

Effects of Political Insecurity on Critical Infrastructures in Nigeria: Focus on President Goodluck Jonathan's Administration

Emmanuel Ugbedeajo Ameh & Basil O. Ibebunjo

Department Of Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution,

National Open University of Nigeria

Corresponding author: eameh@noun.edu.ng

Abstract

Building resilience around facilities, setting up security measures, and starting countermeasures are some ways to protect infrastructures. Some common forms of critical infrastructures include emergency services, the energy sector, dams, food, public services, industry, health, transportation, gas, public communications, radio and television. Nigeria's nature of political insecurity has however, hampered the thriving of these infrastructures. The paper therefore sets to uncover the effects that political insecurity has had on this critical infrastructure. It uses a combination of conceptual review, theme analysis, and theoretical presentation make up the methodology. For its theoretical framework, the paper adopts Structural Functionalism. Structural functionalism is a prominent sociological theory that expounds on why society functions the way it does based on the interface between the various social institutions that make up society. The paper explores literatures of other researchers, sieving their ideas and creating a balance for a structured argument. It concludes by buttressing the fact that political insecurity is a major player in the inefficiency of the infrastructures in Nigeria. The paper therefore recommends that critical infrastructures such as education, health, transport, and power, should be given a big concentration by all levels of government. With this in place, there would be provision of employment as well as employable graduates to manage such infrastructures.

Keywords: Political Insecurity, Critical infrastructure, Nigeria, Corruption, Development

Introduction

Critical infrastructure facilities must be effectively protected if the country is to maintain its security, economic vigour, and public health and safety. Hence, securing, preventing, neutralizing, or mitigating the impacts of terrorists' unintentional or intentional attempts to destroy, render inoperable, or otherwise take advantage of critical infrastructure facilities should be the main focus of successful protection. Development is guaranteed when these infrastructure facilities are reliable and efficient. Ola (2010) believed that sustained growth was possible with a strong infrastructure. Critical infrastructure that is accessible to the public is vulnerable to both natural and man-made attacks. According to Badiora and Obadiora (2011), there is a need to plan for protection because the lack of infrastructure is actually made worse by human activity. Building resilience around facilities, setting up security measures, and starting countermeasures are some ways to protect infrastructure (Janes, 2014). In the global United Nations Development Programmes'

(UNDP) Human Development Index ranking (HDI) of 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2008, the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) placed Nigeria poorly because of infrastructure shortage. Hence, one of the steps taken to safeguard crucial national infrastructure and assets (CNAI) was the creation of the Nigeria Security and Civil Defence Corps (NSCDC), which was authorized by the NSCDC Act of 2003 and its 2007 amendment. The Act thus serves as evidence of the Federal Government's sincerity and dedication to safeguarding Nigeria's critical national infrastructure (CNAI).

Communications, emergency services, the energy sector, dams, food, public services, industry, health, transportation, gas, public communications, radio and television, commercial facilities, and the chemical and nuclear sectors are all examples of critical infrastructure. The office of the National Security Adviser (ONSA) to the President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria designated a number of facilities as critical infrastructure. According to the definition, "critical"

infrastructure is that which, if damaged or destroyed, would cause catastrophic and wide-ranging harm. Critical infrastructure, as defined by the European Commission, is an "asset or system that is needed for the maintenance of crucial social activities." Critical infrastructure protection is defined by the Canadian Organization for Economic and Cooperative Development (OECD) as a cyclical process that includes prevention, detection, mitigation, reaction, and recovery (OECD 2008).

The government is primarily responsible for setting objectives for preserving critical infrastructure, while private sector knowledge and action are mostly responsible for reducing the vulnerability of privately held and corporate assets. However, political insecurity is drastically affecting the protection of these critical infrastructures. Political insecurity, which is defined as the state's disregard for and violation of the fundamental human rights of its citizens (UNDP, 1994), is one of the phenomena that has emerged as a major cause of insecurity worldwide. Instead of ensuring the safety of their citizens, many regimes have a tendency to be the risks themselves or the very origins of insecurity. These dangers result from their harsh policies and poor treatment of their own people (Frerks & Klein, 2007).

Nigeria's historic transition from military to civilian rule in 1999 signalled a fresh start for the nation. As a result of the democratically enshrouded promises of growth, it rekindled citizens' aspirations and expectations. One essential component of the public's expectations is their sense of security. Regardless, the political arena is laced with insecurity, with individuals abusing power and causing vulnerability on the critical infrastructure of the country. It is against this backdrop that this paper explores the effects that this political insecurity has on the critical infrastructure. In doing this, the paper proceeds to explore other literatures, bringing out different perspectives of concepts. It then outlines the method to be used, as well as the theoretical framework that best supports it. It goes on to discuss the thrust of the subject matter after which it concludes and supplies the relevant recommendations.

Conceptual Discourse

Political Insecurity: Using Cingranelli-

Richards (CIRI) data, Werthes, Heaven, and Vollnhals (2009) compared political unrest across the world's continents, including Africa, the Americas, Asia, Europe, and Oceania. Indicators of political unrest included press freedom, physical abuse, and arbitrary or political detention. Due to the high prevalence of political insecurity cases there, they claim that, as compared to other continents, political insecurity is an Asian problem. Edwin (2007) investigates political persecution, violence, and terrorism in Uzbekistan from a more focused perspective. The abuse of power, the lack of press freedom, which suppresses public criticism, and the persecuting and torturing of peace-loving Muslims in the guise of battling terrorism, according to him, all contribute to violence and the development of terrorist organizations. He explains the connection between political repression and violent resistance using two alternative theories. Regardless of the case study that each of these two studies looked at, they all share political insecurity. Yet, because political insecurity is defined differently in every study, various causes of the phenomena are identified.

According to Bates (2005), there are three factors that contribute to political unrest in Africa: the military's hold on power, the leadership style, and the prevalent element, which is poverty since it makes the state weak and, consequently, encourages racial unrest among the public. In a similar vein, Apogan-Yella (2005) examines political unrest in West Africa, although she places the blame for political unrest and underdevelopment on autocratic state institutions that lack effective checks and balances. The legislature, judiciary, auditor generals, central banks, and press are not well-established and autonomous institutions of the state. The report does not offer any information on political unrest, and neither does it mention the framework that it used.

In a case study on three particular local governments in the Nigerian state capital of Ibadan, Abdul-Jelil (2008) points to god-fatherism as one of the main causes of political unrest in the state during the fourth republic, among other things. Although this study attempts to identify the underlying causes of political unrest in one region of Nigeria, no traditional nor all-encompassing security

measures were employed. Instead, the study examined the issue of political insecurity from an economic perspective as evidenced by the employment of the theories of the economy of affection and social exchange.

Additionally, Owolabi and Okwechime (2007) assert that the Nigerian federal government and multinational corporations jointly contribute to human insecurity in general and political insecurity in particular for the residents of the Niger Delta in a case study focused on the region of the Niger Delta in Nigeria. The study utilizes federal revenue allocation to Niger Delta states' statistics from 1980 to 1996 and analyses the problem through the lenses of human security. They contrast it with the rest of the states in Nigeria to demonstrate how the federal government of Nigeria mistreats residents of the area by giving them a less allocation than the other states, despite the fact that their resources and land are being abused. Their concept of political uncertainty is ambiguous, though. This is so that they can be regarded as environmental insecurity since environmental issues are distinct from political ones.

Between 1986 and 2005, political assassinations in Nigeria are examined by Igbafe and Offiong (2007). They discovered that political assassination, the primary result of political violence, is brought on by the desire for political power, unhealthy political rivalry, and the ineffectiveness of the national security institutions. They go on to say that the national security apparatus is incompetent and inefficient, which discourages foreign investment and fosters antagonism and an autocratic type of governance. During the time in question, assassination instances were quite prevalent and reached 51 in all. The studies on political insecurity in Nigeria that were reviewed for this study all differ significantly in one way or another.

Critical Infrastructures

A network or system that is essential to an organization, society, or economy's day-to-day functioning is referred to as critical infrastructure. They could include the production of electricity, gas, and oil; telecommunications; water supply; hospitals; and transportation networks (such as railroads,

airports, etc.). They could also include the provision of banking and other financial services as well as services related to human security.

Critical infrastructures are typically regarded to be facilities and services that are necessary for a society's fundamental functions. However, the definition of critical infrastructures varies from country to country (Sandsolz, 2017). In the United States, the idea of critical infrastructure has expanded beyond infrastructures whose prolonged unavailability could cause serious military and/or economic disruption to include attacks on national monuments, where an attack could change how a factory functions and endanger the safety of nearby communities (Patrascu, 2012). According to Hebar and Zarsky (2017), there is a significant risk to critical infrastructure from human adversaries acting maliciously as part of armed or unarmed conflicts between nations, criminal activity (including various types of hacking), retaliatory actions taken by displeased workers, and terrorist acts.

According to Alcaraz and Zeadally (2015), critical infrastructure is a collection of physical or virtual systems that are so vital to a country that any disruption could have a negative impact on public health, economic prosperity, national security, or any combination of these. There is broad consensus that the following industries fit within the definition of essential infrastructures: banking and finance, electricity, water, telecommunications, transportation, and healthcare. For instance, vital infrastructures of Nigeria include the oil and gas, maritime, banking and finance, transportation, telecommunication, and defence sectors. As a result, any issue or disruption in any of these areas would undoubtedly have an impact on the nation's economy and security.

Methodology

The methodology employed in conducting this study largely relied on data that were generated from secondary sources such as official websites, journals and published texts. Each of the data used to conduct this study is relevant to the study. In order to obtain the originality of the study, content analysis was adopted and used to sieve the numerous data gathered. This enabled the reliability and credibility of the study.

Theoretical Framework

The study uses Structural Functionalism as its main analytical framework. This theory, which was developed by a French sociologist named Emile Durkheim, explains how the interactions between the many social institutions that make up society explain why society works the way it does. These institutions include the government, non-profits, the legal system, schools, and churches, among others. Since 1966, famous researchers like Almond and Howell have studied structural-functional theory, which they defined as the observable behaviours that comprise a system. Functions deal with the outcomes involving goals, procedures, and patterns of behaviour. Ntete-Nua (2004:143) notes that “functions deal with the consequences of action while structures refer to those arrangements, which perform functions and roles”.

In order to fix the system, which in this case means integrating resources from the government and civil society organizations to ensure peacebuilding in Nigeria, structural functionalism explains the interconnection and interaction in a political system (Eze, 2015). If Nigeria is to enjoy the stability and peace that are desired, the state and civil society organizations-the two key players in every political and social system-must collaborate peacefully and toward a common objective. The structural-functional theory holds that society is a complex system whose elements interact to promote stability and cooperation. The basis of society is provided by social structures, which are comparatively stable patterns of social behaviour.

Families, communities, civil society, and religious institutions all have social structures that define and influence our lives. Some social outcomes that have an impact on how society as a whole functions are caused by each social structure. Societies are seen by structural-functionalists as an organism with a number of interrelated parts. A fundamental concept of structural functionalism is that society is made up of organizations or groups that are cohesive, uphold common standards, and have a particular culture.

The structural functionalist theory has a number of central tenets that are appropriate for our study. Every society aims for equilibrium, to

name one of the prepositions. The analysis of the structural-functionalism theory reveals that it explains why some aspects of the existing Nigerian society and critical infrastructure, which is still being torn apart by complex conflicts and an unsteady security system. Yet, structural functionalism falls short in describing how those who are oppressed oppose social institutions and social structure. It has also been criticised for neglecting the role of conflict and change in society. It assumes that social institutions and norms work in harmony to maintain social order, which may not always be the case. As Macionis and Plummer (2018) note, this perspective “has been criticized for neglecting the ways in which social structures can generate conflict, rather than consensus”. The theory is, however, suitable despite its shortcoming. It elaborates the importance of infrastructure in the structure of human race, which is at the heart of this paper.

Pointers of Political Insecurity

In this study, political insecurity is defined as the absence of protection against political or governmental repression, threats of political repression, violations of human rights, lack of protection against military dictatorships, any type of physical abuse done by public officials, etc (Tadjbakhsh & Chenoy, 2007). According to the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), political insecurity is a state in which people's fundamental human rights are violated (Human Development Report, 1994). Some of the pointers of political insecurity in Nigeria are discussed below:

Assassination: This refers to the extrajudicial executions carried out by government agents without following the correct legal procedures. The majority of killings are the result of the unlawful use of lethal force by law enforcement, security officers, and other state agencies against criminal suspects, detainees, convicts, and others (Cingranelli & Richards, 2008). The term "assassination" refers to the intentional killing of a prominent person for any one of the following three causes:

1. Murdering someone because of their political views in the expectation that they may also pass away because of their principles. In this case, eliminating the

- victim is not the only goal; his political or religious philosophy is also a target.
2. Killing someone in order to get control over them in order to replace them or take over their position. This typically occurs when a perpetrator recognizes there is no other way to gain the victim's status or authority while he or she is still breathing.
 3. Assassination, which refers to the killing of a prominent figure with the goal of gaining fame, is another definition of notoriety. Several notable targets have been the victims of this kind of assassination. The perpetrator only does it to gain notoriety.

Enforced Disappearance: The term "disappearance," which Amnesty International refers to as "enforced disappearance," could also refer to a circumstance in which a person is detained, arrested, or kidnapped by the government or any agencies acting on its behalf. The perpetrator typically claims to be unaware of the arrest and to be hiding his whereabouts, which exempts him from legal protection (Amnesty International, 2010). Due to the victim's access to confidential information about the authorities or his or her involvement in politics, state agents are also likely to be responsible in disappearance cases. The victims are frequently classified as terrorists or threats to national security in addition (Cingranelli & Richards, 2008).

Arbitrary Imprisonment: Arbitrary imprisonment or detention and arrest refers to the arrest, detention, or imprisonment of individuals based solely on their religious convictions, without any reasonable suspicion that the alleged offender has actually committed the crime for which he is being held, detained, or imprisoned, and without the application of a fair legal procedure. Political imprisonment, also known as arbitrary detention, is when individuals are detained by government agents due to their speech, nonviolent protests of the government or its leaders, nonviolent religious practices, or membership in an ethnic or racial group (Cingranelli & Richards, 2008).

Corruption as a Leading Pointer of Political Insecurity

Whether it is structural or personal, corruption

is corruption. Despite the difficulty in defining it, "corruption" is typically understood to be the active or passive misuse of authority by appointed or elected officials for private financial or other profit (OECD, 2002). Development and all security indicators, whether major, minor, retail, systemic, sectoral, institutional, or personal, have shown it to be harmful. This is due to the fact that it stifles the economy, impairs the functioning of its institutions, and entrenches underdevelopment whichever way it goes. Nigeria is ranked poorly on the Human Development Index (HDI) from 1999 to 2020 according to statistics from the National Bureau of Statistics and the United Nations Development Programs (UNDP). This is because of lack of infrastructure. Nigeria's latest ranking of 161st out of 189 nations and territories (UNDP 2020) is attributable to institutional corruption, which has diminished the state's ability to carry out its tasks effectively.

The Federal Republic of Nigeria's 1999 Constitution, as amended in Section 15(5), stated that the government will "abolish all forms of corrupt practices and abuse of power" (Nigeria Constitution, 1999). This is due to the fact that corruption poses a danger to the Constitution's requirements for good governance, freedom, equality, justice, and the welfare of all citizens (Nigeria Constitution, 1999 as amended). Additionally, it jeopardizes the safety of government buildings as well as the efficient management and defence of vital infrastructure and assets.

The Nigerian government also developed anti-corruption organizations to combat the threat of corruption. They include the Economic and Financial Crime Commission (EFCC) and the Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offenses Commission (ICPC), which were formed by Acts of the National Assembly in 2000 and 2003, respectively (Enweremadu, 2022). Corruption persists in Nigeria despite the proliferation of anti-graft organizations and the Constitution's stance on it. In Nigeria, corruption permeates every industry, affecting not just the vital infrastructure protection sector but also the executives at the federal, state, and local government councils. Government institutions now cooperate or work together to ingrain corruption as a normative component of

government transactions since it has become systemic inside them. Every institution of government that has a role to play in the budget participates in the facilitation of corruption, from the Executive arm of government's preparation of the national budget to MDAs' defence of the budget in the National Assembly to their execution of the budget.

Even the judiciary participates in the corruption trade in Nigeria by using their in-depth understanding of the country's shoddy criminal justice system to create legal obstacles that allow the heads of state to roam the nation freely despite the serious accusations of corruption "hanging on their necks." According to studies, senior military officers, legislators, judges, attorneys general of the federation, ministers, and heads of parastatals and MDAs have frequently been found responsible for corrupt acts involving the misappropriation, embezzlement, diversion, and theft of funds under their various institutions as well as the violation of the law.

According to reports, the Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Commission (ICPC) chairman claimed that the commission recovered excess funds totalling N147 billion that some MDAs illegally diverted from the 2020 budget as personnel costs during a one-day interactive session with directors of finance and accounts and internal auditors in significant Nigerian Ministries, Departments, and Agencies (MDAs) on February 18, 2021. (Vanguard, 18 February 2021). The Chairman also announced that 51 entities in the health sector were found to have manipulated budgets following a commission probe.

The summary of findings from the 51 health sector institutions that the ICPC looked into revealed that they engaged in fraudulent fund-diversion through manipulation of beneficiary account numbers on the Government Integrated Financial and Management Information System (GIFM), padding of nominal rolls, and widespread misuse of personnel cost allocation to non-personnel related expenditure, especially on outsourced services, totalling N4.5 billion (Vanguard, 18 February 2021). The Commission chairman further disclosed that it swept up N42 billion (staff cost) as part of its 2019 System Analysis and Review of MDAs

after receiving a warrant to do so from the Minister of Finance.

Illicit Financial Flows (IFF), which are taken from government revenue and expenditures as a result of poor governance, corruption, and a disregard for the rule of law, cause enormous economic losses and have a negative impact on the efficient operation of government. The CIP is essential to the efficient operation of government, and any disruption or destruction to the CI has an impact on the nation as a whole. Because of this, corruption can result in financial losses in government revenue and expenditures, which have a direct impact on how well the government is run. This is due to the fact that the sector will undoubtedly suffer if money intended for the operation, maintenance, and protection of important national infrastructure and assets is either embezzled, misused, or diverted elsewhere.

Effects of Inefficient Infrastructural Development

If President Goodluck Jonathan (as he was then) had carried out the great infrastructure development plan he had promised the electorate, it would have positively affected Nigeria's ability to compete with other growing economies. Not because the government lacks the resources to carry out those projects-on December 20, 2012, the National Assembly formally approved a budget of N4.987 trillion for 2013, compared to the N4.75 trillion approved for 2012-but rather because the infrastructure that was supposed to promote national prosperity was not implemented. The following items are included in the 2013 budget: a crude oil budget benchmark of \$79 per barrel, up from \$72 per barrel; a recurrent spending cut of nearly \$50 billion to N2.38 trillion; and an increase in capital project allocations to N1.62 trillion from N1.34 trillion in 2012 (Federal Ministry of Works, 2013). Even with N1.62 trillion in the 2013 budget and N1.34 trillion in the 2012 budget of Nigeria as passed by the National Assembly, Nigeria under ex-President Goodluck Jonathan had the chance to carry out the majority of the commitments he made (Ayeni & Beji, 2019).

It Nurses Poverty

The approach and manner in which nations

engaged in infrastructure development globally demonstrated that it has some favourable security implications. Notwithstanding the enormous opportunity the President (as he was then) had while in office, the security implications of infrastructure development have not been fully realized. That is a chance because under his rule, Nigeria's oil production boomed-specifically, crude oil sold for \$120 per barrel. Infrastructure growth is viewed as being essential to progress and a good living. In retrospect, Miller (2013) contends that in the UK, a national strategy is growing public support for infrastructure. The government has big plans to enhance the railroad, airport, and energy sectors, but obtaining sufficient funding prevents them from being fully implemented. Reconsiderations of previous agreements have resulted in a bigger role for public money in "private" endeavours.

Infrastructure development is prioritized over protecting people and property in developed nations. Because President Goodluck Jonathan's pledge to build transportation infrastructure was not kept, it was not necessary to start the project in the first place. Udo (2015) agrees that only \$400 million of the USD 1.1 billion loan from the Chinese Exim Bank obtained for the construction of a standard gauge rail connecting Lagos to Kano is still with the ministry of finance, according to President Muhammadu Buhari's information from the permanent secretary of the ministry of transport, as the majority of the money had been transferred elsewhere.

Because the infrastructure was not finished, the Goodluck Jonathan Administration had no good security implications for the country in the transportation sector, particularly the rail transit. Without a doubt, the lack of completion of the aforementioned infrastructure will exacerbate the issue of poverty; as a result, Ilo (2008) argued that poverty is the main cause of civil unrest in Nigeria because people who are hungry and lacking in basic necessities of life are more likely to act violently. In every civilization, one of the reasons of violence is poverty.

Gyong (2012) asserts that the absence of purposeful, dependable, and focused leadership in Nigeria poses the greatest threat to the accomplishment of President Jonathan's

transformation agenda. According to Okpanku (2013), Nigeria ranked 133rd for infrastructure. It is important to remember that the political establishment of the time did not fulfil the promise of infrastructure development he made to Nigerians; as a result, the President solely looked out for and advanced his own interests, not that of Nigerians. Poverty has been brought on by the President's actions. The majority of African leaders are autocrats who frequently work on ineffective projects that have no effect on industrialisation and productivity (Michael & Okorie, 2013). The President's support of some programs, like the *Almajiri* program in Northern Nigeria, is a waste of time.

It Hampers Economic Development

According to Sanusi (2012), Nigeria's existing infrastructure deficit is a significant barrier to the country's goal of becoming one of the world's greatest economies by 2020. According to Abubakar (2011), citing the National Planning Commission (NPC) (2009), one of Nigeria's long-standing major issues is the country's wide income disparity, which manifests itself in widespread unemployment, poverty, and poor or non-existent access to public services like portable clean water, decent housing, electricity, and a dependable transportation system.

Based on the aforementioned assessment, unemployment and poverty in society are caused by a lack of infrastructure development. Hence, Nwagboso (2012) suggested that one of the main reasons for insecurity in the nation is the problems of poverty, unemployment, and unequal wealth distribution among ethnic nations. When there is no critical infrastructure development that can increase national prosperity, insecurity results.

Conclusion

Modern and effective critical infrastructure development is recognized to have encouraged industrialisation, boosted long-term economic growth, provided services for the smooth operation of society, and created and maintained jobs. According to research, economic growth that results in the greatest number of people experiencing economic success is a result of infrastructure development (Aschauer, 1989; Easterly & Rebelo, 1993). However, this has not been attained as a result of political insecurity

which is rampant in Nigeria. One of the most concerning challenges facing the Nigerian people is the appalling state of political insecurity. The absence of political security and the ongoing existence of episodes of political insecurity in Nigeria can be linked to a wide variety of factors. According to what has been said in the paper, the effects are worrisome.

Recommendations

While critical infrastructure is a necessity for the fostering of national development, political insecurity has been a major hindrance. In order to avert this, the following recommendations are made:

1. The president of Nigeria needs to prioritise surrounding himself with people whom have the interest of the country rather than their own self-interest. This will greatly limit the prevalence of corruption.
2. There is need for a stronger security system, particularly one designated to monitor the activities of government personnel whom might be dubious to the point of wanting to carry out assassination or cause mayhem in the society.
3. Critical infrastructure such as education, health, transport, and power, should be given a big concentration by all levels of government. With this in place, there would be provision of employment as well as employable graduates to manage such infrastructure.
4. Government can partner with NGOs in establishing and sustaining some of the deteriorating critical infrastructure.

References

- Abdul-Jelil, A. (2008). God-fatherism' and Nigeria's fourth republic: violence and political insecurity in Ibadan. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Institute of African Studies, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Abubakar, I.W. (2011). Social service delivery and governance in Nigeria, 1960-2010: Retrospect and prospect. In Barkindo, B.M., Ifamose, F. & Akpen, P. (Eds.), *Nigeria at fifty: issues and challenges in governance* (1st ed.). Makurdi: Aboki Publishers.
- Alcaraz, C., & Zeadally, S. (2015). Critical infrastructure protection: Requirements and challenges for the 21st Century. *International Journal of Critical Infrastructure Protection* (IJCIP), Elsevier Science, 8, 1-35.

- Amnesty International Report (2010). The state of world's human rights. Retrieved August 10, 2011 from http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_2010_EN_Complete_reprint.pdf.
- Apogan-Yella, A. (2005). Underdevelopment: main cause of insecurity in West Africa. (USAWC Strategy Research Project).
- Aschauer, D. A. (1989). Is public expenditure productive? *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 23(2), 177-200.
- Ayeni, E. O & Beji, B. G. (2019). Security implication of infrastructural development in Nigeria: 2010-2015
- Badiora & Obadiora (2011). Graffiti vandalism of Public Facilities in schools and Colleges: *International Journal of Development Studies*. 2(3)
- Bates, H. R. (2005). Political insecurity and state failure in contemporary Africa, Harvard University, CID Working Paper No.115, 2005.
- Cingranelli, D. & Richards, D. (2008). The Cingranelli-Richards human rights dataset version 2008.03.12. Retrieved April 25, 2010. <http://www.humanrightsdata.org>
- Edwin, B. (2007). Repression, political violence and terrorism: The case of Uzbekistan. *Security and Human Rights*. vol. 18, 108-118.
- Enweremadu, D. U. (2022) Anti-corruption in Nigeria (1999–2007): The politics of a failed reform. Ibadan: *French Institute for Research in Africa* (IFRA-Nigeria). doi: 10.4000/books.ifra.1588.
- Easterly, W., & Rebelo, S. (1993). Fiscal policy and economic growth: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 32(3), 417-458.
- Eze, A.O. (2015). *Contemporary basic concepts in government and politics*. Enugu: Chrisbest Productions.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999) Section 15 (5) of the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria as amended.
- Frerks, G. & Goldewijk, B. K. (2007). Human security and international security. The Netherlands: Wageningen Academic Publishers.
- Gyong, J. (2012). A Social Analysis of the Transformation Agenda of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan. *European Scientific Journal*, Vol 8 (16), 95-113
- Hebar, E., & Zarsky, T. (2017). Cyber security for infrastructure: A critical analysis (Vol. 22). Florida State: University Law Review.
- Human Development Report. (1994). Retrieved October 10, 2010. http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr_1994_en

- [chap2.pdf](#),
Igbafe, A. A. & Offiong, O.J. (2007). Political assassinations in Nigeria: An exploratory study 1986-2005. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 1 (1), 9-19.
- Ilo, S. C. (2008). The face of Africa: Looking beyond the shadow in Akubor. E.O. (2011), Civil unrest in Northern Nigeria: Beyond the Literal Boko Haram. *Journal of Constitutional Development*, vol 2 (4), 71-93
- Janes (2014) Adopting a holistic approach to Protecting Critical Infrastructure. (<http://www.janes.com/article/39495/adopting-a-holistic-approach-to-protecting-critical-infrastructure-es14e3>)
- Miller, J.D (2013). *Infrastructure 2013: Global Priorities, Global Insights*. Washington, D.C: Urban Land Institute.
- Nwagboso, C.I. (2012). Security Challenges and Economy of the Nigerian State (2007 – 2011), *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, Vol. 2 No. 6, 244-258.
- Okpanku, J. (2013). Nigeria global perception dips amid poor infrastructure. *NewsWatch Times*. Retrieved from www.mynewswatchtimesng.com.
- Ola, A. B (2010). Infrastructural Vandalism in Nigerian Cities: The Case of Osogbo, Osun State.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2002) Corruption: A glossary of international criminal standard. *OECD Publication*. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/corruptio...>
- Owolabi, O. & Okwechime, I. (2007). Oil and security in Nigeria: The Niger Delta crisis. Africa Development, XXXII.
- Patrascu, A. (2012). Cyber security evaluation of critical infrastructures system. Retrieved from: <http://www.Research Gate>
- Sandsolz, S. (2017). Five things that you need to know about critical Infrastructures: United Nations University. Institute for Environment and Human Security. Retrieved from: <http://ehs.unc.edu/blog>.
- Sanusi, S.L. (2012). The role of development finance institutions in infrastructure development: what Nigeria can learn from BNDES and the Indian infrastructure finance company. *A key note address delivered at the 3rd ICRC PPP stakeholders forum on July 18, 2012*, in Abuja. http://cenb...rum_160712.pdf.
- Tadjbakhsh, S. & Chenoy, A. M. (2007). Human security: Concepts and implications. New York: Routledge.
- Udo, B. (January 1, 2014). Jonathan lists achievement, pledges to make Nigeria greater in 2014. *Premium Times Newspaper*. <http://www.premiumtimesng.com/news/152>. Retrieved on October 15, 2015.
- UNDP (1994). Human development report 1994. New York: Oxford University Press.
- UNDP Human Development Report (2020) Nigeria: Human development and the Anthropocene: Briefing note for countries on the 2020 human development report. Available at: <https://hdr.undp.or/sites/defa...>
- Vanguard (2021) Available at: <https://www.vanguardngr.com/20...>
- Werthes, S., Heaven, C. & Vollnhals, S. (2009). Development, security, and the contested usefulness of human security, Institute for Development and Peace.