twenty-Five Years.* Ibadan: Heinmann.

Okpaga, A., Ugwu, S. C. & Eme, O. I. (2012). "Activities of Boko Haram and Insecurity Question in Nigeria" in *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review (OMAN Chapter),* 1 (9), 77 – 99.

Reveron, D. S. and Murer, J. S. (2009). "Terrorist or Freedom Fighter" in Jeffrey H. Norwitz (ed). *Pirates, Terrorists and Warlords: The History,*

Influence and Future of Armed Groups around the World. New York: Sky House Publishing, pp. 311-322.

Walt, S. (1991). "The Renaissance of Security Studies" in *Meshon International Security Review.* Vol. 41.

Williams, G. I. (n.d) "The Place of National Armed Forces in the Regional emerging Scenario: a Contemporary view." A lecture delivered at the National War College (NWC), Abuja, Nigeria, p. 6.

Williams, P. (2008). "Violent Non-State Actors and National and International Security" in *International Relations and Security Network Series.* Zurich: Swiss Institute of Technology. Retrieved from: http://www.google/se2.isn.ch/serviceengine/filecontent? serviceID.ISFPub&field=8EEBA9FE-AA15-32FC9434A lng =en