

Institutional Building and Defence Transformation in Nigeria: An Appraisal of the role of the Military

Manpaa Aliyu Musa, Ph.D, Adole Raphael Audu, Ph.D and Shehu Mustapha Liberty

Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Maiduguri, Borno State.

Email: adolecabs@yahoo.com manpapella@gmail.com

Abstract

The military as an institution has transcended many phases of human civilization. Although this institution may vary in terms of its organisation and level of sophistication, there is no disputing the fact that the military had long been acknowledged as the foundation of most, if not all societies. This is evident in the quantum of scholarly narratives and historical accounts of invasions and conquest of the weaker and vulnerable communities by the stronger and militarily superior ones. Traditionally, the role of the military globally has been defending the territorial integrity of the state. Cold War struggles between the Eastern and Western bloc. During the Cold War, global polity had witnessed unprecedented cases of praetorianism; when military intervention became contagious like bush fire across Africa, Asia and Latin America sweeping all the newly installed democratic governments. The two ideological blocs have been fingered as culpable in the menace of military intervention providing ideological platform, training, resource and logistics for their puppet military officers. First, to overthrow the existing democratic institutions and later to perpetuate themselves in power. The exit of USSR from the global power theatre in October 1989 marked the official end of cold war and the ascendancy of new world order, the unipolar arrangement under the American hegemony making military rule an aberration. As alternative, they imposed liberal democracy and capitalism as the only acceptable political and economic order. It is in the light of the above that this Paper examined the role of institutional building in defence transformation and democratic governance in Nigeria. The paper relied on Esman's Model of Institution Building as basis for analysis. The methodology for this paper was scholarly narratives based on library documentation. The paper concludes by advocating for a paradigm shift from the misconstrued view of the military being an aberration to one in which it is taken as an instrument of defence transformation of the country through the absorption of the principles of Institution Building Model.

Keywords: Appraisal, Defence, Defence Transformation, Institution Building, Military, Nigeria.

Introduction

The military as an institution is as old as mankind transcending and transiting from one phase of human evolution to the other. Although the institution varies in their organisation and level of sophistication, it has long been acknowledged as the foundation of most societies in both ancient and modern nation states alike. Scholarly narratives and historical accounts are awashed with the stories of invasions and conquest of the weak and vulnerable societies by the stronger and military superior communities from time immemorial. Within the context of the pre-colonial Africa and Nigeria in particular the military existed in the ancient kingdoms of Kanem Borno Empire, Old Oyo Empire, Dahomey kingdom as well as the ancient Benin kingdom among others (Osabiya, 2015).

One peculiar characteristics of this said period was that the military as an institution was saddled with the primary responsibility of expansion and defending the territorial integrity of the state. Although such powerful institution was regularly consulted even on matters that are purely political they have no direct control over the affairs of the state as they essentially

remained subordinates to the political authorities (Lai, 2004). However, the unusual happened when this institution chose to abandon her primary traditional responsibility and decided to embrace the secondary unpopular option of taking over the state power (Osabiya, 2015). Consequently, the military that hitherto been regarded as the protector of the emperor or the Praetorian Guard suddenly transformed into political class and from this moment onward military praetorian became associated with the overthrow of legitimate and elected government (Larry, 1997). This is what became known in the military literature as praetorianism, meaning the direct intervention by the military in politics of the state.

This development has altered the scholarly narrative about the role of military institution from that of the custodian of the state to an aberration so much such that it is no longer only normative but a necessity that any form of infraction in the process of human advancement or even developmental debacles are often theorised and linked to the period of protracted military rule. There was a time in African history when military rule or praetorianism had become a resilient paradigm in politics in both practice and praxis. During this period the drive for the new found gold mine has attracted many young graduates into the military for obvious reasons; as a medium for acquiring political power, as convenient means of acquiring wealth and economic power as well as prestige and status symbol. Thus the military which ought to have represented integrity, modesty, and discipline has been enmeshed into sleaze and moral decadence often expressed in affluent and ostentatious life style as primitive accumulation and conspicuous consumption has gradually became the order of the day.

Globally, the military as an institution had been a symbol of nationalism and patriotism. While this perception had been retained elsewhere in the world the general perception about the military has been negative. The defeat of the Nazi Germany and its triple alliance by the allied forces and the passing of the UN resolution 13...which provided for equality and self-determination has triggered the massive agitation for and eventually granting of self-government to the hitherto colonies of the European superpowers. The independence of India in 1945 became the turning point and gave impetus to the anti-colonial struggles particularly in Latin America, Asia and Africa. No sooner did these "Third World Countries" (a term often used to describe countries that secured independence and appear at the global scene after the second world and are faced with the challenges of developmental debacle) emerge and the planting of new democratic institutions in these new sovereign states than the ideological struggles between the Eastern and the Western bloc commenced. Although the cold war was ideological struggle, the real battle field has been shifted to third world countries. This phenomenal cold war had further reinvigorated and reinforced the space for praetorianism by providing ideological platform, logistics and financial support to their puppet regimes, which resulted in the collapse of the newly installed democratic government and institutions across Africa. Hence the new found military rule became endemic and contagious like bush fire sweeping across the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. The two ideological blocs have been fingered as culpable in the menace of military intervention providing ideological platform, training, resource and logistics for their puppet military officers. First, to overthrow the existing democratic institutions and later to perpetuate themselves in power. The exit of USSR from the global power theatre in October 1989 mark the official end of cold war and the ascendancy of new world order the unipolar arrangement under the American hegemony making military rule an aberration. As an alternative, they imposed liberal democracy based on capitalism as the only acceptable political and economic order. It is in the light of the above that this paper examines the role of institution building in defence transformation and democratic governance in Nigeria.

Meaning of Institution Building

The term institution building has over the years gain global currency and is widely used by people from all walks; scholars, policy makers, development experts, donor agencies as well as development aid workers. This reality has exposed the concept to scholarly polemics and disputes on its actual meaning, which make the definition of the concept complex, ambiguous and contestable. The term institution building is often conflated with similar concepts such as institution development and organisational building so intricate that the terms are usually used inter changeable.

Paradoxically, the lack of consensus on the meaning of the concept has spill to the contemporary with little or no change to what it used to be when the concept first appears in the development aid literature as a standard item of jargon in development aid activities. This ambiguity and lack of clarity in the concept has been attributed to three main forces. Fundamental ambiguity in English language; a marked preference among some practitioners of the academic discipline of sociology and organisation theory for abstract conceptual debate and jargon generation; and the fact that unclear terms are frequently useful in political and policy context (Moore, Stewart and Hudock, 1994). The term institution building as constructed by inter-university research programme denotes; an approach to the understanding of social change. It is an effort to identify operational methods and action strategies that will be helpful practitioners, to persons actively engaged as change agents especially in a cross-cultural situation. Thus the inter-university research programme defines institution building as the planning, structuring, and guidance of a new or reconstituted organisation which (a) embodies changes in values, functions, physical and/or social technologies. (b) Establish, foster and protect normative relationship and action pattern; and (c) Attain support and complementarity in the environment (Esman and Blaise, 1966;1). The institution building approach has a pronounced social engineering bias. Its proposition is rooted in the believe that a very large proportion of the most significant contemporary changes especially in the developing countries are deliberately planned and guided and can be clearly distinguished from those changes that occurs through gradual evolutionary process or as a consequence of political or social revolution (Esman,1967).

The institution building approach presupposes that the vehicle for the introduction change is primarily a formal organisation. As it is this organisation that symbolises, promote, sustain and protect the innovation, and that it is the organisation as well as the new normative relationship and action patterned they foster which must become “institutionalised” meaningful and valued in the societies in which they functioned. From another perspective Moore *et al* (1994) conceptualised institution building from trajectories; the positive and the negative. From the positive perspective, institution building refers to an attempt to improve the functioning of the society by creating, structuring, or changing institutional software- the way people relate to one another in the context of public action and public activity.

Negative institution building on the other hand serves as a label for those development activities that do not centrally involve (only) physical construction, the transfer of physical and financial resources or major policy change. Institution building is a term used for a wide range of activities that have not been historically viewed as the proving of core professional discipline of the aid fields; Economist, Engineers, Natural resources, Specialist, Medical personnel and Population specialist (Moore *et al*, 1994). The definition of institution building is abstract and confusing to make it more concrete requires its conceptualisation within the context of the “core” and “periphery”. The core institution building is the organisation building; the enterprise of trying to support improvement in the effectiveness of the organisation separately or in networks by changing their structures, management procedure etc. the objective is the more

effective accomplishment of the task that a particular organisation(s) are supposed to undertake for example (auditing public account). The means are building up capacity of the organisation(s) to do this task. Within the context of this paper therefore, institution building refers to series of interrelated deliberate actions guided behaviour. This denotes the identification and appropriate utilization of human and material resources for the entrenchment and sustenance of pristine core values in a characteristics and manner that is normative, gradual, and willing among the organisational client or target population in line with the broad mission and vision of the organisation concern. Institution building has Leadership, doctrine, program, resources and internal structure. They are interconnected that without one the other structure and processes established for the operations of the institution will not function effectively.

Meaning of Defence Transformation

The term Defence transformation (DT) came into common usage in the later 1990's. Like every other social science concept, it has been defined by stakeholder military officials' scholars' analysts and observers differently. This made a single universal acceptable definition not only difficult but impossible. According to David (2000) there is no single process called Defence transformation as every country's experience and starting point are different. This makes its conceptualization and understanding contextually and country specific. However, despite this variation in countries experience and starting point which sharpen their conceptualization of the subject. There exists a common stand point among various stakeholders regarding to the origin of the concept. This is owing to the fact that most if not all stakeholders agreed that the concept Defence transformation is rooted in the decline and fall of the cold war system and the consequences which followed from that (David, 2000)

The US Department of Defence (2008) *defines defence transformation as a process that shapes the changing nature of military competition and cooperation through new combination of concept capabilities, people and organization to exploits our nations advantages and protect against asymmetries vulnerabilities to sustain our strategic position which help underpins peace and stability in the world.*

Operational Guide Note (2016) defined defence transformation as a major and long lasting changes to the structure, functions and ethos of the defence sector of a control, (from this perspective. Defence transformation is, therefore, more extensive than simple incremental improvement to a country's defences sector such as happens all over the world; this Defence transformation typically occur after a major political conflict or crisis usually involving violence and often on a large scale. Within the above context defence transformation is more ambitious than the reorganization of defence sectors following peaceful transition such as those in the Eastern Europe after 1989. It should be seen therefore as a component of whole security and justice transformation process.

Looking at the defence transformation from the general perspective the concept can be thought of as large scale discontinuous and possibly disruption changes in military weapon, organization and concept of operation (i.e. approached to war fighting) that are prompted by significant changes in technology or the emergence of new and different international security challenges. David (2000) argues that the dynamics of the Cold War although dangerous and illogical did at least provide the majority of states in the world with platform and kind of framework within which to make defence and security policies. He went further to state that Countries that were freed from the intellectual shackles of the cold war began to wake up and think for themselves about what they need their military for. This no doubt has been a painful intellectual demanding process and in many part of the world has not progressed very far. The

greatest obstacles have been conceptual rather than tangible, and have reflected the fact that people found adoption to sudden change difficult.

The implication of the aforementioned development is the polarization of perception and emergence of divergent opinion on what constitute the actual meaning of defence transformation. First and foremost, there are bands of cold war nostalgic who try to cling to the ideas of the 1980's substituting Islam for communism but otherwise changing little. There are also those security conservatives who argued that one should stick to the old is being tried and trusted. There are also the liberal vigilantes who after years of calling for smaller armed forces or none at all suddenly want them to be greatly expanded and sent all over the world. Caught in the web of the complex intellectual polemics of the above nature, David (2000) thus defined Defence transformation as the process by which nations are adapting their defence policies to the post-cold war world and rethinking defence from the ground up. Although, it covers issues such as budget, organization and accountability. Here Defence transformation begins with the fundamental question about the role of Armed forces and their place in society and the way in which the Defence community make and implement defence policy.

In distinct context the Bush administration has adopted a broad based conceptualization of Defence transformation. According to the regime Defence transformation encompasses wide range of process and interrelated events which include; the making changes in department of defence business policies, practices and procedures particularly with an eye towards stream lining operation and achieving efficiencies so as to reduce cost and move new weapon technologies from the laboratories to the field more quickly. In addition, the administration had equally expanded the concept of Defence transformation to refer to proposed changes in matters such as the budget process and environmental matters affecting military training. There is also some Defence Transformation Advocates who attempted to clearly distinguished Defence transformation from incremental or evolutionary military change brought about by normal modernization. According to them defence transformation is more likely to feature discontinuous or disruptive forms of change. They equally emphasized that while much of the discussion about transformation revolves around changes in military weapons and systems, changes in organization and concept of operation can be as important as or more important than that of weapons and systems. To bring the much needed transformation some have argued that change in organisation and concept of operation can lead to achieving defence transformation even without changes in weapons and systems. They further buttress that even with the dramatic changes in weapon and systems without corresponding change in organisation and concept of operation might not lead to transformation. The implication of the above is that these advocates tend to advocate more of institution building approach than the garrison or militarised approach to defence transformation.

Some transformational advocates mentioned that the best period during which transformation can and should be pursued is the period of military dominance and political stability. This is because states that suffered defeat in military related conflict tends to learn and adjust fast from their war experience than do countries that emerged victorious as victorious countries they argued can become complacent making only incremental improvement to military forces and concept of operation that appears dominant and are then unpleasant spirits in subsequent conflict by adversaries that in meantime have developed new and unforeseen military capabilities. Similarly, some observers have equated transformation principally with the idea of making United States forces more mobile, agile and lethal through greater reliance on things such as unmanned vehicle (UVs), advanced technologies for precision strike operations and the special operation force. There are also other advocates that primarily equated transformation with concept of Network Centric Warfare (NCW) and the C4 ISR technologies to implement NCW.

From the forgoing, it is clear that the concept of defence transformation is both complex and ambiguous. This notwithstanding, we can operationalize defence transformation within the context of this paper to mean a well thought of and deliberate process of interrelated series of activities directed towards improving the institutional capacity, concepts of operation, military weapons, command and control through robust policy formulation and implementation with sole aim of securing the internal and external environment of nation states. In other words, defence transformation is the post-cold war defence policy measures that were adopted by individual state with the view of creating safe haven for the realization of their nation interest.

Theoretical framework

The institution building theory is not a single theory but a broad variant conventional model put forward by organization and management scholars to guide the process of development. The institution building theory is rooted in the works of Esman and Blaise (1966). The main theoretical disposition of institution building based of Esmanetal conceptual model is that development should be conceived as a social engineering bias. It is rooted in the proposition that very large proportion of the most significant contemporary change especially in developing countries are deliberately planned and guided and can be distinguished from those that occur through gradual evolutionary process or as consequences of political or social revolution. Further, the approach presupposes that the introduction of change take place primarily in and through formal organization. I.e. the formal organization serves as a vehicle for achieving institution building. When these organizations and change inducing, change protecting and formal, they are considered to be the institutions.

These organisations and the new patterns they foster become institutional e.g. meaningful and valued in the societies in which they function. This process involves complimentary set of interactions between the institutions and the environment. The environment varies in its readiness or resistance to change both overtime and from place to place. Basic to Esman's approach is the assumption that the effacement assimilation of the new physical and social, technological requires that the environment provides supporting values, normal process and structures which usually are not present when the new model changing the environment to compliment or accommodate the new technologies are primary introduced in and through organizations the supportive values, norms, processes and structures must be institutionalized. In and through these organisations, that is normative relationship and action patterns and performs functions and services that are valued in the environment. The result of analysis of these institutionalized changes can serve as guide to social action. Hence the assumptions that institution building is agency social process. A set of element and action can be identified which is relevant to institution building in giving the research framework that guided institution building programme contain three major elements.

- i. A set of institution variables, notably;
 - a. Leader
 - b. Doctrine
 - c. Programme
 - d. resources & internal structures.
- ii. The linkages the interdependence which text between an institution and other relevant parts of the society? the institutionalized organization does not exist in isolation as such it must establish and maintain a network of complementarity in its environment in order to survive and function, there are basically four (4) linkages;
 - a. Enabling linkages
 - b. Functional linkage
 - c. Normative linkage
 - d. Diffused linkage
- iii. "Institution" as an end state.

It must be made clear that Esman based his approach on three (3) Analytical categories in his institutional building universe.

These institutional variably are those elements thought to be necessary and sufficient to explain the systemic behaviour in an institution.

Institution Building and Defence Transformation in Nigeria

Institution building and defence transformation are closely related and mutually supportive concepts. While institution building provides the framework and guidance for the achievement of defence transformation, the primacy of defence transformation is to create a secure environment for institution building. The common feature shared by both concepts is that they are made up of series of interrelated activities and process that are change and innovative driven. The focus of this segment therefore is to examine the role of institution building in facilitating defence transformation in Nigeria. However, before delving into the real issue, it is imperative to highlight: the key objectives of defence transformation, stages in defence transformation as well as the operational areas expected to be covered by defence transformation.

Objectives of Defence Transformation

Mention was made at the onset of this paper that defence transformation as a concept is a continuous process that varies from one region and country to another. Owing to the fact that every country has peculiar historical, cultural and technological capabilities which by implication affect its drive towards achieving defence transformation. This variation in economic and technical competence in addition to the point at which a country began its defence transformation struggles to a large extent shapes the process and levels of development. It is noteworthy however, to state that despite the wide range of controversy surrounding the concepts there is consensus among stakeholders; Scholars, security experts and policy analysts that defence transformation as a concept is rooted in the development surrounding the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of cold war struggles which saw the emergence of new world order (disorder) under the auspices of the United States unipolar hegemony. The question therefore is what is the rationale behind defence transformation? Defence transformation (DT) is incumbent because historical account indicates that attempting to have a perpetual grip on the existing state of affairs no matter how expedient, advantageous or prosperous looks it wear, is short-sightedness approach and often proved to have come with disastrous outcome. In addition, the continuous threat both real and perceived posed by wide and complex terrorist networks such as Boko Haram, Al-Qaeda, Al-Qaeda in Islamic Maghreb (AQIM), Al-shabaab, Islamic State of Iraq (ISIS), Islamic State of Iraq and Levant (ISIL), etc.

Similarly, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the collapse of traditional imaginary national boundaries as a result of rapid technological advancement and the impact of globalization in the 21st century have resulted in the rapid and increasing porosity of boundary between political, economic as well as military domains. This emerging gale of globalization has miniaturized the world like never before making non-sense of distance and time and as well, shifting the battle field from elsewhere to nowhere. Thus, the necessity for finding an improved and better way of working with our numerous coalitions allies, leveraging new technologies and operation concepts in order to create our dominance coalition advantage against current and potential future adversaries. Furthermore, it is globally acknowledged that even the world best military forces like United States, Russia, China Germany etc., are transforming their defence what more of economically and technologically dependent nations like Nigeria.

Consequent upon the above the US Transformation Planning Guidance (2016) identified four (4) imperatives that lend urgency to the need for transformation Viz:

- i. Strategy
- ii. Threat
- iii. Technology
- iv. Risk mitigation

It should be noted however, that these factors identified could be applied universally though differently in accordance with individual nation's preparedness and level of technological advancement it is imperative to domesticate and replicate these imperatives within Nigerian context.

Strategic Imperatives

The primary goal of defence transformation is to build a strong viable and globally unparalleled power that will contend both the present and future adversaries. To achieve this objective requires the development of agile, network centric force that can take action from forward position rapidly reinforce from other areas with the view of growing capabilities that will defeat our present and future adversaries swiftly and decisively. In addition, the phenomenal shift of battle field from the old wars i.e. wars among sovereign states with definite boundaries to new war in which battle field appears to have no boundaries required defence planners both military and civilian to brace up by building a capability based, rather than threat based forces.

In Nigeria, however we have a long way to go in order to materialize this objective as the nation neither has the political will power to neither do this, nor have those in charge demonstrated the technical competence to realize our manifest destiny among nation-states in the global power theatre. Today the nation is grappling with security challenges posed by its internal adversaries in collaboration with their external allies, yet Nigeria relied almost 100% on the western military hardwires, war tanks and fire arms to wage the battle. It is imperative to note, therefore, that if the world's super power with older technological development and military weapons are still striving for defence transformation, then Nigeria must take its defence transformation very serious. Most especially in the face of the glaring emergence of internal insurrection from across all the region which ranges from the Boko Haram insurgency dominant in the north east, the perennial clashes among farmers and herders men in the northeast and north central, the issue of kidnapping and cattle rustling in the north west, the rise in cultism and militancy in the Niger delta and the insurrection by indigenous people of Biafra (IPOB) led by Namdi Kanu.

Threat Imperative

Of the entire imperatives that compelled both advanced countries (US Russia, Germany, China, etc.) and the emerging powers like Nigeria to embark upon the defence transformation agenda, the most disturbing is the issues of uncertainty of global policy owing to the high level of threats both perceived and real. There is no doubt that we are all living today in a world operating in the first predictable threat environment comprised of what was experienced before and during the cold war struggles. I.e. the period of mutual assured destruction In practical terms each and every country developed or developing, including but not limited to Nigeria have many axes of approach to defend against both in the endogenous and exogenous. Today, regional and global powers alike are developing capabilities which pose threats to everyone's national interest or stability. This scenario is worsened by the velocity at which sovereign states strive towards the realization of their defence transformation goals. This development made self-preservation and return to the Hobbesian state of nature in the international system with utmost certainty. Similarly, both state actors (STAC) and non-state actors (non-STAC) adversaries are attempting to compensate and neutralize US military hegemony by developing asymmetrical capabilities. Furthermore, the upsurge and proliferation of chemical, biological, radiology and nuclear (CBRN) capabilities have raised the spectre of such weapon cheaply

falling into the hands of the terrorists. In Nigeria, specifically, this is evident in the calibre of weapons in the hands of Boko Haram and their counterparts, Niger Delta terrorists which often dwarf and outmatch the obsolete ones used by poorly equipped Nigerian armed forces. In many cases when the poorly equipped and poorly motivated Nigerian army comes under the superior fire power of the enemy, they have no option but to retreat. Invariably, the non-STAC using the international seaways and airways of global commerce has also greatly diminished the protection afforded by most nations including Nigeria by virtue of geographical distance. This made such countries vulnerable hence the need for defence transformation.

Technological Imperative

The technological imperative that necessitated the defence transformation is closely linked to globalization as a result of revolution in science and technology, more specifically information technology has resulted in the collapse of traditional imaginary national boundaries and miniaturization of world into global village making nonsense of this distance and time.

This development has not come without negative price. First, it has resulted in accessibility to highly capable technologies at low thereby weakening the barriers in places where hitherto the global policemen, the US enjoying uncontested advantage. Today however, the story is no longer the same as this globalization has created new forms of competition among both state and non-state actors in the space and cyber space. Similarly, the proliferation of information technology has also increase the potential for miscalculation and surprises, particularly involving Weapon of Mass Destruction (WMD) and their delivery system. In the light of this, it become necessary for any serious nation Nigeria, inclusive to heed to continuous basis update, redefine and exercise its new technology especially in the defence sector.

Risk Mitigation Imperative

The dream of every sovereign state that embarks upon defence transformation is to create a force today that meets the presence as well as the future challenges. To achieve this onerous and herculean task requires a discreet and careful balance of today's needs in relations to the needs of tomorrow. In line with this, it is incumbent on the national force of today to be agile and lethal in order not to be put in jeopardy as defence department rebalances its investment towards designing and building the force of the future. For Nigeria to realise the above goal, its defence sector should borrow a leaf and replicate the risk management framework provided by the defence department of the USA and other technological advanced nations taking local context in to consideration. Alternatively, it should develop framework modelled along that of US. The components of categories of risk to be envisaged are many, however, the popular four (4) identified by the US defence department are:

- i. Force management risk
 - ii. Operational
 - iii. Challenge
 - iv. Institutional
- (i) Force management risk: management involves planning, organizing, and coordinating and control elements among others. Force management risk therefore is not an exception. This is because the force size and population is influenced by interplay among series of internal and external variables alike.

The force population is daily faced with the challenges which if those responsible for its management did not take proactive measures will expose the force to risk in the future. These challenges include reduction in the number if personnel which could be as a result of death, retirement or sickness among others. Similarly, there is problem of development and procurement of new military wares. The barrier in areas where hitherto the global policeman United States was enjoying uncontested advantage has been broken. Today the story is no

longer the same as this technological advances had created new form of competition in space and cyber space, they also increased the potential for miscalculation and surprise particularly involving WMD and their delivering system; in the right of the above it become necessary for every series governance nation state Nigeria among but not limited to, need to on continuous basis update, redefine and exercise it new technology especially in the defence sector.

Force Management Risk:

Management involve planning, organizing coordinating and control elements among others, force management risk therefore, is not an exception as the forces population day in day out are faced with series of challenges which if those responsible for its management not take adequate proactive measures will expose such force to risk in the future, some of these challenges include; reduction in the number of personnel due to death, retirement and sickness among others. Similarly, there is challenge of development, procurement on new military hardware in which case the knowledge of the personnel needs to be update in order to brace up with how to handle this weaponry. Thus the Nigerian Defence headquarter should embark on the continuing challenge to recruit, train and retrain the calibre of personnel to prevail in combat. In military operation as in other organization qualitative personnel is the key for efficient and effective war management.

Scope of Defence Transformation

Defence transformation we have argued is a continuous process without end and it is by nature all embarking process of thinking creatively in order to work better together with other stakeholders and agencies. Because of the broad basea nature of the scope of defence transformation which makes it complex and ambiguous there is a need for us to draw a boundary concerning areas that will constitute our attention in the course of defence transformation. Within the context of this paper the scope of defence transformation in Nigeria will be tailored towards the realization of three flash points identified by the United States Defence Department these three areas are;

- i. Transforming how we to business inside the Department
- ii. Transforming how we work with our interagency and multinational partners
- iii. Transforming how the fight

It is imperative to note at this juncture that in application or practical realities the scope borrowed from the United States would only provide us with institutional framework to guide our focus. In the implementation moreover, there is significant difference in our approach as we have distinct level of socio-economic and technological development.

Transforming Ways of Doing Business

The 21st century have provided sovereign nation state with a big challenge of compressed time cycle. Achieving Defence transformation goals of these countries therefore requires creative and innovative transformational business and planning practices to adopt that will appropriately and conveniently fit into the compressed time cycle. These measures include adaptive planning, a more entrepreneurial, and future oriented; capabilities based resource allocation planning process. Similarly, there is need for accelerated acquisition circles build on spiral development output based management, and a reinforced analytical support agenda.

Transforming our Work Relationship with Others

The September 11 terror attack on the twin towers of the United States has no doubt altered the Global perspective of Defence and security. The question was if the defence headquarters of a globally acknowledged military sophisticated unified power would be achieved by the terrorist which nation is save. This single development has enormous altered the defence and security perception and strategy of many sovereign nation including but not limited to the U.S. This

resulted in the demand for increased relationship and synergy among various agencies and multinational partners. Of particular interest, the attack has increased premium on defining new and more efficient ways of interacting with other agencies of the state and other multinational partners. In addition, there is also increased demand to promote improved coordination across all level of government (Federal, state and local). The purpose of this is to increase intelligence gathering, corporation, more rapid response and the ability to conduct seamless operation. The implication of the above is that if the nation's military transform, those responsible for defence transformation needs military capabilities that can be effectively applied in concert with multinational an interagency capability. It is against this background that reworking or rethinking the way Nigerian Defence transformation managers relates with other agencies military, paramilitary or civilian to a larger extent affect its capability in realization of the goals of Defence transformation.

Conclusion

It is not contestable that Nigeria as nation is in dire needs of transforming its approach to warfare to meet up with the contemporary global best practices and international rule of engagement. Nigeria still relied on the obsolete war strategy and since force transformation depend on creativity and innovative development of future joint war fighting concepts and experimentation it become necessary to evaluate these new concepts. There is a need to subject this concept to rigors combat simulation condition at our various training facilities and interoperating lessons learned from both domestic experience in the war against Boko Haram and Niger Delta as well as those learned by virtue of participating as a member of the multinational joint task force as well as other aspect of on-going global war on terrorism.

Recommendations

In the light of the foregoing conclusion, the following recommendations are made:

1. **Operational Risk:** Here the Nigeria military management should develop the ability to support near term contingencies and operations of the military by providing the military genuine equipment and hard ware that can make them stand external aggression.
2. **Future Challenge Risk:** As the name implies this involve futuristic exercise, most particular to tackle head long the challenge of investing in new capabilities for the future. For instance, the Military should send its personnel for the right type of training. This will equip them with modern intelligence and tactics in the field of operations.
3. **Institutional Risk:** Here the main concern is on the challenges of ensuring that one manages our resource effectively by allocating into functional and optimal usage. The Military should endeavour to judiciously use the money budgeted by the Federal government on the fight against insurgency by been accountable and responsible for their actions and inactions.

References

- Claude, A. (1994). Democratization of disempowerment; Malt House Monograph Series, Lagos, Nigeria
- David, C (2000) Defence Transformation: A short guide to the issue Institute for Security Studies, Pretoria South Africa
- Esman, M.J. (1967). Inter-University Research programme in Institution building: The Institution building concepts- An interim appraisal. Pittsburgh Syracuse Indiana, Michigan St
- Esman M.J. and Blaise, H (1966). Institution building Research: The Guiding Concepts, University of Pittsburgh, and GSPIA
- Huntington, S (1957). The Soldier and the State: The theory and practice of civil military

- relations. Harvard University Press: Massachusetts Cambridge.
- Lai, O. (2004). Democratization and the military in Nigeria in: O.L. Anifowose (eds) Democratization and the military in Nigeria Frankard Publisher Lagos Nigeria
- Larry, D. (1997). Transition without end. Vintage publishers' Ltd Ibadan, Nigeria
- Moore, M., Stewart, S. and Hudock, A. (1994). Institution building as development assistant Method, A review of literature and ideas report. Vastergotlands, Trycker skara sausex, Brighton
- Osabiya, B. (2015). Democratization and the military in Nigeria: A case for enduring civil military relations in the fourth Republic and beyond. Review of public Administration and Management vol. 3 issue 1
- Operational Guidance Notes (2016). Defence Transformation <https://issat.dfcaf.ch>pdf>
- Tilly, C. (1990). Coercion, capital and European states, AD990-1990, oxford university Press, Cambridge MA Basil Black Well
- United State Department of Defence (2007). Defence Transformation: background and oversight issues for congress (RL 32238)
- United State Department of Defence (2004). Elements of Defence Transformation available on the interne <http://www.oft.osd.mil/library/libraryfiles/documents> 383 ELT of DT I.R pdf
- United State Department of Defence (2003). Office of the Secretary of Defence, Director Force: Transformation, Military Transformation; Strategic Approach Fall.