

Historical Reflection on the Imperative of Security Sector Reform (SSR) in A Democratic Society

Iyanda Kamoru Ahmed*

Abstract

The end of Cold War heralded “Hot Peace” into the international system. Before then, people thought that the conclusion of the Cold War would bring about a lasting peace on a global scale. However, this noble aspiration was not to be—September 11, 2001, amply and—brutally demonstrated besides, the increasing wave of terrorism. Global democratization efforts brought about the end of the Cold War. People all across the world took advantage of the political space that was created to assert their individual and communal rights, sometimes using violence, as a result of the intentional action's unforeseen effects. In hindsight, the use of the state's brutal coercive power to suppress people and groups thought to hold opposing views, regardless of how beneficial those viewpoints could be, is what ultimately kept the Cold War going. However, democratization eliminated the cap. When the development donor partners and multilateral institutions realized how grave a threat this “healthy” development or situation was to democratization, they had to abandon their old support model and demand on security sector reform. Practically speaking, democracy and reform in the security sector reinforce each other. We will examine whether or not this link is true in this work and utilize the results to provide a paradigm that would support it.

Keywords: Cold war, coercive power, democratisation, democratic society, global terrorism, multilateral institutions

INTRODUCTION

All living organisms have a serious innate desire for security. Unfortunately, though, in some instances, the security of one may amount to the insecurity of another. These dynamics of security accounts for the attempts by the Nazi Germany to exterminate the Jews; the Hutus undertook the extermination of the Tutsis; the Serbs pursued cleansing policy on Albanians in Kosovo etc.

Again, in Nigeria for instance, the un-dialectical logic of security is amply reflected in what is erroneously referred to as “security votes” devoid of any accountability; not to talk of transparency. In all these examples, what has emerged is security defined in terms of realpolitik. Thus, might is right and secure. From the beginning of state formation, the security of state was the main organising

principle of security arrangements as against state of security. This state of affair was historically derived from European experience and imposed on African countries as a result of colonialism. The Thirty Years War that ravaged the whole of Europe from 1618 to 1648 and its aftermath was a precursor to the state-centric definition of security. According to Nnoli, the Treaty of Westphalia, 1648 that ended the war recognized and sanctified certain realities that emerged in the cause of the war [1]. One of these was the nation state. For the first time, a central authority emerged with the power to monopolize the use of force within certain territory

*Author for Correspondence

Iyanda Kamoru Ahmed
E-mail: ogiyanhistonet@gmail.com

Senior Lecturer, Department of History and International Studies, Federal University Gashua, Yobe State, Nigeria

Received Date: June 24, 2024
Accepted Date: September 06, 2024
Published Date: September 09, 2024

Citation: Iyanda Kamoru Ahmed. Historical Reflection on the Imperative of Security Sector Reform (SSR) in A Democratic Society. International Journal of Trends in Humanities. 2024; 1(2): 9–18p.

in relation to both internal and external forces. An army that had suppressed all local center of power and prevented any external forces from entering its territory against its wishes supported it.

Over a period of time, the state centric nature of security calculation became supercilious among the subjects of the sovereign given the backdrop of social inequality concealed in the structure of the society. This structural imbalance particularly in France crystallized in the French revolution with its aim in the triple watchword of liberty, equality and fraternity. At first by liberty the French meant security of the individual against the actions of the state; by equality they meant equality before the law and the abolition of privileges. The fraternity that was thought of was chiefly among individuals and was exemplified in many an enthusiastic gathering on the eve of 1789, where the nobles and the peasants fraternized together.

From the foregoing, and given the current realities of globalisation, order or paradigm for security has always been dynamic or in a state of flux; reflecting a particular material condition or epoch [2]. There are no abstract rules; rather, every historical era has its own set of laws. As soon as a society moves from one stage of development to the next and outlives its previous period, it also starts to be governed by new laws. In summary, economic life provides us with a phenomenon that is comparable to the history of evolution in a different field of biology.

The international system from its inception has passed from one form of order to another and such order within the international matrix cannot be said to be stable or equilibrated. Perhaps, the instability of order pioneered or engineered against the backdrop of national interest defined exclusively on geopolitical by nation-states. The most important expression of order is that it must correspond to a particular mode of production and production relations. Before the current globalisation, mankind witnessed other security models which guided the actions of states. Thus, Momah said, The order that emanated from the Treaty of Westphalia lasted for 150 years, congress of Vienna was sustained for 100 years and the international order of Cold War held out for 40 years [3].

Against all these, the current demand for a security sector reform corresponds to the search for an order in the era of globalisation characterised by democratisation. Paradigmatically, both security sector reform and democracy have a linear and mutually reinforcing relationship. We shall however investigate its appropriateness to the nascent democracies. Based on that, we shall make normative recommendations to streamline it to specific historical condition of societies. The work is divided into five sections. To follow this introduction are the various views on the concept of democracy followed by that of the security! security sector reform.

THE CONCEPT OF DEMOCRACY

The English word "democracy" comes from the Greek word "Kratos," which signifies power or authority [4]. The definition of democracy is "rule by the people," or "demos." The Greek word "Kratos," which means power or authority, is the source of the English word "democracy." Democracy is defined as "rule by the people," or "demos.". In its original construct, the people mean 'the poor' or 'the many' [5]. The content and definition of democracy have over a long period of time, been defined and operated differently by different authorities and societies. Even the most authoritarian regimes lay claim to democracy. So, we may grasp what Gricks says when he says, "In the world of public affairs, democracy is perhaps the most promiscuous word." A phrase that has no clear definition runs the risk of having no significance at all.

Some of these variegated views are expressed by the people like Joseph Schumpeter who defined it as, A political technique is an institutional arrangement that is specific to making political, legislative, and administrative decisions. It is a process wherein an individual gains the power to participate in the decision-making process through a competitive struggle for the votes of the people [6].

Besides, Karl Popper defined it as a system of government that gives the people the power to remove rulers from power and hold them accountable, as well as give the governed the means to pursue reform without resorting to violence—even when the ruler is opposed to it [7]. While contributing to the debate, Larry Diamond defined it as a form of governance that satisfies three fundamental requirements for both individuals and organized groups (particularly political parties) at regular intervals while refraining from using force, a high degree of political participation in the election of leaders and politics, at least through regular and equitable elections, guaranteeing that no significant adult social group is left out; and a degree of civil and political liberties, including the freedom of expression, the freedom of the press, and the ability to form and join organizations, sufficient to maintain the integrity of political competition and participation [8].

The above assertions are liberal orientation of democracy as they define the final rules of democracy and failed to define the rules of substantive democracy or the dividend of democracy. Indeed, liberalism is not enough to explain the basis of liberal democracy. The questions which the liberal democracy failed to address are questions such as why regular elections, free expression, and all those sundry liberal provisions. People accept these ideals in the hope for the realization of higher democratic ideals, according to BeTglund seen against this background, there is such element of communitarian dynamics which underscores its structure and historical underpinning. In this regard, a functional structure, derived from the unique historical experience of the people guarantees the ideals of democracy based on popular democracy. It is in the light of the foregoing that the tension which characterized the actual interpretation of constitutionalism and its relevance to political equality has seriously exposed what is concealed and unanswered question of liberal democracy. Again, this is an outcome of the social structure. Indeed, the protagonist of liberal democracy based on constitutionalism assumed erroneously that society is homogenous. This is dangerous to the operations and perhaps, consolidation of democracy. In a typical capitalist system, characterized by social groups, economic determinism becomes the main organizing principle for democratic consolidation. Thus, Bangura insisted on economic restructuring as a precondition for the realization of democratic ideals [9].

Indeed, it is envisaged that restructuring of the economy will mediate the imitation imposed on citizens constitutionally. For instance, in respect to constitutionalism, citizens are limited to voting and therefore opportunities for further participation are limited by access to resources which are not evenly distributed. Thus, democratically, these inherent inequalities of constitutionalism must be moderated by limiting the resources of the powerful and improving access to them for the less powerful. In this way, the thesis concurs with Rousseau's explanation of the social contract, The people of England mistakenly think they are free; they are only free while they elect members of parliament; once they are elected, the people are enslaved, and the country becomes meaningless. The English people abuse their freedom in the short time they have it, and they should be punished for it [10].

"No citizen should be rich enough to buy another and none so poor as to be forced to sell himself," he continued. The other limitation or constraint is "rolling back the state" as engineered by the agent's globalisation. The net result of this is the enthronement of unrestrained capitalism leading to inequality, and therefore lack of equity. Besides, there is choice less democracy engineered by this, and hence an entitlement capacity is obliterated. Now, entitlement acuties are the fundamental procedures and rules of resources which people must be able to draw upon in order to enjoy the opportunities to act as citizens. On the other hand, popular sovereignty or equal autonomy matched by democratic constitutionalism obviously signifies popular entitlements to legitimate power in society and therefore basic resources. Entitlement is another word for legitimate access to resources people need, if they are to be able to act as sovereign or autonomous citizens.

Thus, from the foregoing in a dependent capitalist state characterized by fractured bourgeoisie, coupled with class consciousness being endangered from such arrangement, it can hardly usher in the nines and procedure for the realization of entitlement capacities. In its place, the state has enormous

powers for the realization of capitalist interest while apparently appearing to mediate in the emerging class conflict. The state, therefore, as a capitalist machine in the mist of choice less democracy has alienated the people the more and the requirement for the national consensus and coalition building for sustainable democracy has been slaughtered. It is in this nexus that Olukoshi said; students of African traditional politics should pay greater attention to the democratic content of constitution-making and constitutional practice since it is possible to have authoritarian regimes that are rooted in constitutionalism and rule of law as such [11]. It is not enough, when we assess political developments in Africa, simply say that the actions of governments were in accordance with the constitution and the law, since the constitution itself and the law could easily become instruments of exclusion and oppression. Thus, going beyond constitutionalism, a democratically constitutional state, ensures that citizens themselves participate and decide effectively and objectively on matters of general or common concern and significance. In this situation, there should be subsidiary and functional decentralization. Indeed, matters of general and common concern would be decided at the most transcendent level.

THE CONCEPT OF SECURITY SECTOR REFORM

The concept- security is not new, in fact it has remained the central organizing principle of existence both at individual and group levels. It is a cherished concept as well as a mysterious concept. Mysterious in the sense that security of one may appear to be insecurity of another. It is in this dialectical opposite that the Nazi Germany was interested in the extermination of the Jews, the genocidal war embarked by Hums against Tutsis in Rwanda find explanations. With this justification, the Serbs start ethnically cleansing the Albanian population in Kosovo. In Nigeria Abacha caged Nigeria and Nigerians so also was the Idi Amin of Uganda.

All this portrays the assertion that security is surrounded by a self- preservation both at individual level as well group level. It is significant to note that the Federal Republic of Nigeria's 1999 Constitution addresses security issues under section 217. The creation and makeup of the federation's armed forces are covered in Section 217 (1). These forces would be made up of the Nigerian Navy, the Army, and any other branches of the government that may be created by a National Assembly Act. Section 217(2) states that, subject to a National Assembly Act to that end, the Federal shall maintain and equip the armed forces as may be deemed suitable and efficient for the goal of:

- a. Protecting Nigeria from foreign invasion.
- b. Preserving its borders' security against encroachment from the air, sea, or land.
- c. Repressing rebellion and assisting civil authorities in restoring order when requested by the president, subject to any restrictions imposed by a National Assembly Act;
- d. Fulfilling any duties as required. may be mandated by a National Assembly Act.

In this nexus, the Nigerian Constitution adopted the West phalanx approach to security which is exclusively strategic at the detriment of the non- strategic variables which is more encompassing and its neglect, more threatening to the overall security calculation and endeavors.

According to the aforementioned, conventional security doctrine only considered the strategic variable that was seen as the defense of a state's essential interests or core values, which are the maintenance of a state's political independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity, all of which can only be achieved through the use of military force. This is the basis in which in classical terms, military might is overwhelmingly considered as the exclusive instrument for guaranteeing security of the state. This historically derived security doctrine over a period of time has been subjected to critical concerns. For instance, it assumed that the state is homogenous and therefore ignored other contending issues or elements which as well have linear and proportional relationship with national security. By emphasizing the security of the state, the Westphalia security doctrine does not take into account the possibilities of demand for security from elements within the state, as well as the international community as a whole. By predicating security on the state, it not only ignores these demands for security but also legitimizes the state politically and morally, building an aura of mystique around it that reifies it and makes it look

like a system divorced from the interests of individuals within the state. When such a clash occurs it automatically privileges the security of the state over the other security demands and, worse still, assigns a negative value to the later, it still holds to the belief that conflicts, which threaten security occur mainly between states. The internal dynamics that may threaten the state are left out of analysis.

In this regard, a threat to national security should be seen to include an action, conduct undertaking which threatens any element of national power. It includes actions that degrade, reduce or marginalize the quality of life of the people. The reliance on military powers by the conventional security advocates fails to see that a state can exist without the military. For instance, Japan after World War II was demilitarized. She got her key military establishment disbanded completely in compliance to Article of Japanese post World War II Constitution which forbade the Japanese nation from ever again building a war capacity. All these were conscious efforts to redirect her resources into productive uses. Thus, the money that could have been spent on military purposes was directed to education, industrialization through the development of Research and Development (R&D) and infrastructural development.

Again, Switzerland has maintained neutrality in terms of international politics and has not gotten entangled with belligerence in any war or conflict situation. She recently marked her 50-year anniversary of surviving as an independent sovereign country without a standing army. One time as a sovereign nation, Tanzania disbanded her military completely. It is -also interesting note that Costa the seat of Inter- America Court of Human Rights and seat of the United Nations University of Peace has no standing military, courtesy of 1949 Costa Rica Constitution.

Since the army attempted coup of 1981, the Dominican Republic has no standing army. Since America led the invasion of Grenada in 1983, the country has no standing army. Haiti army disbanded in 1995 other countries without standing armies include: Maldives, Mauritius since 1968, Panama since 1990 when she abolished the army, San Marino, Solomon Island, Tavalu, Vanuatu, Saint Kith and Nevis, Liechtenstein. However, in the case of Japan, it was only in 1976 that the then Prime Minister Miki got a constitutional amendment to establish a small defense force spending limited to 1% of the countries GNP. The implication of this incontrovertible assertion is that elements of power could be both integrative as well as disintegrative relative to the level of exploitation. In other words an unexploited variable could endanger security threat. Developmentally, security has been equated to development. According to McNamara (1968), "security is development and there can be no security without development." In this sense, progress and security are complementary [12]. Perhaps, the realization of the mutuality between development and security made Africa Leadership Forum (1992), to articulate the new orientation.

Thus, it is the belief of the new thinking that security should be more comprehensive as to include strategic and non- strategic variables. This was emphasized by Oberg (1984) particularly relative to mobilization in terms of national crisis. He argued that effective security measures can also be directed to intangible variables or even ideational things like lifestyle, ideology, culture, freedom, identity, the protection of nature etc. He further articulated that individuals who are not satisfied with the basic human needs are not secure and thus potential threat to. National security. Thus, security is seen as electrostatic force that binds all the elements and groups in a social system together. Since the idea of security ties people, nations, and the international system together so strongly, it must be approached from a holistic angle. While personal security, national security, and international security all make some sense. In their own right, a full understanding of each can only be gained if it is related to the other two. Attempt to treat security on a single level invites serious distortion of perspectives.

Using the integrated approach or grand- strategy for the overall security calculus has multiplier effects on all the sectors and segments of society. Barney and others harmonized the relationship when they argued that security properly understood is not exclusive reliance on military security against foreign invasion but also domestic order, food security, national disaster security, etc. The notion of

security needs to change from a singular emphasis on national security to one that also considers food, employment, and environmental security, as well as security via human development rather than weapons. The United Nations Development Programmed Report articulated this integrationist approach through functional human development. Integrating all these variables reveals that the greatest threat to national security particularly in a dependent and fractured capitalist state like Nigeria is under development manifesting itself in the rising unemployment and underemployment, inequality, poverty, reflecting the structural imbalance in the distribution of socio-economic goods [13].

The scenario as it were underscoring the incessant threats of the Niger-Delta region of the neo-colonial Nigerian state and besides has impacted negatively on the overall policy of the state. Indeed, the economy is the fundamental basis of security. The current American hegemony in the world affair is a reflection of her economic power which she started to assert with the famous Monroe Doctrine a declaration which steadily warned European powers that United States will not tolerate their interference or intervention in the areas of American spheres of influence. She went further to demonstrate her economic buoyancy through the Marshall Aid Plan and also aided the establishment of multilateral institutions like World Baric and International Monetary Fund (IMF). This underscores Powell's assertion that historically, the robustness of the American economy has made it possible to allocate considerable funds towards research and development. As a result, Americans now possess better technology, which greatly enhances our ability to discourage others during a crisis, while advancing our combat efficiency in war maintaining this technological advance remains a critical concern of senior American Military Commanders.

A like manner and prior to American hegemonic ascendancy, tile hegemony of Britain occurred when she was a leading world economic power. The virility and effectiveness of a nation's foreign policy is a reflection of the total buoyancy of her political economy. The epoch hegemony of British occurred when she was a leading World economy. Britain survived politically during the World War II but was economically shattered and hence abandonment and liquidation of her international obligations starting with Greece. In repudiating exclusive reliance on strategic variable of security, based on sovereignty Obasanjo said, an urgent security need is a redefinition of the concept security and sovereignty [14]. We must, for example, inquire as to why sovereignty appears to bestow total impunity upon any government that, for political, religious, cultural, or social reasons, commits genocide and other heinous crimes of destruction and control against a certain segment of its population. Is there not a minimal standard of good behavior that should be anticipated and required from government in the interest of all humanity in an interdependent world?

The end of Cold War, which ushered in democratisation processes into the international arena was unexpectedly marked with some unexpected consequences which culminated in the attack on World Trade Centre popularly referred to as September 11. Although, before then, the need for integrating strategic and non-strategic variables of security has been identified, it was Clare Short, the British Secretary for International-Development in a speech 1998 made security sector reform prominent both as a term and as a concept.

The "New World Order" that US President George W. Bush had declared during the Gulf War was not what came after the Cold War. The Clinton administration promoted multilateral diplomacy and the UN, as evidenced by the creation of the Partnership for Peace and the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, to name just two. However, under George W. Bush's administration, the US's interest in multilateral approaches—which is now widely viewed as a hyperpower—proved fleeting and extremely selective, with a heavy focus on perceived US national interest. This hope was challenged as 11 September 2001 brutally illustrated.

“Terrorism became the norm, organizing crime and violence. There have never been as many internally displaced people and refugees in human history as there are now”. There are more tiny arms

floating around than I can remember ever seeing. There were more "failed states" than ever before. Thus, a growing number of nations are losing their vital monopoly on force, ceding it to private enterprises and organizations, progressively losing the ability to impose their will on their armed forces and internal factions, or having to fear the wrath of powerful, hidden, and opaque (henceforth seen as all the more dangerous) extremists who are factious and capable of threatening, if not overthrowing, democratic institutions, the rule of law, or remnants of totalitarianism [15]. Organized crime's influence and global reach are expanding on a daily basis. Its capacity to mobilize funds and resources for improved technology and, when needed, even more potent weaponry surpasses those of police forces in many nations. These days, the world's oil industry earns less annually than the illicit drug trade alone.

Consequent upon these ugly developments, it was felt internationally that these issues occasioned by globalization should be articulated and addressed through security sector reform. Thus, security sector reform came into being as a result of the need to address insecurity in the global scale. According to Brzoska (2004), The goal of Security Sector Reform (SSR) is to create a single, shared understanding between the challenges of new demands on development donors and the opportunities of expanding development assistance into security-related fields [16]. The vision of the SSR is one of the security sectors that supports human development, lowers poverty, and gives everyone, including the impoverished, more options in life. A renewed emphasis on results-driven development assistance in the late 1990s, with a primary focus on poverty reduction, helped dismantle some of the prior hurdles within the development donor community that prevented them from addressing the security sector.

Therefore, security sector reform is best understood as a grand strategy for dealing with security related issues. Particularly, it is a shift from the traditional military assistance to developing and dependent capitalist state characterized by choice less democracy and within the control of the international new alignment of political and social forces that is unfolding in the advanced capitalist countries. Security sector reform is anchored on Development and some of its functional methodologies include reduction in military expenditure, poverty reduction and post conflict peacemaking and conflict prevention. As a rejection of the state centric definition and conceptualization of security, it is aimed at enhancing the state of security rather than the security of the state, the two contending issues in the security discourse.

The concept has been subjected to serious discussion. Some of topics from both the advanced capitalized and those of the Dependent capitalist states express the view whether it is useful instrument in development policy. Security sector reform has also been accused to constitute a European Centre-left project to the aim that it is devoid of much meaning as it ignored the meddling causes of insecurity in the developing countries.

The military forces in particular, as well as almost all other African security institutions, are near mirror images of their erstwhile colonial security institutions. The rank system mainly stays the same, with very few exceptions, even though many of the small defending forces were composed of native African guerrilla groups with their own non-Western customs and doctrines (One of these was the National Party of South Africa's generally fruitless attempts to establish a hierarchical structure in the 1950s that was modeled after the original Boer Commandos). Their institutional structures accept either the British, French, or American value system, and despite the importance of human security from a political and social standpoint, the "core" components of the security sector as institutions within the African context are the army, the police the intelligence services, paramilitary organizations as well as guerrilla and rebel armies. Failure to address these institutions effectively, taking into account the importance of linking them to broader security institutions (the rest of the criminal justice system) and larger development processes (reconstruction and development, the creation of a culture of good governance and so on), could potentially jeopardize not only the stability of individual countries, but the entire sub regions as well.

Ideological themes that pervade their discourse are manifestly European in Origin. Against this accusation, we are going to see its relevance or otherwise to the consolidation of democracy in the various societies of the world. Indeed, as a grand norm, security sector reform is central in the consolidation of democracy. Substantially, it is the security sector that deals with all the elements of the state instead of what is previously limited to the state. According to Ebo (2007) Normatively speaking, the goal is to guarantee that the security industry is founded on good governance, which is characterized by the qualities of transparency, accountability, involvement, and people-responsiveness [17]. Institutionally, civilian control, broader public control that encompasses civil society and educated discourse on matters of national security, as well as a constitutional and legal framework are all necessary components of democratic governance of the security sector. Thus, while democratic governance of security sector is the desired objective, security sector reform is the means of achieving this end results.

SECURITY SECTOR REFORM AND CONSOLIDATION OF DEMOCRACY

Consolidation of democracy through the application of security sector reform as is presently constituted, has however been subjected to controversy. This springs from the concept of popular democracy, which has element of communitarians, derived from the historical, cultural, political and even economic experiences of people in question which are unique to them.

This makes sense in light of Hendrickson's assertion that the DFID policy statement's justification for concentrating on security sector challenges is reasonable, widely accepted, and uncontroversial [18]. There is growing recognition that security issues are frequently exacerbated rather than resolved by untrained or improperly governed security forces. Spending too much on security might be better directed toward other areas that help reduce poverty. There is a compelling case to be made for taking a more comprehensive approach to development that takes security sector concerns into account, since issues in the security sector are often a sign of larger social, political, and economic difficulties that impoverished nations face. The relationship between security sector reform and consolidation of democracy particularly in Africa has been a subject of controversy. Some contributors have predicated their rationalization of the problem associated with the consolidation of democracy on low level of literacy, low per capita income, and the disruptive power of ethnicity, the absence of authentic, transformative and indigenous bourgeoisie. Granted these factors. Fetters to the consolidation of democracy; their explanatory power are seriously and fundamentally inadequate and not enough to explain the crisis of democracy in Africa. Thus, a materialist conception of history which seeks to explain issues from the origin and dynamics of its material condition offers adequate explanation.

From the above text, we argue that for security sector reform to actively contribute to consolidation of democracy it should first address oppressive material questions. It is the issue of national question defined as an issue of oppressive material relation on weaker forces or nations in both national and global dynamics of power relations. Its resolution must be based on the efforts at doing away with oppressive material power relations in order to create the basis for free and independent development free from imperialist dependence. The resolution of the national question therefore, is the removal of fetters to enhance unhindered economic development that can empower the generality of society free from the drudgeries of feudal, semi feudal, imperialist relations and those of their rentier classes.

If this is not central focus of security sector reform, it would have failed in aiding the democratic consolidation, as it amounts to obvious neglect of historically derived material conditions which are unique to a particular society. Here, security sector reform should address such issues of popular sovereignty rules of entitlement etc. The central focus which security sector reform should address is the content of popular sovereignty. The starting point should be focused on meaning and content of citizenship derived historically and in line with the wave of democratization processes. The erosion of social citizenship occasioned by the imposition of neo-liberalism and the conditionality's which led to be the decline in social provisioning and loss social citizenship should be articulated and addressed [19].

If security sector reform fails in this cardinal objective, consolidation of democracy will be difficult if not impossible.

Again, given the dynamics of globalization and democratization processes, the dependent capitalist African states decision making processes have been globalized and given the backdrop of multilateral financial institutions impositions on them it has resulted into what Olukoshi called “choicelessness”. Thus, while the dependent capitalist states have opened up their political space, their economic space has tremendously been narrowed: by the imposition of multilateral conditionality’s by globalization or imperialism.

This seriously neglected the local content in addressing the national question. According to Olukoshi (2000) as a consequence, the required domestic consensus and coalition-building for sustainable economic reform has been neglected, undermined and accounting to donors has taken the place of accountability to the populace by the government [20]. The donor-led economic reform process has thus tended to erode the legitimacy of the internal democratic process through the externalization of effective decision-making on the economy.

As it is, currently, students of transitional societies should focus more attention on the democratic content of constitutional making and practices as against constitutionalism and rule of law which are possible to usher in authoritarian regimes, it then follows that effective security sector reform should focus more on this direction. Security sector reform should therefore be tailored towards the interpretation of government actions exclusively in accordance with constitutional provision in any instance; and that constitutional provisions are not designed and used for repression, oppression as well as exclusion. Thus, for an enduring democracy, it should not be based on abstraction but rather on content- which positively affects the total existence of the populace. It is only on this that legitimacy can be maintained- a central rationalizing principle for democratic consolidation. This has however been neglected within the regime of multilateralism represented by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank (WB).

Within the framework of donor structural adjustment programmers, efforts were made to dismantle the African states which, both in theory and practice, was seen as on the continent. This single-minded external attack combined with processes of internal decay to considerably weaken the state and in many cases, rob it off an autonomous and well anchored organizing and a worsening legitimacy deficit, for the consolidation of democracy in Africa, there can be no question of tradeoff between the state and market. Effective and Legitimate state structures are essential to the construction of sustainable democratic system.

From the fore going, security sector reform for the consolidation of democracy should strengthen the state particularly in terms of social provisioning which is central in the quest for democratic consolidation. It is through this that the internal decay, loss of hope, anomie, rising unemployment, etc which are manifested in the rolling back the state could be reversed, democracy sustained and beyond that consolidated.

CONCLUSION

Within the framework of donor structural adjustment programmers, efforts were made to dismantle the African states which, both in theory and practice, was seen as on the continent. This single-minded external attack combined with processes of internal decay to considerably weaken the state and in many cases, rob it off an autonomous and well anchored organizing and a worsening legitimacy deficit, for the consolidation of democracy in Africa, there can be no question of tradeoff between the state and market. Effective and Legitimate state structures are essential to the construction of sustainable democratic system.

REFERENCES

1. Nwagwu E, Ikechukwu U. New states in world politics: Prospects and challenges. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. 2014; 19:1-1.
2. Robinson WI. Globalization and the sociology of Immanuel Wallerstein: A critical appraisal. *International Sociology*. 2011 Nov;26(6):723-45.
3. Milton P. Guarantee and Intervention: the Assessment of the Peace of Westphalia in International Law and Politics by Authors of Natural Law and of Public Law, c. 1650–1806. In *The Law of Nations and Natural Law 1625–1800* 2019 Aug 23 (pp. 186-226). Brill.
4. Sultana T. The evolution of democracy through the ages: focus on the European experience. *Journal of European Studies*. 2012 Jun 1;28(1).
5. Koenig-Archibugi M. Who are the people? Defining the demos in the measurement of democracy. *Political Studies*. 2022 May;70(2):402-24.
6. Wohlgemuth M. Schumpeterian political economy and Downsian public choice: alternative economic theories of democracy. *Law and the State. A Political Economy Approach*, Cheltenham (UK). 2005 Jul 27:21-57.
7. Metz T. Popper's Politics and Law in the Light of African Values. *Jus Cogens*. 2020 Sep;2(2):185-204.
8. Diamond L, Morlino L. The quality of democracy: An overview. *Journal of democracy*. 2004;15(4):20-31.
9. Bangura AK. The democratic project and the human condition across the African continent. A Distinguished Public Lecture organised by Department of Sociology, University of Lagos and Centre for Black and African Arts and Civilisation (CBAAC), delivered at the Main Auditorium, University of Lagos, Nigeria. 2013 Jun 20; 20:368.
10. Douglass R. Rousseau's Critique of Representative Sovereignty: Principled or Pragmatic? *American Journal of Political Science*. 2013 Jul;57(3):735-47.
11. Prempeh HK. Africa's "constitutionalism revival": False start or new dawn?. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*. 2007 Jul 1;5(3):469-506.
12. Brushett K. Partners in development? Robert McNamara, Lester Pearson, and the commission on international development, 1967–1973. *Diplomacy & Statecraft*. 2015 Jan 2;26(1):84-102.
13. Eneji AG, Agri EM. Insecurity, conflict and socioeconomic development in Nigeria. *Social Science Journal*. 2020; 8:1-9.
14. Ujomu PO. National security, social order and the quest for human dignity in Nigeria: Some ethical considerations. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*. 2001 Dec 31;10(2):20-.
15. Aguilera-Barchet B, Aguilera-Barchet B. The Golden Era of Liberalism and the Apogee of the Nation-State. *A History of Western Public Law: Between Nation and State*. 2015:489-554.
16. Brzoska M, Heinemann-Grüder A. Security sector reform and post-conflict reconstruction under international auspices. *Reform and reconstruction of the security sector*. 2004:121-42.
17. Ebo A. The role of security sector reform in sustainable development: donor policy trends and challenges. *Conflict, Security & Development*. 2007 Apr 1;7(1):27-60.
18. Ghimire S. Optimised or compromised? United Kingdom support to reforming security sector governance in post-war Nepal. *Third World Quarterly*. 2017 Jun 3;38(6):1415-36.
19. Law A, Mooney G. The maladies of social capital II: Resisting neo-liberal conformism. *Critique*. 2006 Dec 1;34(3):253-68.
20. Olukoshi AO. Economy and politics in the Nigerian transition. *African Journal of Political Science/Revue Africaine de Science Politique*. 2000 Dec 1:5-29.