Reinforcing the Human Security Responsibility Framework for Violence Prevention and Enthronement of Peaceful Co-Existence in Nigeria

[1]**Fie David Dan-Woniowei**
& [2]**Preye Kuro Inokoba**

[1&2]*Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences Niger Delta University, Wilberforce Island, Bayelsa State.*

Keywords:
Human security,
Violence prevention,
Peaceful co-existence,
Nigeria.

Corresponding Author:
Fie David Dan-Woniowei

Abstract

Nigeria's quest for peaceful co-existence between and among its diverse ethnic nationalities is seriously threatened by protracted violence and extreme cases of human insecurity across the country in recent years. It is true that violence in its entirety cannot be totally eliminated in human society, but it can be prevented by any responsible State. The view of this article, also, is that the extreme violence cascading Nigeria, which makes it impossible to actualize its desired peaceful co-existence among the culturally diverse communities can be prevented. However, the article asserts that peaceful co-existence can only be possible in Nigeria, if she would be willing and determined to reinforce the human security responsibility framework (HSRF) into its governance imperative. The HSRF is a people-centered, comprehensive, context-specific and violence prevention-oriented mechanism to foster peace, and engender development especially, in developing countries such as Nigeria. The adoption of the HSRF in this article, further reinvigorates the United Nations (UN) General Assembly Resolution 66/290, as a wakeup call on Nigeria to quickly identify and address the widespread and cross-cutting challenges of the survival, livelihood, and dignity of its people. Going further, the article argues that much had not been achieved in Nigeria regarding the promotion of a people-centered, comprehensive, and context-specific, as well as violence prevention-oriented policies targeted at engendering peaceful co-existence in the country. It stems the arguments on the recent incidences of violence across the country that have serious implication on the HSRF, and by extension, the desired peaceful co-existence of its diverse ethnic nationalities. The article, therefore, concludes that Nigeria should adopt the HSRF to safeguard the people and communities' vital freedom, including freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom from indignity in order to achieve her most desired peaceful co-existence among the different ethnic nationalities, clamoured by the operators of the Nigerian State in every democratic dispensation.

Background to the Study

Nigeria's desire to enthrone peaceful co-existence of its over two hundred and fifty ethnic nationalities has been challenged continually, by violent human security threats of extreme dimension since transition from military rule to democracy in 1999 (Aliyu, 2022; Itumo, Udeuhele & Aro, 2017; Onuoha, 2011), which includes the militant agitations in the Niger Delta, the Biafra separatist agitations and killings in the East, and the Oodua separatist agitations and killings in the West, as well as, the Boko Haram insurgency, herders and farmers' clashes, kidnappings, banditry, killings in the North, among others (Chinwokwu & Michael, 2019; Itumo, Udeuhele & Aro, 2017; Ezemenaka & Prouza, 2016). The plethora of such violent human security events across the country assumed an incredible dimension, particularly from the build-up of the 2015 general elections, and have since then, continued to negate the notion of the 'non-negotiable unity of the country', or its variant, 'peaceful co-existence' of the diverse ethnic nationalities (Omilusi, 2020). This is particularly, in the manner in which some human security issues are being handled by the government and its security agencies in the country (Omilusi, 2020; Chinwokwu & Michael, 2019). It generates quite a lot of uncertainty in the minds of most of the ethnic nationalities or communities to question the rationale for living together peacefully as one indivisible nation called Nigeria.

Nigeria's quest for peaceful co-existence of its diverse ethnic nationalities and communities started right after independence from Britain in 1960. It suffices to state that the kind of peaceful co-existence pursued since then by the ruling class has been a mirage. The reasons are not farfetched. Some scholars and public analysts have put the blame on bad governance and its manifestations, such as inequality, injustice, unemployment, and poverty, mutual distrust, deprivation, discrimination, and depression, among others (Adegbami & Adeoye, 2021; Akinrinde & Damola, 2018), and climate change, as well as, migration, among others (Tarif, 2022; Olagunju et al. 2021; Werz & Colney, 2012). Couple with that, is political leadership failure driven by self-interest and other primordial considerations over and above public interest (Yagboyaju & Akinola, 2019). Going further, it was traced to abuse and misuse of ethnicity and religion, as well as, how such, and related cleavages are being manipulated by the political elites in order to gain access to power (Izueke, Okoli, & Nzekwe, 2014).

In that light, this study, argues that the prevalence of the numerous violent human security threats in Nigeria have close link with the divisive tendencies of ethnicity, tribalism, religious bigotry, and nepotistic cleavages, among others, which the ruling few exploits for their selfish interest against the interest of the vast majority of Nigerians. It, also, asserts that such an attitude of the ruling few negates the country's unity, or its collective existence and development. More that, it has continued to pull the strings of the non-negotiable unity of the ethnic nationalities and communities apart more than ever before in the country's history. The series of the violent agitations and events across the country are clear indication of the existential realities.

Nevertheless, the operators of the Nigerian state and its institutions have not relented in making efforts to galvanize the diverse people and communities to live in peace and harmony. This, the ruling few has not seized to do in almost every democratic dispensation. They vow

under Section 14 (2) (b) of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 [As Amended], to protect and promote the vital core of citizens' lives and property in the country. Undoubtedly, such oaths place a major responsibility on the government to perform its primary role of safeguarding the citizens' right to life, livelihood, survival, and dignity in the country. However, such vows since 1999 have become quite deceitful when we place the human security maladies on the frame of prevention *vis-à-vis* on peaceful co-existence of the diverse ethnic nationalities and communities (particularly, ethnic minorities) in Nigeria.

Given the magnitude of the negative impacts of extreme human security threats on peaceful co-existence in Nigeria, the academia as well as faith-based organizations (FBOs), among others have initiated various peace-building mechanisms to curb the menace in the country (Abeki & Kia, 2019; Nwanguma, 2018; Egugbo, 2016; Iduh, 2011). Nevertheless, this article reinforces the human security responsibility framework for the prevention of extremely violent human security challenges and the enthronement of peaceful co-existence of the culturally diverse people and communities in Nigeria.

Conceptual Clarifications
Human Security Responsibility Framework
The human security concept came into existence as a response to the state-centric view which shifted the reference object of security from states to individuals (Hama, 2017). The approach was largely developed by the UN after the end of the cold war (UNTFHS, 2016; Holmes, 2015; Kjaerulf & Barahona, 2010). However, its application reached a significant milestone with the adoption of the UN General Assembly Resolution 66/290 (UNGAR 66/290) on 10 September 2012 (UNTFHS, 2016), and has since evolved to mean different things to different people (Adger et al. 2014). It first appeared in the global Human Development Report (HDR) of the UN Human Development Programme (UNDP) in 1994, equating security with people and development rather than arms and territorial protection by States (Wallace, 2015). Ever since, the UN has been encouraging Member States to identify, and address all forms of threats to human survival, livelihood, and dignity of their people and communities. In fact, that report was the source of encouragement for all the UN Member States to sign, adopt, and apply the UNGAR 66/290 in order to resolve their teething human development challenges. This was significant as it was geared towards the protection of individuals in their daily lives (MCDC, 2014), against all forms of human security threats, including environmental insecurity (natural disasters), economic insecurity (economic and financial downturns, chronic and persistent poverty, food insecurity, among other), health insecurity (health pandemics – HIV/AIDS, Ebola fever, COVID-19, among others), violent extremism (violent conflicts, terrorism, banditry, kidnapping, hostage-taking), among others (Holmes, 2015; UNTFHS, 2016).

To cope with such challenges besieging the world, the UN places the burden on all Member States to engage in activities that promotes the HSRF, such as a people-centred, comprehensive, and context-specific, as well as, prevention-oriented measures that will reduce the likelihood of conflicts, and overcome obstacles of development, while, ensuring the promotion of human rights for all (UNTFHS, 2016; Kjaerulf & Barahona, 2010). In

addition, the HSRF underscores individual life and communities' safety from hunger, disease, oppression, and other harmful and disruptive activities of human daily life (Holmes, 2015). Going further, it guarantees economic security, environmental security, food security, health security, personal security, and community security, among others (Holmes, 2015). Better still, the HSRF is a comprehensive measure that comprises three basic concerns - freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom to live in dignity (UHTFHS, 2016). Here, the HSRF simply, emphasizes that State authorities should guarantee the safety, and expansion of the people and communities' vital freedoms, irrespective of the situation, place, and time its domain, or country (Johns, 2014). In addition, it actually, emphasizes that State authorities should ensure human rights protection (i.e., security of its people and communities), however, not in the form, or protection mechanisms as opposed to the security of the State conceived by the ruling class (Kjaerulf & Barahona, 2010). In all intents, and purposes, it means the protection of both the people and their communities, which requires that the State should avoid all critical and pervasive threats. What that entails, is that the measures should be directed towards empowering the citizens to take charge of their own lives. In other words, it should take into consideration the limited human activities and basic abilities (absolute needs) of the people and communities are identified, protected, as well as, promoted to engender peace and development. Most importantly, the individual and communities' freedom for survival, to livelihoods, and basic dignity, regardless of gender, race, religion, ethnicity, citizenship, party affiliation, or other distinguishing characteristics should be guaranteed (Alkire, 2003). Putting all together, the HSRF canvasses the promotion of national, regional, and global stability, as well as, engendering peace, security, justice, and sustainable development, particularly in developing countries such as Nigeria (Weller, 2014).

Nigeria's commitment to guarantee the security of her citizens' lives and communities' freedom to livelihoods, or survival, and basic dignity, regardless of gender, race, religion, ethnicity, party affiliation, or other distinguishing characteristics is not enough (Alkire, 2003), particularly in stopping the direct, structural or cultural (DSC) violence (Galtung, 2004), perpetrated by extremists in the country, such as banditry, kidnapping, maiming, and killing of people, and the destruction of property and communities, among others. This attitude lowers the citizens' potentials to live together as one indivisible country, and it amounts to government failure (Abeki & Kia, 2019; Egugbo, 2016).

Hence, this article, also underscores that Nigeria being a signatory to UNGAR 66/290, and also, as entrenched in the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, [As Amended], 1999, bestow the responsibility on the ruling class to protect the vital core of the citizens' lives, including their freedom for survival, and dignity in any part of the country without fear or favour. In particular, the Constitution recognizes the cultural, and religious composition (or the diversity of its people and communities), especially, the ethnic minorities in the north and south of the country and declared it a secular state. This measure of human security in Nigeria was to ensure that all its people live together peacefully at all times as one indivisible country, or entity without fear or favour.

However, the dimension of organized and collective crimes (Kjaerulf & Barahona, 2010), being perpetrated in the country, particularly, from 2015 and beyond, and the way and manner such human security challenges are handled raises serious concerns. Many have attributed the causes on the state of inequality created by the political leadership in Nigeria (Egugbo, 2016; Kjaerulf & Barahona, 2010). These authors, collectively, accused the political leadership for deliberately manipulating, and exploiting the poor in the country to their own advantage. In particular, Kjaerulf and Barahona (2010), blames the Nigerian state, and its social, economic, and political actors as self-serving, instead of serving the public interest, or good. In addition, the authors accuse the political class of employing violence as means to perpetrate personal gains by planting nondemocratic power structures in the country. The situation, also, was attributed to governance failure, especially when it threatens the most cherished non-negotiable unity, or peaceful co-existence of the diverse people and communities in the country (Abeki & Kia, 2019; Egugbo, 2016). Peaceful co-existence emphasizes harmonious living among the diverse people and communities in the country to foster national peace and stability, good governance, and development. In addition, it eschews all forms of human security threats (violence). However, there is a growing perception about the attitude of government regarding the wanton disregard of safety of human life and dignity, and by extension, its cherished peaceful co-existence of the diverse ethnic nationalities and communities in the country. There is, also, the perception of ethnic, tribal, religious and regional considerations, or approach employed by the ruling class in addressing the violent crises in the country; a feeling that further intensify the strings of discord, or disunity that negates the collective will of the people and communities to peacefully live together as one indivisible nation. Undoubtedly, such challenges call for further scrutiny.

Thus, the focus of this article was that peaceful co-existence can be achieved in Nigeria, if the ruling class will be willing to reinforce the HSRF. Consequently, the following propositions guided the discourse: (i) violence or conflict prevention in Nigeria is the responsibility of State authorities and agencies (Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, [As Amended], 1999); (ii) using coercion based on ethnic, tribal, religious, and regional, as well as, political party considerations as most preferred strategy in managing the human security challenges besieging the country by the ruling class, particularly those that have the potential of challenging their social, economic and political well-being (Abeki & Kia, 2019), is not in tandem with the HSRF; (iii) the political class notion of the non-negotiable unity of Nigeria is deceptive; and (iv) the dimension of the human security challenges confronting the no-negotiable unity of the country equally places greater responsibility on the Nigerian State.

Violence and Violence Prevention
Violence can be prevented, and its impact reduced (WHO, 2008; Krug et al. 2002). However, to prevent it, we must first, understand what it entails. Violence involves the use of physical force intentionally, in order to injure, abuse, damage or destroy oneself, or other person(s) or property. In addition, it is a deliberate or spontaneous destructive action undertaken against either property, or persons by a government or private individual(s) (Chaturvedi, 2006). Explicitly, the World Health Organization (WHO, 2008), defines violence as the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, or another person, or

against a group or community, which either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, mal-development, or deprivation. Krug et al. (2002), identified three broad range of human security outcomes in the definition of the WHO, namely, psychological harm, deprivation and mal development. The inclusion of these outcomes points to the fact that violence does not necessarily result in injury or death alone, but also, poses a substantial burden on individuals, families, and communities, among others (Krug et al. 2002). For example, violence against women, children and the elderly, among others results in physical, psychological and social problems that do not necessarily lead to injury, disability or death (Krug et al. 2002).

Violence can be divided into three broad categories, namely, self-directed violence (suicidal, self-abuse, self-mutilation), interpersonal violence (family and intimate partners violence – largely between family members and intimate partners, and community violence - involving individuals who are unrelated), and collective violence (social, political and economic violence – committed by large, or organized groups, or a state) (Krug et al. 2002). This category involves a wide range of actions, including but not limited to intimidation, terrorism, repression, riots, revolutions, and all other known traditional forms of warfare (Chaturvedi, 2006), which is the focus of this article. Going further, such acts of violence, or human security threats are usually, carried out with arms and other material and nonmaterial elements in order to frustrate, intimidate, or harm or cause injury, and kill, as well as destroy properties, thereby, force the weaker party to succumb, or gain victory in the struggle (Nwatu, 2018; General Dempsey, 2017).

Going by the accounts established, violence can be perpetrated against a state, or government, or party in power, ethnic or religious group, individuals, or community by aggrieved private individuals, or groups, and can as well, develop to extreme dimensions, such as insurgency, terrorism, killings, bombings, banditry, kidnapping, and hostage-taking, destruction or damage to properties, outright sacking of villages/communities, as well as, result into ethnic/religious violent crises, and farmers and herders conflicts, among others as experienced in Nigeria under the period of this study.

Notwithstanding, such carnage in Nigeria can be prevented or reduced (Krug et al. 2002). Thus, violence prevention in this study, is about stopping the occurrence of violence in the Nigerian society, and where it occurs, use various peace-building mechanisms to curb further escalation of such extreme violent events in the country. Taking such a step, is essential because it will engender the enthronement of peace and security among the diverse ethnic nationalities in the country. New approaches and capacities should also be identified and developed by the various stakeholders to deal with the cross-cutting violent human security threats, or challenges that are fast eroding the country's desire for peaceful co-existence. In other words, for Nigeria to achieve its desire for peaceful co-existence, there must be a paradigm shift, involving the creation of a strong political will by the operators of the Nigerian state, which should be devoid of any form of unwillingness based on ethnic, tribal, or religious cleavages, among others. The operators of the Nigerian state must carry out structural and institutional changes, or reforms, as well as create an effective information/communication

channel to promote and facilitate dialogue among the diverse ethnic nationalities in Nigeria. In addition, state-provoked terrorism against some sections of the Nigerian society, and the lack of political will to address the root causes of the social, political and economic violence in the country should be completely, avoided.

Peaceful Co-Existence
The concept of peaceful co-existence like many other concepts in the social sciences, may mean different thing to different people, and interpreted as such, depending on the side of the prism one look at it (Izueke et al. 2014). Notwithstanding, the desire by humans to peacefully, live together, and with the environment, has dominated, and will continue to dominate international, national and local, or community efforts in promoting the well-being of mankind and the environment. Such efforts were canvassed by China, India and Myanmar following their political independence, jointly entrenched peaceful coexistence to propel their speedy development. Consequently, they proclaimed a five-principal agenda rooted in peaceful co-existence to fast track their developmental aspirations, which include mutual respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of member states, mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality of members, and mutual benefits. The popularity of these principles and their relevance in the world could be the reason for their almost unconditional endorsement by the United Nations in its Charter. It is also important to note that the five principles of peaceful coexistence are not mere rhetoric, they have practical applicability through: (i) upholding the sanctity of sovereign equality of states, (ii) cooperation in the fight against a common problem like terrorism, (iii) acknowledging with due concern the diversity of world's economies, (iv) promoting common development of the world's economies on the basis of equality and mutual benefit, (v) promotion and maintenance of peace and security through dialogue, and (vi) recognizing and giving full scope to the important role of the United Nations and other multilateral arrangements (Izueke et al. 2014). These principles look global in nature and application yet locating them in the context of the Nigerian secular society, and the human security responsibility approach to violence prevention and peaceful co-existence can be intellectually, resounding.

Human Security Challenges and Peaceful Co-existence in Nigeria
Nigeria's desire for peaceful co-existence among its diverse ethnic nationalities, or its variant, 'non-negotiable unity of the country', proclaimed by the ruling class; continue to suffer serious setback due to ethnicity, religion, social, economic, political, and environmental considerations, among others (Abeki & Kia, 2019; Ikeke, 2015). These cleavages account for the manifestation of the various violent conflicts and events that impinge on human security across the length and breadth of the country, including the militant agitations of the South-South in response to environmental degradation and resource control, the Biafra separatist agitations and other organized criminal gang operations in the South-East, and the militant Oodua separatist agitations and other organized criminal gang operations in the South-West, as well as, the militant Islamic insurgency (Boko Haram, Islamic State in West African Province (ISWAP), and herders and farmers conflicts, as well as, other organized criminal gang operations in the North-East, North-West, and the North-Central, or Middle Belt among others (Tarif, 2022; Azad, Crawford, & Kaila, 2018). These organized groups, and

other criminal gangs engage in both regular and irregular means of warfare, and uses various other instruments of warfare (Combs, 2022). However, they never intended to win the conflict, but to intimidate and frustrate the regular security agencies (Udo, 2022). In the process, they also, engage in kidnapping and hostage taking of people for ransom, killings, and destruction of properties such as farmlands and flock, and outright sacking of villages, among others.

These activities perpetrated by such criminal elements, who takes undue advantage of the endemic ethnic biases or religious bigotries in the society to vent their evil agenda, has consistently, almost makes it impossible for Nigeria to achieve her desire for peaceful co-existence (Nwanguma, 2018). Some of the major actors and their activities across the six regions, or geo-political zones in the country are captured in Table 1.

Table 1: Human security threats across regions in Nigeria from 2015-2022.

S/N	Groups/Gang	Human Security Treat	Purpose	Region
1	Militant Islamic Groups a) Boko Haram	Insurgency	Enthronement of Islamic education/Islamic state	North-East/Lake Chad region
	b) Islamic State in West African Province (ISWAP)	Insurgency	As in 1(a)	
	c) Herdsmen/Farmers	Herders-Farmers clashes	Land grabbing/ethnic and religious chauvinism	North-Central or Middle Belt
	d) Organized criminal gangs	Violent attacks	Banditry, kidnapping, killings, self-defense, etc.	North-West, North-East, North-Central
	e) Police and other security agencies			
2	a) Indigenous people of Biafra (IPOB)	Violent agitations	Self-determination/Separation	
	b) Movement for the actualization of the sovereign state of Biafra (MASSOB)	Violent agitations	Self-determination/Separation	South-East
	c) Organized criminal gangs	Violent attacks	Killings, kidnapping, banditry, etc.	
	d)Eastern Security Network (ESN) (Ebube Agwu)/Police and other security agencies	Extra Judicial Killings/Destruction of properties villages	Security	
3	a) Ilana Omo Oodua worldwide (Yoruba self-determination group)	Violent agitations	Self-determination/Separation	
	b) Organize criminal gangs	Violent attacks	Banditry, kidnapping, killings, self-defense, etc.	South-West
	c) Western Security Network (WSN) (Amotekun)/Police and other security agencies	Extra Judicial Killings/Destruction of properties/villages	Security	
4	a) Niger Delta Avengers (NDA)	Violent agitations	Deprivation/Marginalization	
	b) Criminal gangs	Violent attacks	Oil theft, sea piracy Kidnapping/Hostage taking, self defense	South-South
	c) Police and other security agencies	Extra Judicial Killings/Destruction of properties/villages	Security	

Source: Authors' compilation 2021.

The first observation from the table was that the human security threats cover every part of Nigeria. That notwithstanding, they mostly, occur in the north, east and western zones of the country within the period. The second being the nature and dimension of the violent events, particularly, in the Middle Belt, or North-Central, South-East, and Oyo State in the South-West of the country. Couple with that, is the way State authorities selectively handle them. Though, these explanations has been vehemently, contested by the ruling class, or the President Mohammadu Buhari led APC government, as well as, many apologists of insecurity in Nigeria. Nevertheless, the truth is that President Mohammadu Buhari's administration has failed to tackle the problem of insecurity it promised the people of Nigeria in 2015. The numerous unsuccessful security operations and strategic responses of the security agencies in the country attest to the failure of the administration regarding HSRF. This is because the ruling class, or government per time, wants only to address human security threats when their social, economic and political well-being is affected, or when it has do with the welfare of their ethnic nationality and religion (Wallace, 2015). Another pointer to it, is the increasing rate of the separatist agitations and violent events across the country, which not only threaten the vital core of human security of the ethnic nationalities but questions the rationale for their continuous staying together as one indivisible entity.

Undoubtedly, such attitude and question lay credence to British colonialism, particularly, the unholy marriage of the diverse ethnic, religious, social, economic, and political entities, where the north virtually, was imposed on the rest of the country. This complex reality has continued find its way and plays significant roles in the building of political and economic structures and institutions of the country from independence till now. Sadly, the operators of the Nigerian State, even under democratic rule, vehemently, has refused to let go such attitude and practices. Consequently, this consistently, hunts and erodes the collective will of the people and communities to peacefully, live together as one indivisible entity. Nigeria's peace and stability can only be guaranteed if the ruling class will reinforce all dimensions of the human security responsibility framework.

Human Security Responsibility Framework for Peaceful Co-existence in Nigeria
The human security construct emerges as a new paradigm shift for understanding global vulnerabilities (Waller, 2015). Its emergence was based on the premise that the traditional approach to national security has become limited in addressing the world's complex security challenges on individual lives and communities (Holmes, 2015; Wallace, 2015). It underscores that the individual rather than the State should be the proper reference for security. Proponents of this people-centred view of security hold that it will engender national, regional, and global stability (UNTFHS, 2016; Waller, 2015; Wallace; 2015). In addition, the construct has become widely understood and acknowledged that peace, security, justice, and sustainable development are inherently linked and therefore, require a holistic approach for their promotion (Wallace, 2015).

However, the concept has been criticized as largely academic, vague and too encompassing in nature (Wallace, 2015). In addition, the opponents argue that human security does not assist researchers in understanding what security means or help decision-makers and practitioners

to formulate good policies and programmes (Wallace, 2015). Furthermore, the concept has been criticized as a vehicle for promoting organizational interests of certain organizations that fits their purpose since 1994 (Wallace, 2015). In addition, Wallace (2015), affirm that politically, some close associates with the notion of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) have advanced the human security paradigm in questioning the issue of national sovereignty violations at the international level, and nations that adopt it as a national goal has engendered better policy decisions.

Going by that, both sides of the argument is crystal clear in the current Nigerian situation of HSRF. Nevertheless, of such vagaries, over the years, the HSRF has been acknowledged as the most preferred tool for analysing the root causes of human security challenges and responses, particularly, threats to human life that are complex and multidimensional in nature at different levels (Kjaerulf & Barahona, 2010). In operationalizing the concept, the UN developed a set of guiding principles for Member States to adopt the approach, which among others, emphasizes that HSRF must be people-centred, multi-sectorial, comprehensive, context-specific, and prevention-oriented (Indriastuti, 2020; UNTFHS, 2016; Kumssa, & Kiriti-Nganga, 2016). Most importantly, the approach is expected to implement protectionist and empowerment-related policies. The protectionist strategy involves 'top-down', which is between State authorities and institutions, and citizens (Scolobig et al. 2015). While the empowerment aspect is 'bottom-up' driven, and focuses on developing the capacity and resilience of individuals and communities to act on their own behalf (Bonsu, Tyree Hageman, & Kele. (2020). In addition, the framework emphasizes participation in the design and implementation of solutions to ensure human security for themselves and others (Wallace, 2015). Going further, it should be pointed out that key players such as the Civil Society and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) should also, be encouraged to shield people and communities from the menaces of human security.

It is on such a pedestal that this article reinforces the HSRF for the treatment of the widespread and cross-cutting challenges of human security in Nigeria, which Holmes, (2015), and Alkire, (2003), summarized as the survival, livelihood, and dignity of the diverse people and communities to peacefully, co-exist among themselves in one indivisible country. Recognizing the fact, also, that the Nigerian State desire for its people and communities to live together in harmony, and has been taken up the responsibility in protecting and promoting the vital core of its citizens' lives; the freedom for survival, livelihood, and basic dignity, devoid of gender, race, religion, ethnicity, or any other such distinguishing characteristics (Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999 (As Amended). However, the oaths taken in each democratic dispensation has not been able to metamorphose into realizing this vital constitutional mandate from the operators of the State in securing the people and communities in Nigeria.

Conclusion
The paper reinforces the HSRF as the most preferred mechanism for violence prevention and peaceful co-existence of the diverse people and communities in Nigeria. It argues that violence of extreme dimensions with attendant human security threats, which are perpetrated

by militant Islamic groups, and separatist groups, and criminal gangs, as well as, State authorities and security agencies, has continued to erode the country's most cherished desire for peaceful co-existence, or its variant, the non-negotiable unity clamoured by the ruling class, or operators of the State and institutions in every democratic dispensation. In addition, the paper underscores that such events, and most importantly, the manner in which State authorities handles them, undermines the vital core of the people and communities' freedom, including freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom from indignity in almost every part of the country. Going further, the paper juxtaposes such attitude of the ruling class to ethnicity, tribalism, nepotism, and religious cleavages, among others, on the rationale for the diverse people and communities to live together in harmony as one indivisible entity. It concludes that such divisive tendencies exacerbated by the operators of the Nigerian State erodes the collective desire for peaceful co-existence in the country. The paper, therefor, recommends that the operators of the Nigerian state should adopt the HSRF, and implement every facet of it devoid of such divisive tendencies the national Constitution also frown at in preventing violence against human security and the enthronement of peaceful co-existence of the diverse ethnic nationalities in the country. Specifically, the operators of the Nigerian state must endeavour to stop all forms of direct structural and institutional violence on some groups of people and communities. In addition, State authorities must be willing to effect comprehensive structural and institutional reforms, as well as establish effective information/communication channels that will promote and facilitate dialogue among the diverse ethnic nationalities and address the endemic social, political and economic violence in the country.

References

Abeki, S. O. & Kia B. (2019). Violent conflicts and challenges of peacebuilding in contemporary Nigeria. *International Journal of International Relations, Mass Communication Studies*, 5(3), 23-30.

Adegbami, A. & Adeoye, J. O. (2021). Violent conflict and national development in Nigeria. *Hatfield Graduate Journal of Public Affairs*, 5(1), 9.

Adger, W. N., Pulhin, J. M., Barnett, J., Dabelko, G. D., Hovelsrud, G. K ... & Vogel, C. H. (2014). Human security. In: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectorial Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Field, C.B., Barros, V. R., Dokken, D. J., Mach, K. J., Mastrandrea, M. D., ... & White, L. L. (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 755-791.

Akinrinde, O. O. & Damola, A. I. (2018). Conflicts in Nigeria, chapter two, https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/62945758/Wukari_Published_Article202 00413-126055-l1v4pe-libre.pdf?1586827860=&response-content retrieved 2023/06/04.

Aliyu, R. (2022). Leadership, separatist/secessionist agitations and prospect for national unity in Nigeria. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, *12*(1), 63-75.

Alkire, S. (2003). *A conceptual framework for human security, 3.*

Azad, M., Crawford, E. E. & Kaila, H. K. *Conflict and violence in Nigeria: Results from the north east, north central, and south-south zones.* No. 130198. The World Bank, 2018.

Bonsu, N. O., TyreeHageman, J., & Kele, J. (2020). Beyond agenda 2030: Future-oriented mechanisms in localising the sustainable development goals (SDGs). *Sustainability*, *12*(23), 9797.

Chaturvedi, A. K. (2006). Educational printing and publishing academic's dictionary of political science. *Nigeria: EPP Books Services Nigeria LTD Corruption in Nigeria, Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia, Available at en. wikipedia.org/wiki/corruption in Nigeria. Retrieved 07/12/22.*

Chinwokwu, E. C. & Michael, C. E. (2019). Militancy and violence as a catalyst to kidnapping in Nigeria, *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, *21*(1), 17-35.

Combs, C. C. (2022). *Terrorism in the twenty-first century.* Taylor & Francis.

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, [As Amended], 1999).

Egugbo, C. C. (2016). Governance and sustainable peace in Nigeria. African research review (AFRREV), *An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal, Ethiopia 10(4),43,* 41-55.

Ezemenaka, K. E. & Prouza, J. (2016). Biafra's resurgence: State failure, insecurity and separatist agitations in Nigeria. *Central European Journal of International & Security Studies*, *10*(3).

Galtung, J. (2004). Violence, war, and their impact. On visible and invisible effects of violence. *Polylog, 5.*

Global Human Development Report (HDR) (UNDP, 1994).

Hama, H. H. (2017). State security, societal security, and human security. *Jadavpur Journal of International Relations*, *21*(1), 1-19.

Holmes, K. R. (2015). What is National Security? 2015 Index of U.S Military Strength, The Heritage Foundation, pp. 17-26.

Iduh, S. (2011). The key challenges to peace in Nigeria. *International Journal of Vocational and Technical Education*, 3(8), 121-134.

Indriastuti, S. (2020). Islamic perspective on human security: A discourse analysis. In *ICIC 2020: Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Islamic Civilization, ICIC 2020, 27th August 2020, Semarang, Indonesia*, 428, European Alliance for Innovation.

Ikeke, M. O. (2015). The ecological crisis and the principle of relationality in African philosophy, *Philosophy Study*, 5(4), 179-186.

Itumo, A., Udeuhele, G. I. & Aro, G. C. (2017). Social conflicts and insecurity in Nigeria: Where lies the future. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 55(3), 345-361.

Izueke, E. M., Okoli, F. C., & Nzekwe, I. I. (2014). Peaceful Co-existence: A tool for sustainable Development along the boundary corridor of Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(27 P1), 364.

Johns, l. (2014). A critical evaluation of the concept of human security. https://www.e-ir.info/2014/07/05/a-critical-evaluation-of-the-concept-of-human-securityretrieved 2021/09/25.

Kjaerulf, F. & Barahona, R. (2010). Preventing violence and reinforcing human security: a rights-based framework for top-down and bottom-up action. *Rev Panam Salud Publica*, 27(5), 382-95.

Krug, E. G., Mercy, J. A., Dahlberg, L. L., & Zwi, A. B. (2002). The world report on violence and health. *The lancet*, 360(9339), 1083-1088.

Kumssa, A. & Kiriti-Nganga, T. W. (2016). Human security assessment in Kenya: The case of Isiolo, Lakipia, Nandi and Elgeyo Marakwet Counties (Note 1). *Rev. Eur. Stud.*, 8, 156.

Mulata, A. K. (2017). *Managing conflicts in Africa Through Regionalism* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).

Multinational Capacity Development Campaign (MCDC) (2014).

Mulata, A. K. (2016). *Managing peace and conflict issues in Afric*a. Retrieved September 18, 2020, from http://www.africanforumscotland.com/managingpeace-and retrieved 2023/04/04.

Nwanguma, C. I. (2018). Peaceful co-existence in Nigeria: An analytical study of Christian perspective of neighbourliness. *Journal of Integrative Humanism, Ghana 9 (1)*, 144.

Nwatu, R. (2018). Electoral violence and sustainable democracy in Nigeria. *Journal of Administration*, 3(1), 43-59.

Olagunju, T. E., Adewoye, S. O., Adewoye, A. O. & Opasola, O. A. (2021). Climate change impacts on environment: Human displacement and social conflicts in Nigeria. In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* 655(1), 012072, IOP Publishing.

Omilusi, M. (2020). Endless circle of self-determination rumbling: When the stick-and-carrot strategy fails, Is Nigeria's collective journey still non-negotiable?, *Diverse Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(2), 45-58.

Onuoha, G. (2011). Contesting the space: The "New Biafra" and ethno-territorial separatism in South-Eastern Nigeria, *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 17(4), 402-422.

Scolobig, A., Prior, T., Schröter, D., Jörin, J., & Patt, A. (2015). Towards people-centred approaches for effective disaster risk management: Balancing rhetoric with reality, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 12, 202-212.

Tarif, K. (2022). *Climate change and violent conflicts in West Africa: Assessing the evidence. SIPRI Insights on Peace and Security*, No. 2022/3, February, 2022, 1-24.

Udo, A. (2022). Assessing media and security agencies relationship in governance of Niger Delta,
Nigeria. *Journal of Governance and Accountability Studies*, 2(2), 119-131.

United Nations Development Program (UNDP) (1994). *Global human development report 1994*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security (UNTFHS) (2016*). Human security handbook: An integrated approach for the realization of sustainable development goals and the priority areas of the international community and the United Nations*. United Nations System. Human Security Unit, January 2016.

Wallace, D. & Silander, D. (2015). The United Nations, international organizations and responsibility to protect. In *International Organizations and the Implementation of the Responsibility to Protect*, 9-36. Routledge.

Weller, E. (2014). *Comprehensive approach to human security*. Research report. Knowledge Platform Security and Rule of Law.

Werz, M., & Conley, L. (2012). Climate change, migration and conflict in Northwest Africa: Rising dangers and policy options across the Arc of tension. *Centre for American Progress, http://www.americanprogress.org*, 4.

World Health Organization. (2008). *Preventing violence and reducing its impact: How development agencies can help*. World Health Organization.

Yagboyaju, D. A. & Akinola, A. O. (2019). Nigerian state and the crisis of governance: A critical exposition. *Sage Open*, *9*(3), 2158244019865810.