Introduction:

Internal security has been widely defined within the context of the protection of the values, critical human and infrastructural assets, territorial integrity, and lives and property of citizens from threats. The principle underlying internal security is governed by Thomas Hobbes' Social Contract Theory while the process is driven by the citizens and state’s law enforcement agencies with the Police holding the primacy, under an ideal security architecture.

In the face of current internal security challenges and the resonating national discourse on police efficiency, this lecture explores the internal security question, highlights the imperative of community-driven approach and proposes options towards strengthening internal security and furthering the capacity of the State to meet its statutory obligation as enshrined in Sec.14(b) of the 1999 Constitution which provides that ‘the security and welfare of the people shall be the primary purpose of government’.

While it is argued in the lecture that modern policing is driven by three strategic elements – *people*, *technology*, and *systems*; it is my submission that any internal security architecture that is not driven by the concept of citizens’ consent and partnership is a negation of the Thomas Hobbes Social Contract Model of internal security management and to that extent, is destined to fail.
It is also submitted that the current seemingly intractable internal security challenges in the country are direct consequences of the alienation of the policed populace, absence of an internal security policy framework, and poor understanding of the requirements and dynamics of internal security management by strategic actors including legislators, policy makers and political actors which engender evolution of ill-thought-out approaches. Other mitigating factors include the failure to appreciate the dynamics of technology in crime and policing, and inability to evolve new security strategies and systems towards security governance in the country. Consequently, a new policing architecture that is citizens-based, technology-driven, and systems-governed is proposed.

**Concept of National Security:**

Security is about the management of threat and it is often thought of as the pursuit of freedom from threat. Security requires specification of both a threat, and a referent object. Threats are about the possibility of harm coming to a valued referent object. The concept of security within the national space has been defined within the context of national security, a term that defines the dynamics and interrelationships between internal security which refers to threats from within the country and external security which touches on transnational threats.

Within this perspective, Arnold Wolfers (1960), defines national security as "the absence of threats to acquired values and subjectively, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked."\(^1\) Professor Charles Maier of Harvard University similarly defines the concept through the lens of national power by noting that national security is best described as a capacity to control those domestic and foreign conditions that the public opinion of a given community believes necessary to enjoy its own self-determination or autonomy, prosperity

and wellbeing\(^2\). Also highlighting the intertwining relationship between internal and external security within the context of national security, Moshe Keinan defines national security as-

\[\text{The dynamics of a state's ability and readiness to deal effectively with external threats caused by rival states and rival organizations, and deal effectively with internal threats - caused by parties inside the society, which put in risk the physical existence of the state's population, its identity, its values ant its vital interests}^3\ (\text{emphasis mine})\]

Aside these, some authorities have attempted to define national security in terms of demographic threats occasioned by epidemics, natural disasters, climate change and other events causing severe environmental damage and the ability of the State to emplace an effective emergency response plan to swiftly protect it from or rehabilitate the populace in the event of such occurrence.

The argument here is that National Security is infused with two important dimensions. These are Internal Threats and External Threats. Internal security, which is concerned with internal threats is all State actions directed at emplacing, upholding and deploying national laws, strategies, policies and state law enforcement agencies towards the maintenance of peace, law and order; safeguarding citizens from fear or threats to their values, livelihood, liberty, lives and property within a country’s territory. While there are usually several secondary law enforcement agencies that are statutorily empowered to advance the internal security interests of a nation, the Police is commonly acknowledged as the lead agency within the internal security framework of any nation.

---


\(^3\) Moshe Keinan is a renowned Israeli National Security Analyst and Systems Theorist
In contrast, external threats within the context of national security is according to Harold Brown, U.S. Secretary of Defense from 1977 to 1981 -

*The ability to preserve the nation's physical integrity and territory; to maintain its economic relations with the rest of the world on reasonable terms; to preserve its nature, institution, and governance from disruption from outside; and to control its borders*⁴

The primary responsibility for guaranteeing external security lies with the Military of a nation and where this is undertaken in conjunction with other security agencies, the military will, under an ideal situation, take command and control pre-eminence in such operational relationships.

**Military – Police Synergy in National Security**

The statutory role of the military is basically defence against external aggression while the Police plays the lead role in managing internal threats to national security. Nonetheless, in exceptional cases of severe disorder, section 217 (2) (c) of the Constitution provides that the military could be deployed to suppress insurrection and act in aid of civil authority. The President, Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of Nigeria, relying on this provision, has deployed the military to complement the Police in serious internal security challenges of magnitudes that have practically snowballed beyond the operational capacity of the Police including riot control, combating armed robbery, kidnapping, oil bunkering, agrarian farmers/pastoralists crises, militancy, insurgency and natural disasters.

According to Sanda (2013), the deployment of the military for Internal Security Operations (ISO) is often a subject of intense debate. While some
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view such deployment as a welcome idea since they often times save lives and mitigate the destructive consequences of violent conflict, others argue that their deployment often result in some unintended consequences\(^5\). What remains undeniable is that such deployments are constitutional and within the prerogative of the President, Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the Federation. Indeed, as Sanda (2013) observes this process is what has been conceptualized as Military Aid to Civil Power (MACP) when it involves the use of firearms and Military Aid to Civil Authorities (MACA) which refers to the engagement of the military to support civil powers in the management of disasters or humanitarian situations not involving use of firearms.

Conversely, Sec.4 of Police Act which highlights the duties of the police states that among other functions, the Nigeria Police ‘shall perform such military duties within or outside Nigeria as may be required of them by or under the authority of this or any other Act’. This provision is unique to the extent that it imposes some level of military service responsibility on the police and by so doing, highlights the importance of inter-agency collaboration in national security management. This could be referred to as the concept of Police Assistance to Military Authority (PAMA).

The import of PAMA, a national security concept that has not been given prominence in public security discourse, is that while the military can support the Police in its internal security roles, the Police is also under statutory obligation to support the military within the context of national security management when so called upon as being experienced with the deployment of detachments of Nigeria Police Mobile Force to the counterterrorism frontline in the north east where they are currently fighting side by side the Military, under military Command and Control. This symbiotic relationship remains critical to national security management of the country.

In a Paper titled ‘Internal and External Security and National Borders’ Lt Col (rtd) JAN Kamenju, the Director of Kenyan Security Research and Information Centre (SRIC), opines that in performing its secondary functions under MACA and MACP, the military, must have clear instructions on the exact activities they are expected to undertake including clear time frame and procedures for disengagement as according to him, Military role does not mix with law enforcement roles granted their training, orientation and operational standards\(^6\). Similarly, under PAMA, it is anticipated that the operations of the Police component will be clearly delineated and a clear exit plan projected in advance. In all instances, however, it must be emphasized that an internal security system of any nation where the police primacy is lost to the extent of the Military performing civil law enforcement functions on a wide scale and over a lengthy period of time remains endangered and conscious state actions must be implemented to prevent such.

In undertaking a broad dissection of the concept of national security, it must be re-emphasised that this lecture focuses on the internal security component of national security.

**Internal Security: Theoretical Expositions**

Scholars have propounded several theories to appraise factors that explain human conducts which instigate actions that threaten internal security. Prominent amongst these theories are the Functionalism Theory; Social Conflict Theory, and the Relative Deprivation theory among others. Similarly, 

the Social Contract Theory provides a strong theoretical base for the management of internal security.

The functionalism theoretical approach to the understanding of internal security threat has its origins in the works of Emile Durkheim, who was especially interested in the functions of human behaviour within a conflict situation and how social order is possible or how society remains relatively stable and secure. It assumes that each part of the society is functional for the stability of the whole and that under an ideal situation, the parts of society produce order, stability, and productivity. From this perspective, disorganization in the system, such as deviant behaviour, leads to change because societal components must adjust to achieve stability. When one part of the system is not working or is dysfunctional, it affects all other parts and creates social problems, which leads to social change that could threaten peace, security and the social order within a community.

The Social Conflict theory evolved from the works of Karl Marx who focused on the ideological approach in explaining social disorder and internal security threat. Focusing on class stratification within the society Marx theorized that the dominant capitalist system is premised on the existence of the bourgeoisie - powerful minority class and an oppressed proletariat – the majority class. This stratification creates a class conflict resulting from uneven and unjust distribution of resources among them. This unequal social order was maintained through ideological coercion which created consensus and acceptance of the values, expectations, and conditions as determined by the bourgeoisie. Marx theorized that the work of producing consensus was done in the "superstructure" of society, which is composed of social institutions, political structures, and culture, and what it produced consensus for was the
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"base," the economic relations of production\textsuperscript{8}.

Marx reasoned that as the socio-economic conditions worsened for the proletariats, they would develop a class consciousness that revealed their exploitation at the hands of the wealthy capitalist class of bourgeoisie, and then they would revolt, demanding changes to smooth the conflict. He also assumes that if the changes made to appease conflict maintained a capitalist system, then the cycle of conflict would repeat. However, if the changes made created a new system, like socialism, then peace, security and stability would be achieved.

The relative deprivation theory assumes that all types of warfare including counter-insurgency are fought simultaneously at all levels. They are political-strategic levels, the military-strategy level, operational level and tactical level. The political-strategic level of warfare employs all aspects of the state power and uses the military as only one of the means of attaining its strategic end state.

The relative deprivation theory gives an understanding of complex issues of human behaviour and attitudes, including feelings of stress, political attitudes, and participation in collective action. According to Gurr, violent conflict like the activities of herdsmen is as a result of collective discontent caused by a sense of relative deprivation by the citizenry who contrary to their expectation that democracy will improve their living conditions, believe that it has rather worsened it\textsuperscript{9}. According to the relative deprivation theorists, the primary source of the human capacity for violence appears to be the frustration-aggression mechanism; the anger induced by frustration is a


motivating force that disposes men to aggression, irrespective of its instrumentalities. The relevance of this theory to the understanding of internal security is apt considering the fact that majority of those who engage in the violent conflicts are mostly youths who have no jobs and decent means of livelihood.

**Social Contract Theory and Internal Security:**

Thomas Hobbes Social Contract Theory could be engaged to dissect the essence of policing, the evolution of policing as a community-based concept, and law enforcement functions as an internal security management approach in any society. Hobbes devised the Social Contract theory in the 17th Century to explain the dynamics of security and governance. After Hobbes, John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau are the best-known proponents of this enormously influential theory, which has been one of the most dominant theories within moral and political theory in history.

The theory states that common security should be favored and that a bit of individual liberty should be sacrificed by each person to achieve it. According to Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), before the social contract era, man lived in a state of nature in which there was “a war of every man against every man”. It was a period of internecine strife in which the life of man was “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short”. Self-preservation was the order of the day. It was necessary to have law and government so as to promote order and personal security.

---


13 Freeman, M.D.A., op. cit., p. 112.
Hobbes argues that the main purpose of government is to protect the natural rights of individuals and that people agree to give up absolute rights to a government to gain protection and maintain order. He also argues that morality consists of the sets of rules governing behaviour and that rational people would accept, on the condition that others accept them as well. In a “state of nature”, there are no social goods because the social cooperation needed to produce them does not exist. Consequently, there must be guarantees that people will not harm one another, and people must be able to rely on one another to keep their agreements. Only a government can provide for these conditions and in establishing a government, people give up some of their personal freedoms (the freedom of anarchy, such as it is) and give the government the authority to enforce laws and agreements. By implication, people living under a government are parties to a social contract. Each person agrees to follow the laws of the state on the condition that everyone else does the same. That way, people are all relatively safe from each other and all will benefit from the other social goods that will result therefrom.

The Social Contract postulation assumes that the state exists to enforce the rules necessary for social living, while morality consists in the whole set of rules that facilitate social living. Thus, government is needed to enforce the basic rules of social living (e.g. don’t rob people, don’t break agreements), while morality may encompass some rules that are important for social living but are outside the scope of the state.

According to Hobbes, morality is just such a contract. The aim of the contract is to create social order, ending the state of nature and making it possible for people to cooperate and produce social goods. In order for the contract to best achieve its aims, it is important that everyone, or nearly everyone, to be party to the contract (otherwise there is a state of anomie). It is against this background that Hobbes argues that in order to guarantee the survival of any society, the contractual relationship between government and citizen must be aimed at the protection of life and property, establishment of a
police force to enforce the contract, and establishment other rules to secure the benefits of social living. Other essentials include framework for the protection of the society against outside threats which will necessitate the establishment of an Army; as well as the emplacement of civil rights standards as safeguards against abuse of state powers. Thus, the social contract is used by Hobbes to justify authoritarian government, avoid rebellion and possibility of civil war.

Underlying John Locke’s political theory is that “no man can be subjected to the political power of another without his own consent”.14 The state of nature before the social contract, to him, was not one of brutal view. He posited that property was nevertheless insecure. To Locke, it was in a bid to overcome this natural condition that by contract, the purpose of government was recognized as the protection of human entitlements.15

Rousseau’s idea of a state of nature though close to Locke’s does not place emphasis on the sanctity of property. According to Rousseau, the social contract is a mystical construct by which the individual merges into the community and becomes part of the “general will”...whoever refuses to obey the general will shall be compelled to do so by the whole body.16 The Constitution of a nation embodies this social contract with the Police being the primary institution around which the aggregation of this social contract is woven.

The import of these postulations is simple. It is that policing as a critical component of community and national security, is, by origin, a product of citizens’ consent. It evolved out of the resolve of members of a community to sacrifice part of their personal rights and repose their trust in a body of men and the state in return for their personal and community security. In consequence, any internal security model that alienates the citizens will

15 See Freeman, M.D.A., op. cit, p. 112.
remain ineffectual. Conversely, any model woven around the community is bound to remain potent. The concept of community policing draws from this exposition.

**The Internal Security Question**

The major threats to Nigeria’s internal security over the years are terrorism which is accentuated by violent extremism ideologies; separatist agitation and proliferation of ethnic militias; kidnapping for ransom; armed robbery which at times, could be orchestrated by trans-border criminal networks; and agrarian/Pastoralists farmers’ crises which is a particularly potent threat to national security because they can trigger ethnic and religious interpretation. Others include cattle rustling and banditry; religious, inter-ethnic and intra-communal crises; oil theft and piracy; Sabotage, disruption and vandalism of critical infrastructure; murder and cultism-related violence; cybercrime; political violence, especially election-related violence; and financial and economic crimes such as corruption; money laundering, electoral fraud, trafficking in persons, drugs and arms, and fraud, which trigger or aggravate poverty and inequality which constitute motivations for crimes and threats to internal security.

Some of these problems derives from or are aggravated by economic and social conditions such as erosion of ethical and moral conduct in private and public life, corruption, ethnic and religious intolerance, deterioration of infrastructure and service delivery, steady rise in unemployment and mass poverty, widening social and economic inequality, proliferation or arms and drug abuse.

**Evaluation of Nigeria’s Internal Security Framework**

The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 as amended provides for the constitutional role of the Nigeria Police Force. By the tenor of section 215(3) and (4) of the Constitution the Nigeria Police Force shall maintain and secure public safety and public order, ensure internal stability
and prevent threats to national security. In consequence, the Police in any nation represents the foundation upon which internal security management is built. Hence, the extent of internal security is predicated on the extent of the operational efficiency of the Police in any country. This, in turn, is predicated fundamentally on the strength of the social contract between the Police and the citizens on the one hand, and between the government and the Police on the other hand. It is also predicated on the synergy between the police, the extended policing family (other law enforcement community) and the Military.

Within the Nigerian policing space, these variables appear weak so much that the policing actors within the internal security system (inclusive of the extended policing family) have been ineffectual in their individual and collective capacity to manage internal security challenges. Beyond this, the absence of a National Internal Security Policy against which the performance of the Nigeria Police and other strategic state actors could be measured and the roles of the citizens and other strategic non-state actors defined also remains a major gap within the national security management framework of the country.

Against this unwieldy architecture, it is not surprising that the internal security management approach of the country as currently constituted, is largely reactive and less proactive. This should be expected of an internal security management system that is lacking citizens consent and support in relation to willingness to provide vital criminal information, experiences huge funding deficit, driven by competitive rather than collaborative orientation, lacks a Policy Framework to guide its operation, and yet, confronted with high public expectation and huge internal security challenges that constantly overstretch its human and institutional capacity. These challenges make community policing an attractive, cost-effective and most potent internal security strategy in Nigeria, if nationally embraced, adapted and adopted.
Community Policing in Nigeria: Critical Issues

That community policing which demands effective police-public partnership and trust in crime prevention is the best and most potent form of policing has never been in doubt. Even among police personnel themselves, a research carried out between March 2001 and December 2003 by the Centre for Law Enforcement Education in Nigeria (CLEEN Foundation) in partnership with the NPF in fourteen states selected from the six geopolitical zones of Nigeria, discovered that if community policing strategy is adopted, it could assist to eradicate most of the challenges attributed to the traditional reactive police culture17.

While there is no debate on the efficacy of community policing model in internal security management, there are debates on the origin of the practice with most literature crediting its evolution to the United Kingdom in 1929. I tend to disagree with this assertion. Community Policing had been in practice in our local communities in Nigeria long before colonialism and we must take a fair share of national credit in this regard.

In a July, 2015 publication entitled ‘Rest in Pieces, Police Torture and Deaths in Nigeria’, the Human Rights Watch asserts that prior to the onset of colonization by the British in 1861, traditional African policing methods were rooted in the community and closely interlinked with social and religious structures. The enforcement of traditional customs and beliefs was carried out by community structures such as age grades (formal organizations whose membership is based on pre-determined age range), secret societies or vocational guilds (for example, of hunters, farmers or fishermen). Through these diffuse systems of crime control, law and order was maintained, largely

without the use of violence\textsuperscript{18}. Similarly, Osaro Ollorwi in a study entitled ‘Community Policing and Crime Control in Pre-Colonial Eleme, Issues and Perspectives’ highlights how Secret societies, traditional religion and supernatural devices were adopted by the Elemes in South South Nigeria as community policing and social control instruments in pre-colonial era\textsuperscript{19}.

Furthermore, in a study titled ‘Community Policing in the Traditional Igbo Society: A Model for Preventing Crime in the Contemporary Nigerian Society’, Ernest Toochi Aniche observes that community policing is neither foreign nor novel to Africa as long before colonialism, the traditional Igbo society of the now south-eastern Nigeria had devised a community-oriented means of policing its communities and curbing or preventing crime using primarily the age grade system and masquerade secret society\textsuperscript{20}. Since all adult male citizens belong to both the age grade and masquerade society, the import of this traditional security architecture was that the task of policing was that of the entire society and policing functions were undertaken in a clearly structured, communal system that was based on the values, input and tasking system of the local communities.

In addition, community-based policing and social control architecture which was woven round the traditional institutions and customs were visible among the Yorubas in the South West and the Hausas in the Northern part of Nigeria. These traditional, community policing practices, varied as they were in orientation and implementation, were known to share the modern principles associated with community policing as being advanced by the Western world.


\textsuperscript{20} http://www.academia.edu/19912033/Community_Policing_in_the_Traditional_Igbo_Society_A_Model_for_Preventing_Crime_in_the_Contemporary_Nigerian_Society
just as they were very effective in enabling the pre-colonial Nigeria societies in not just fighting crime but also in preventing crime.

In essence, ladies and gentlemen, as we make to advance the concept of community policing in our drive to perfect our internal security architecture, we should not be under the faulty perception that we are advocating a novel or alien crime control practice, neither should we submit to the perspective that community policing is a Western policing system, practice or culture that is being foisted on us. In contrast, it is my submission that community policing is part of our culture, our evolution as a nation and our way of life until it was disrupted by colonialism and further dislocated by the Constitution which institutionalised central policing framework and effectively detached or alienated the people from their police, thereby, weakening the practice of community policing as inherited from our forefathers across all cultures and ethnic groups in Nigeria. What we are pushing for, therefore, is that we go back to the basics by re-embracing, modifying, adapting and readopting our traditional community policing model to meet the dynamics of crime and modern dictates.

Just like in Nigeria and other African communities, Policing in pre-industrial Europe had also been a local community affair with maintenance of order and crime control being fulfilled by collective tasks which were sometimes, undertaken through voluntary community service on a rotating basis among local community actors\(^{21}\). This was guided by the practice of ‘scrutiny, hue and cry, and posse’. Much as the evolution of industrialisation with attendant modernisation threatened the basics of localised policing, the core virtues still remain evident and were protected jealously. Hence, even at this early stage of modernisation in Europe, the basic weapon that the citizens still engaged in defending their security and combat danger ‘was their intense sociability – a complex of human relations and institutions predicating on

collective, local, informal and voluntary reactions to disorder and law breaking.\textsuperscript{22}

The import of this comparative historical sojourn is not just to appreciate the dynamics of community policing, but to highlight the fact that as a concept and by origin, policing has always been a communal duty, and a common denominator among countries with the best Police Forces across the world is the community oriented and citizens –driven policing framework they have emplaced and retained. In essence, community policing entails building community trust; engagement of the diverse policed community in identifying and prioritizing threats, and developing crime control and community safety strategies; and partnering to implement and re-evaluate the strategies. In essence, community policing is built on trust – mutual trust between the police and the community; engagement – socialisation between the police and the community towards threats assessment; and partnership between the community and the police towards attaining the common objective of community safety. Much as these constitute the basic ingredients of community policing, it needs be emphasised that there is no universal model of the practice that is applicable in all policing climes.

The approach, therefore, is to recognise the basic principles while adapting and adopting the variations to suit the peculiar policing environment of a nation. In essence, community policing practice must be sensitive and adaptable to the peculiar historical, cultural, economic, and crime realities of the policed community. By implication, even within a country, variations of the mode of implementation may be vital to effective implementation and desired crime control outcomes. This is even more critical in a nation as Nigeria with varied cultural and communal values and varied geo-located threats.

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid
**Concept of Community Policing:**

The 2008 Presidential Committee on Police Reform defines community policing as a straightforward concept of shared responsibility between the police and the community with a focus on provision of efficient and effective service. According to Bayley, “community policing is based on the fact that the ability of the police to control crime through law enforcement based exclusively on their own resources is limited”\(^{23}\). Funding, therefore, provides a pragmatic and compelling reason to pursue a community policing strategy. Generally, because of competing demands on public funds for health, roads, defence, energy, schools, portable water etc, government alone may not be able to meet all the needs of its security agencies; hence the need for partnership, which is emphasized in community policing.

In addition, police need to have information from the public in order to deter crime. Accordingly, if the public does not report crime, the police cannot take action against it. The public can also provide information about conditions that lead to crime in their communities, enabling the police to focus their crime prevention on people, places and situations. Indeed, the concept of intelligence-led policing is fundamentally hinged on the Community Policing Model. This is to the effect that human sources often referred to in intelligence parlance and Human Intelligence (HUMINT) still represents the most potent source of criminal intelligence. Hence, engaging community policing principles will create positive conditions that will engender trust and seamless exchange of information between the community and their police.

**Characteristics of Community Policing**

Effective community policing will, according to Austin Iwar, evidence the following key principles\(^{24}\):
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\(^{24}\) Austin Iwar, Essay on ‘Implementing Community Policing in Nigeria’
i. **Visibility and Accessibility** which encourages high visibility patrols, ordinarily on foot to interact with the public, gain the confidence and cooperation of citizens, and develop local knowledge. The aim of patrol activity is to be preventive and to provide public reassurance, therefore it must be directed and focused on clear objectives, and the demeanour of patrol officers must be civil enough to give citizens confidence to approach and to seek police assistance.

ii. **Community Consultation, Cooperation and Interdependency** which emphasizes that the police collaborate with the public at large in identifying and prioritizing community needs; work in partnership to devise and implement agreed solutions to identified problems; and the community actively engaged in the policing role through volunteer schemes, initiating neighbourhood support networks and augmenting police patrol activities.

iii. **Multi-Agency Collaboration** which presupposes that the Police should recognize that no statutory (or voluntary) body can make a meaningful impact on social problems if it acts in isolation. Hence, the police must evolve frameworks for liaising and working together with other statutory agencies and voluntary organizations in addressing crime and other disturbances to public tranquility.

iv. **Proactive Policing** – This provides that the underlying causes of crime, incidents and public complaints should be constantly analysed, threats projected, community enlightened and the police adopt a systematic and integrated problem-solving approach with a view to reducing and preventing such incidents. In this regard, perception and actuality should be treated with equal seriousness (e.g. the ‘fear of crime’; public perception of police integrity and competence);

v. **Accountability** – This principle encourages police managers to be open and accountable about policies, strategies, operations and decisions affecting the community they are engaged to police. It also proposes that all police personnel are accountable for their professional
and personal standards and for the treatment of citizens. In furtherance to this, frameworks for monitoring and evaluating policing effectiveness should be emplaced and made open to public scrutiny while a clear procedure for redress of grievances against police action by citizens should also be emplaced, publicized and feedback mechanism assured.

vi. Quality Police Service Delivery - Standards of service delivery must be measurable; testing objectives set for operational performance and public satisfaction and the police should develop a culture of service excellence.

Against these principles, community policing embraces a number of values including the respect for and protection of human rights; transparency and openness in relation to activities and relationships within and outside the police organization; demonstrable commitment at all times to deliver the best possible service; empowerment of all police personnel to make appropriate decisions and thereby facilitate a speedy delivery of quality service; willingness to seek for, listen to and act upon public opinion relating to policing priorities; accountability, where the police are properly answerable for what they do, and assurance that citizens with a grievance against the police have effective communication channels and redress.

Imperative of Police-Public Trust and Partnership

The imperative of partnership between the police and the public was underscored by the Principle of Law Enforcement articulated by Robert Peel, the pioneer Chief of London Metropolitan Police in 1829. Of the nine statements advanced in the Principles, five directly emphasize the importance of public consent, trust, and collaboration. Principle two, for instance, states that ‘the ability of the police to perform their duties is dependent upon public approval of police existence, actions, behavior and the ability of the police to

secure and maintain public respect’, while principle three highlights the imperative of the police to, of necessity, secure the willing cooperation of the public in voluntary observance of the law to be able to secure and maintain public respect. Principle four notes that the degree of cooperation of the public that can be secured diminishes, proportionately, to the necessity for the use of physical force and compulsion in achieving police objectives. This is in reference to police conducts that could negatively impact on the legitimacy of the police, negatively affect community trust and endanger effective police-community partnership.

Principle five highlights strategies that could be engaged to strengthen the bond between the police and the community. It observes that the police seek and preserve public favor, not by catering to public opinion, but by constantly demonstrating absolutely impartial service to the law, in complete independence of policy, and without regard to the justice or injustice of the substance of individual laws; by ready offering of individual service and friendship to all members of society without regard to their race or social standing, by ready exercise of courtesy and friendly good humour; and by ready offering of individual sacrifice in protecting and preserving life. Principle seven emphatically states that the police at all times should maintain a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historic tradition that the police are the public and the public are the police; the police are the only members of the public who are paid to give full-time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen in the intent of the community welfare.

In further underscoring the strategic importance of police legitimacy and community partnership in modern policing, the Task Force on 21st Century Policing initiative of the government of United States notes that trust between law enforcement agencies and the people they protect is key to the stability of communities, the integrity of the criminal justice system, and safe and effective policing service delivery. The Task Force also notes in its Final Report that building trust and nurturing legitimacy on both sides of the police/citizen divide is the foundational principle underlying the nature of
relations between law enforcement agencies and the communities they serve and that the public confers legitimacy only on those whom they believe are acting in procedurally just ways\(^\text{26}\). In addition, law enforcement actors cannot build community trust if they are seen or perceived as an occupying or hostile Force coming in from outside or evolving from within the community to impose control on the community without the policed populace’s consent and input. This observation is germane to the policing realities in Nigeria.

Within the Nigerian internal security space, the imperative of Community Policing Model was highlighted in Paragraph 5.26 (i-iv) of the Government White Paper on the Report of the Presidential Committee on Police Reform (April, 2008) which states that “There is need to adapt community policing to suit Nigeria’s peculiarities. Government should formulate a Community Policing Policy and Framework for the country, taking into account our cultural and political environment”.

The report further requests that ‘all police officers should undergo training in the basic philosophy and practice of community policing and that the principle of community policing should be included in the curricular of all police training institutions”. In accepting these recommendations, the Federal Government in the White Paper directed that “The police should establish effective police-community linkages from the lowest to the highest levels to ensure the implementation of crime prevention strategies and policing priorities of the various communities”.

These recommendations summarily emphasize the imperative of police’s integration into the community it serves and in responding to the needs of that community, and the community participating in its policing and supporting its police. One of the main enablers of public partnership is the development and strengthening of Police Community Relations Committees (PCRC) and various Neighbourhood Watch schemes (Vigilante groups).

The implementation of the Nigerian Community Policing Project

While the Federal Government and successive police leadership, particularly since the restoration of democratic values in Nigeria in 1999 have acknowledged Community Policing as the most veritable policing model for the country, it must be emphasized both the then Ministry of Police Affairs (now Ministry of Interior) and the Police have been working to develop a Community Policing Policy and Framework. However, it is recognized that a successful transition from philosophy to operational practice of Community Policing with the Police calls for fundamental changes in the structure and culture of the Nigeria police.

Substantial progress has also been made in this direction with more than a hundred thousand police officers sensitized while many have undergone Community Oriented Policing both within and outside the country across all ranks covering senior officers, divisional managers, beat duty officers, divisional intelligence officers among others. In addition, the concept of community policing has already been included in the new police training curricular.

To facilitate the implementation of the Nigerian Community Policing Project, the British Department of International Development (DFID) in 2003, through its Security, Justice and Growth (SJG) Programme, facilitated a study tour of seven police officers to the United Kingdom (UK) to examine examples of community policing in that country. Other study tours facilitated by MacArthur Foundation were undertaken in the Houston Police Department, US. On their return to Nigeria, these officers were formed into a Community Policing Project Team, with the full support of the then Inspector-General of Police (IGP)\textsuperscript{27}. The Project Team developed a Community Policing Project Plan (2004) with the following aims:

- To facilitate the development of community policing throughout Nigeria; and

\textsuperscript{27} Austin Iwar, Essay on ‘Implementing Community Policing In Nigeria’
To examine the policies, strategies, structures and organization of the Nigeria Police, to ensure that the applicable principles and core values of community policing are enshrined in the professional performance, ethics and codes of conduct of the Nigeria Police.

In addition to improving police community relations and developing the enabling environment for joint problem solving, the second aim of the project was meant to enable a total transformation of the Force. Thus, the Project Plan had six major elements that were interrelated and formed the bedrock of the Nigerian model of community policing. These elements were:

- Manage and deliver an awareness, sensitization and information sharing campaign on community policing;
- Implement community policing training for officers in the States;
- Examine and develop current organizational structures to drive community policing;
- Examine and develop the current training and development function;
- Develop an intelligence-led policing style, including new technology and science; and
- Examine laws, police processes and procedures.

The Inspector General of Police at the time and the Secretary to the Federal Government both formally launched the Community Policing Project in Enugu State in April 2004. The Project Team then commenced a programme of multi-rank sensitization workshops for police personnel at federal and state levels (5000 participants attended these series of workshops) and trained more than 50 Community Policing Developers (CPDs). These CPD officers were then deployed to targeted divisions in Enugu to launch a programme geared to change attitudes and behaviours within both police station personnel and surrounding communities. Following an assessment of the programme in Enugu State, in 2005, the IGP Sunday Ehindero approved an extension of the community policing pilot to cover five more states comprising Benue, Jigawa, Kano, Ondo and Ogun.
The SJG Programme focused its development activities on five key areas in the States: NPF service delivery, police-community partnerships, accountability of the NPF, empowerment of NPF personnel, and problem solving. This development included the appropriate involvement of Nigeria’s Informal Policing Structures (IPS – Neighbourhood Watch) in the five key areas.

**Community Policing in Practice: Models Across Africa**

It might be helpful to draw inferences from citizens-driven policing models in other parts of the world that have experienced security challenges peculiar to ours in order to drive home the essence and effect of the practice as a potent internal security management model. In Kenya, faced with the challenge of cattle rustling, two villages formed a joint security system. They selected a ‘Commandant’ and an Assistant, and hired five police reservists. Some citizens donated vehicles and other kits while the communities contributed to pay them little stipends. The Police reservists worked alongside Rangers employed by large scale Ranchers to repel cattle raiding, while the Kenya Police established a radio connection with the reservists and daily monitored and regulated their activities. Following these moves, cattle rustling declined remarkably in the affected localities.\(^{28}\)

In South Sudan, a Market Association in Yei arranged with the Police that when any trader is arrested for any compoundable crime, he or she is handed over to the Association. The Market Association resolves the issue and report their resolution to the Police. This arrangement has been successful in preventing escalation of relatively low-level disputes thereby reducing the burden on the Police and the Criminal Justice System. In Uganda, another work-based organization, the Taxi Drivers Association has an agreement with the Police that allows the association to police taxi and bus services.
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parks in respect of traffic offences, pickpockets, and other disputes between drivers and passengers, while exchanging criminal intelligence with the Police. The Police, on their part, offer the association’s members training in crime control and prevention. In Sierra Leone, some communities in the South have established mechanisms for the peaceful resolution of conflicts. The Bo Peace and Reconciliation Movement (BPRM) is a coalition of 11 community groups working on peace building, reconciliation and crime prevention in the Bo District in partnership with the local police. Its twenty Local Peace Monitors have resolved many conflicts such as family matters, fighting, land cases and leadership issues. They handled 255 cases in 2014 and their work has reduced communal conflict and litigation in the local courts, and helped many ex-combatants reintegrate into the communities. BPRM’s success has earned it the commendation of the Provincial Administration in Bo. Similar citizens-driven crime management arrangements exist in Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Rwanda and Liberia, while a Corporate Sector-driven model operates in South Africa. Back home in Nigeria, historically, our revered traditional institutions are known to be strong social control actors who have been deploying their grassroots reach and time-tested cultural frameworks for information collection and dissemination, crime detection, and dispute resolution at community level. Their strong knowledge of history, culture, norms and customary practices as well as their reverence by their subjects are vital assets that could be tapped into to engender community – driven policing and address local and national crime and security challenges. Aside this, there is an ingenuous model of community-driven crime management initiative that is noticeable in Plateau State. At the peak of the Jos crises, a community security arrangement in
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which Christians were engaged to secure their Muslim brothers and sisters
during Juma’at Prayers and Muslim brothers providing security for Christian
brethren on Sunday Church services was emplaced in partnership with the
local police. In presenting a united inter-faith and inter-ethnic front to confront
a common enemy, this innovative community policing security model became
potent in the management of the security challenges on the Plateau.

Even more significant is the Citizens-driven internal security model in
the North-East geo-political Zone of Nigeria where youths with the support of
different components of the local community, volunteered to complement the
State by forming themselves into Vigilante and Community Defence Bodies to
defend their communities against terror attacks. The strength of the ‘Civilian
JTF’ as they are popularly called, lies not in the sophistication of their firearms,
training or pecuniary benefits, but in their exceptional courage, exemplary
passion for their communities, and advantage of full understanding of the
topography of their communities. The ‘Civilian JTF’ also draw strength from
their knowledge of the local population such that they can easily identify and
isolate strangers and locals linked to terrorism and other crimes. Furthermore,
they have ability to generate quality criminal intelligence that is vital to crime
management and the war on terrorism. Fighting arm-in-arm with the Military
and complementing the anti-crime functions of the local Police, these non-
state policing actors have proven to be vital assets whose names will be
written in gold when the counterterrorism story of this nation will be
documented.

**Nigeria Police and Community Trust: Militating Factors:**

Trust is central to the effective implementation of community policing
model in every community. Within the Nigerian Policing space, however, a
number of factors militate against the cultivation of community trust in the
Police Force. As espoused by Robert Peel and the Task Force on 21st
Century Policing, it is also recognised within the Nigerian Policing space that
police efficiency is dependent on citizens’ approval of their existence, actions and behaviour. Unfortunately, one of the problems encountered by the police in Nigeria since British colonial rulers established the first police force in 1861 in Lagos is the lack of approval of police existence, actions and behaviours by significant sectors of the society. In essence, the police are not trusted neither is there a strong partnership between the citizens and the police in Nigeria. Several factors explain this state of affairs and they can can be discussed under Historical, policing structure/principles, Legal, Institutional, The Law Enforcement Illiteracy Gap and Political/Policy factors.

Historical Factors – Researchers on policing in Nigeria have argued that the circumstance in which the police emerged in the country constituted the foundation of distrust between the police and the community. The argument is that the origin of the the Nigeria Police is linked to the unpalatable history of colonial subjugation of the local communities in the country. The Police, according to Tamuno31 and Alemika32 was introduced to the Nigerian territories that were occupied by the colonial rulers to promote their interests of exploiting and oppressing the indigenous peoples. Chukwuma33, also notes that the primary purpose of the police during this time was to advance the economic and political agenda of the colonizers. This was achieved by deploying the police in early times in the brutal subjugation of communities and the suppression of resistance to colonial rule.

The use of violence and repression from the beginning of the colonial era, marked a dislocation in the relationship between the police and local

communities, which has characterized law enforcement practices in Nigeria ever since. Against this historical background of its evolution, the Nigeria Police is not generally seen as a product of the consent of citizens of Nigeria, accepted as reflective of their values and expectations, or embraced as a friendly Force with the right orientation to protect their interests.

Policing Structure and Principles - The Nigeria Police is a national police agency established under Sec. 214 of the Constitution for the Nigerian Federation. The Constitution provides that there shall not be any other police Force for the country aside the Nigeria Police Force. Scholars and public analysts have argued that granted our ethno-cultural diversities, the principle that underlie the existence and operation of the Police in Nigeria is insensitive to the diversities within the country and as such, does not engender the effective implementation of community policing model. Under this policing framework, it is argued that the locals naturally find it difficult to relate with and build trust in such a police unit which they assume is alien to them. Conversely, the police officer may struggle to understand the language of the locals, integrate with them or appreciate their sensitivities in contrast to the principles of community policing and makes police-community integration unachievable, it is posited. Indeed, advocates of State Police Model often build their arguments on this line of thought. It is noteworthy also that the Report of the 21st Century Policing Task Force reflected on this scenario as it relates to the United States policing space.

Others authorities have, however, argued that the structure of policing does not constitute an impediment, rather, the orientation and principle that drive policing in the country are the main impediments as such are not community policing centred. Hence, most police officers are not schooled or grounded on the job on the principles and practice of community policing as a law enforcement model. This School of Thought argues that Community Policing is not about who the police actors are within a local community, but about how such police detachments understand their functions, perform their functions, understand their community and integrate the community they
police into the broad strategies engaged in the discharge of their functions. They submit that if the principles and practice of Community Policing are fully integrated into the Police Institution and their operations, and all police officers are socialised into the theory and practice of community policing right at Police training institutions and on the job, any police manager can implement the tenets within any environment with excellent community safety outcome.

Whatever line of the intellectual debate one tilts towards, what is not debatable is the reality that community policing is driven by trust between the local police and the community, and the conduct of the local police determines the extent and strength of such trust. By implication, it is possible that a police detachment populated by officers and men drawn from within the policed locality may not necessarily retain the trust of the community nor secure their willing partnership in crime control functions if such personnel conduct themselves in unprofessional manner towards the community members. Conversely, a local police detachment that is populated by officers and men deployed from other parts of the country, may retain the trust and willing partnership of the policed community if the police personnel demonstrate professionalism and manifest deep knowledge of the principles and practice of community policing within the policed community in the discharge of their Mandate.

This raises questions on the orientation and depth of professional knowledge of police personnel in relation to galvanising their publics as a strategic approach to their public safety and crime management functions. Rather than debating the origin question in terms of deployment of police personnel within the context of community policing, therefore, the debate is best if it is centred on ways of enhancing the professional capacity and deep knowledge gap that is evident in the Nigeria Police as currently evidenced in the area of strategic police management.

*Legal Factors* – The duty of the Police is to enforce the law. Unfortunately, some of these laws as well as the legal powers extended to the police towards enforcing such laws may be inimical to effective police-community relationship
to the extent that they may not be laws that are favourable to the citizens. For instance, in the event of civil protests, the law provides that police should respond in a manner that will prevent breakdown in law and order or threat to public peace. This, at times may warrant the deployment of tactics or weaponry which will pitch the police against the citizens and widen the police-community gap.

Beyond this, as the ‘specialist repositories for state's monopolisation of legitimate force’ which also legally enjoys other powers including power of criminal prosecution, arrest with or without warrant, stop and search, and power to detain (which manifests in custodial violence), studies have shown that there is a correlation between the nature of police power, how it is exercised, and miscarriages of justice which often engender public distrust of the Police\(^\text{34}\).

*Institutional Factors* – This deals with the lack of required resources and skills to ensure the efficiency of the police. Efficiency is a critical factor in developing and sustaining confidence in the police. Sources of inefficiency by the Nigeria Police Force include huge gap between required and provided human and non-human resources made available to the police; management and operational incompetency; poor remuneration and conditions of service; misconduct by some officers, and unrelenting criticisms of the police by the public which demoralise the police and creates what Chan defines as the ‘*siege mentality*’ or the ‘*we and them*’ disposition of the police towards the citizen. Associated with these is the public perception of corruption within the police system\(^\text{35}\).

*The Law Enforcement literacy Gap* – Viewed from the police lenses and from practical experience, there is a widespread knowledge gap of the law and
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policing in Nigeria. Many citizens do not understand the law and the functions and powers of the police and crime control processes. Therefore, enforcement of certain laws is considered an unacceptable action on the part of the police. Further, many citizens expect the police to act on any complaints brought to the Force with dispatch, irrespective of the nature of the allegations, some of which do not constitute breach of criminal law. When police decline, such persons accused police of corruption or ineffectiveness and retain such perception in their relationship with the police.

**Political/Policy Factor** – A major factor that sustains the trust gap between the police and the public is the inability of the country to introduce required reforms for the reorientation of the inherited police forces to serve the interests of the generality of the citizens. In consequence, there is no national policy framework defining the principles of policing and pathways to strengthening public trust and partnership between the police and the citizens 57 years after independence and in the 87 years' history of Nigeria Police Force as presently constituted.

**Conclusion:**

Community Policing is, historically, the rock upon which policing and internal security management rests. However, to give a sustainable effect to the Model within the Nigerian security space, there is the need to evolve a National Internal Security Policy that will recognise and adopt Community Policing as the internal security model of the country and clearly lay out implementation strategies. The Policy framework will define pathways for the attainment of the community policing initiative, define specific roles of all strategic community actors as well as the law enforcement community component and also clearly define the interrelationships and obligations of each of the actors. In addition, the Policy should ensure the integration of community policing modules into the training curricula of the police and other law enforcement agencies while evolving structures to support implementation.
Finally, to the extent that trust is vital to seamless police-community partnership the Federal Government needs to address issues inhibiting trust between the police and their publics, for until those factors that accentuate distrust between the police and the community are addressed through sets of conscious initiatives, the practice of community policing in Nigeria as an internal security management model may remain a mirage.

In drawing this lecture to a conclusion, permit me to leave you with a poser. “To what extent will the establishment of state police advance the concept of community policing and internal security in a Nigeria of the future”? I challenge this rich collection of strategic leaders to, as part of your intellectual engagement of the theme of national security and community policing, dissect in the most intellectual manner this poser as your thoughts shall, undoubtedly enrich the current national discourse on state police and internal security while also shaping the future of Nigeria’s internal security architecture.

I thank you all for your attention.
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