A Comparative Review of the Federal Security Models in Nigeria and the United States of America

by

Akapoti-Ajibola Sunday James, Azeez Olaniyan and Iseolorunkanmi Joseph[I]

Abstract

Federalism is a system of government that shares power among different levels of government. Two dominant security models in federal states are centralized and decentralized, especially within the political context of Nigeria and the United States of America. Security issues are universal simply because of their cross-border nature, which calls for rigorous measures through the collective efforts of all state security mechanisms.

The study aimed at examining the outcomes of security models in two federal states, i.e., Nigeria and the United States of America. The study adopted data from documentary sources that range from Scopus, Google Scholar, and Ebsco. The establishment of the Department of Homeland Security in 2003 was a successful effort in the United States of America at combating terrorism after the 2001 September 11 attacks on the United States of America institutions, the Pentagon, and the World Trade Centre. This model has hitherto prevented recurrence of such a provocative attack, although, the U.S.A. is still facing security issues, especially tension from Russia and China. In Nigeria, the amnesty programme, counterterrorism programme, and other internal measures put in place have failed to quell the security challenges, and the insecurity, such as Boko Haram and kidnapping, remains an intense challenge to the security architecture in Nigeria.

This study provides an understanding of the analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the centralized security model in Nigeria alongside the United States of America's decentralized security approach to inform policymakers to make effective decisions on security strategies.

1. Introduction

Security is fundamental to every sphere of a state's development, and the choice of security model adopted by any state could have significant implications for its security outcomes due to the implementation of security measures adopted, the sharing of information, and the response of the state to security threats (Awotayo &Omitola, 2024). Although the choice of any model is not all-inclusive, it does not guarantee total security. No state can survive amid insecurity, killings, terrorism, chaos, and uncertainty of peace. Security issues are universal concepts and a progressive phenomenon that needs the collective responsibility of all states' security mechanisms for combined synergy toward sustainable governance. The survival of any state hangs on its security architecture, and the importance of security is not negotiable.

David & Salifu (2020) defined security architectural structure as the combination of a country's constitutional and legal system, which includes all institutions that provide a security network for its citizens and secure its territorial integrity. Shaffer (2023) stated that anything that challenges the authority of a state is a security problem, and the degree to which it could affect the stability of a state and its constituent units cannot be determined. The sensitivity of security issues at the global stage prompts states to employ everything within their ability to maintain firm control over their home state and counteract any potential threats to their survival. There is no single country that can be described as free from security threats because security issues are multidimensional and their impact is universal.

Scholars such as Osaghae & Suberu (2005); Collins (2024); Agunbiade (2024); Ogunsanya (2021); Gbandi &Amissah (2022); Omitola & Olaniyan (2020) examined Nigeria's security system and concluded that the insecurity has greatly impacted its development and stability, contributed to the rise of ethnic and religious tensions as a result of corruption, bad governance, and the contest for limited resources, which acted as a channel for violent conflict in Nigeria. This, thereby, affected community stability, breaking national harmony, and stunting growth and development in the country. For instance, the North Central perennial crisis and the Niger Delta crisis were influenced by the agitation over resource allocation and political marginalization. The instability triggered by insecurity is beyond the economic impacts because its implications cannot be measured in monetary terms, still

provides trade crumbling, low foreign policy, and increased governmental spending on security rather than growth and development, with adverse effects on the statehood, as argued by (Wambai, Hayewa, & Mamman, 2023; Iherue, 2020).

The existence of insurgency, coupled with violence, banditry, kidnapping, armed mobs, and communal conflict, underscores how complex and sensitive security in Nigeria could be. The analysis of the insecurity in Nigeria revealed its prevalence in all six geopolitical zones. For instance, the North Central is porous with the Boko Haram militants, which is regarded as the deadliest form of insecurity in the world; it emerged in the 2000s to stand against Western education and later advocated the formation of an Islamic State ruled by Sharia law (Afzal, 2020; Moss, 2018). The North East zone is battling with tension from insurgency and terrorism. North West faces challenges from kidnapping, communal clashes, and banditry, South-south is battling with tension from Niger Delta militancy and kidnapping, South west is porous with robbery, kidnapping, and communal clashes. In contrast, the South East is highly tense with the separatist mentality, pressure, and community-based issues.

Atobatele (2022) averred that the farmer and herder clashes bring to the fore the aspect of environmental factors, including climate change and resource competition, as major security concerns in Nigeria. Indeed, this led to massive displacement and distortion in the national economy, both locally and internationally. Urban violence, political extremism, and mass shootings are the major insecurities in the United States of America while terrorism like ISIS remains a serious attention in United States in addition to organized crime, gun violence, cybersecurity, border security, and radical tension from Russia and China as established from various reports such as (Kleinfeld, 2023; Lutz & Lutz, 2013; Pitcavage, 2019; Richards, 2018; Smith, 2014).

Since security has become the survival of the fittest, each state pursues policies and strategies that will ensure its stability and promote the welfare of its members. Nigeria and the United States of America are federal states with distinct security models constitutionally established through centralized and decentralized systems. In exploring the current insecurity issues, there is no doubt that Nigeria is bedeviled with security challenges such as kidnapping, terrorism, separatists, movement banditry, Boko Haram insurgency, and communal interface, which are detrimental to its national development and political stability, as averred by (Ndema, 2024; Olajide, 2023).

The management and control of resources, such as allocation and distribution centralized system is in the hands of the government. This underscored why the excessive power of the federal government could create inefficiencies and clashes between the central and state governments (Suberu, 2008). According to the 1999 constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, the federal government is empowered to control defense, law enforcement, and national security issues, while the major responsibility of the state government is to maintain law and order, especially through the establishment of the State Security Services (SSS), charged with the responsibility to maintain state security. In contrast, the United States has a more decentralized security architecture, with significant powers granted to state governments. American federalism, according to scholars like Richman & Seo (2020), Amsey (2012), permits the sharing of responsibility between the federal and state governments, which enables the government to respond to security challenges at the instance of perceived threats, while the states are constitutionally empowered to act over homeland security, emergencies, and enforcement of the law. The U.S Constitution gives the federal government control over defense, foreign policy, and national security. Some states, such as California and New York, have established their security initiative, such as data privacy security laws, to address particular local issues in their state (Lim & Oh, 2025)

Far more than the application of military means, security has become a more dynamic and multidimensional concept that provides an in-depth knowledge of the comparative analysis of different security models and their synergy with social, political, and economic security, validating its multifaceted nature. With the unpredictable nature of security, no state can attain its total security agenda because the trend of security issues evolves by the day (WINS, 2018; United Nations, 2023)

This study will help to give an in-depth knowledge of issues related to security through a comparative study of different security models within the federal systems of Nigeria and the United States of America. An understanding of the intricacies of governance and security management can be gained by examining the centralized and decentralized security models in federal states such as Nigeria and the United States of America, and their impact on the security outcomes.

In Nigeria, measures such as anti-terrorism legislation (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2013), and various internal measures such as Operation Whirl Stroke and Safe Haven to combat insecurity in the North Central, especially in Benue and Nasarawa States

(International Crises Group, 2018; Ibrahim & Olasupo, 2023), Operation Lafiya Dole to combat Boko Haram insurgency in the Northeastern with the help of the Nigerian Army and Air force (Ezeani, Ani, Ezeibe, & Ubiebi 2021), Operation Amotekun established by the six South-West governors (Oikhala, 2022). The establishment of the Civilian Joint Force has been an instrument in the combating of insecurity in North-Eastern Nigeria with the professional support of the Nigerian army. The impact of community-led initiatives in the North-West was a bold step toward restoring peace to the region and an amnesty program in the South-South (Oluwaniyi, 2011).

The United States of America addressed security issues, especially in the light of 9/11 attacks, through the establishment Homeland Security to consolidate various security systems (Lansford, 2010), an Intelligence reform system was launched to enhance information sharing between agencies such as the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), (White House, 2012) and established National Counterterrorism Centre (Heins, 2019), engagement of military power through the launch of war as seen in Afghanistan and Iraq (Administered & Archives, 2015; Salt, 2018), the use of USA PATRIOT Act is also a laudable strategy (Information & Recherche, 2006) and increasing public awareness (DHS, 2013).

Despite these measures, security challenges persist. Comparatively, Nigeria and the United States of America experience cybercrimes, terrorism, border security challenges, pandemic and health security issues, and organized crime. The dynamism of the common security challenges in both countries calls for concerted efforts of all state security apparatus for a combined synergy toward sustainable governance. Notwithstanding policy documents put in place by both countries to curb these menaces, security issues remain a global challenge and multidimensional, and their importance can never be underplayed because it is not static, and calls for dynamic measures.

2. Statement of the Problem

Provision of national security remains a cyclical challenge in federal states, where debate over centralized and decentralized security models is common. Nigeria and the United States of America, which are federal states with different security architectures, have faced

difficulties in attaining the best security outcome. The search for the perfect model is a comprehensive strategy that no state can achieve its total security agenda. However, states like France, the U.S, Russia, Canada, Germany, and New Zealand have made considerable efforts to attain substantial security solutions with remarkable outcomes to combat their security challenges. Yet, security remains far-fetched in other milieus (Kitler, 2021). This is further substantiated by (Michaelsen, 2010; Ummah, 2019 ; Oliphant, 2017.

While existing literature offers insight into security governance in federal political systems, a noticeable gap remains in comparative analyses between centralized and decentralized security models across diverse federal contexts. Specifically, there is a dearth of studies that have examined security within the context of Nigeria and the United States of America to explore the structural, operational, functional, and policy outcomes of Nigeria's centralized security system alongside the decentralized model of the United States. This study will address that gap by exploring how each system influences internal security, public trust, and the effectiveness of each model, thereby contributing to policy discourse on security reform in federal states by examining conceptual analysis, reviewing relevant literature, and examining the practical implications of these models in the context of federal states.

Despite differences in the security models adopted by each of the states under consideration, as guaranteed by the constitutions in both countries, security challenges are still prevalent. The inability of each model to provide total remedies to security issues remains an intellectual debate in federal states, especially within the political context of Nigeria and the United States of America, to determine the best model for tackling the perennial security challenges faced by these states. Although, no single fit-all approach to security issues as a result of inadequacies with the centralized and decentralized security models.

Research by Awotayo & Omitola (2024) on "Decentralizing security architecture: evaluating federalism's role in enhancing security frameworks in Nigeria" corroborated the above statement, found a relationship between the centralized security architecture and the surge in the development of security challenges in Nigeria. This is because centralization could alienate citizens from local security decision-making, contributing to insecurity. This has led to the inability of decentralized security systems to quell and address serious security challenges and solve local security issues in Nigeria. In contrast, the decentralized security model as obtained in the USA allows for regional integration and community-led security

initiatives, which could enhance security frameworks and provide a step forward in combating security challenges due to its inclusivity in addressing security challenges and responses to regional needs. However, the suitability of each approach in a federal state remains a subject of discussion.

Constitutional provisions by each of the states under consideration validate outcomes of different security models based on the extent to which the constitution granted each level of government autonomy to operate (Ogedengbe, 2024). Sections 217-220 of the amended 1999 constitution of Nigeria saddled the central authority with the responsibility to establish armed forces and oversee the military, the police force, and other agencies of various security establishments, while the state and local government are to maintain law and order. The USA 1992 constitution, as amended on May 7, 1999, allowed division of security responsibilities among the governmental echelons. Agencies such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) at the federal stratum that are responsible for domestic intelligent for the enforcement of federal laws and investigate crimes and violence and Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) saddles with the responsible for drug control, organized crimes and monitor the activities of drug traffickers, while state/local agencies have police departments and sheriff's offices, operating concurrently with the federal agencies.

However, the inability to solve the cyclical security issues despite the past measures calls for a careful re-evaluation of strategies employed by Nigeria and the United States of America through the adoption of a more integrated and community-focused approach. This study will also examine the centralized and decentralized systems in Nigeria and the United States of America, respectively, and then go ahead to propose a workable security model that will help guide policymakers.

Research Objectives

i.   To examine how centralized and decentralized security models in Nigeria and the United States of America influence national security outcomes.

3. The Rationale of the Study

The relevance of this study to the current security challenges in our contemporary world formed the basis for this study to examine the contribution and challenges of various security models, and how best they can inform policy decisions on security governance in federal states. Nigeria and the United States of America are federal states with different security architectures; they are offshoots of British colonies and have had difficulties in providing total security for their homeland. As observed in this study, security issues can never be underplayed. Nigeria battles significant security issues, including terrorism, notably armed banditry, kidnapping, and communal violence. The surge in insecurity and its complexity in federal states, such as Nigeria and the United States of America, necessitate the need for an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of security models. By comparing both countries, this study would provide valuable lessons that may be learned from the effectiveness of the centralization and decentralization security models in different contexts. While existing literature offers insight into security governance in federal political systems, a noticeable gap remains in comparative analyses between centralized and decentralized security models across diverse federal contexts. Specifically, there is a dearth of studies that have examined security within the context of Nigeria and the United States of America to explore the structural, operational, functional, and policy outcomes of Nigeria's centralized **security** system alongside the decentralized model of the United States. This study will address that gap by exploring how each system influences internal security, public trust, and the effectiveness of each model, thereby contributing to policy discourse on security reform in federal states by examining theoretical foundations, conceptual analysis, and practical implications of these models in the context of federal states.

Nigeria's government has implemented some notable strategies through the deployment of Military operations to combat Boko Haram, leading to temporary improvements but not a complete resolution of the conflict, the engagement of community policing has proved to be inconsistent, and the establishment of the anti-terrorism act to enhance the country's legal framework also flopped due to the lack of enforcement power (Udeoba & Eze, 2021).

4. Scope of the Study

Nigeria and the United States of America are the major study areas of this study. Both countries are federal states, offshoots of the British Colony, having different security systems. This study will examine security models of Nigeria and the United States of America on a comparative basis to identify best practices and lessons that each state can learn from the other to improve its security systems. The comparison is motivated by the divergent security challenges and outcomes in the two countries, despite their shared federalist structures.

Nigeria's centralized security model is striving amidst security issues in the country to address the country's myriad security challenges, including terrorism, kidnapping, and armed robbery. In contrast, the United States' decentralized security model has been credited with facilitating a more effective response to domestic security threats while also allowing for greater public engagement in security decision-making.

By comparing and contrasting the security models in these two federal states, the study tends to provide insights into how different security models could impact national security outcomes and to identify possible areas for restructuring and enhancement in Nigeria's security sector.

5. Operational Definitions of Terms

  i. Security is about how the state and its members are protected from internal and external attacks
 ii. Homeland security is the strategic measure put in place by the U.S government to tackle terrorism challenges in the wake of the 9/11 attacks on its institutions (World Trade Centre and Pentagon)
iii. Federalism is an arrangement of government that involves the submission of individual sovereignty to one another to form a strong union despite their ethnic and cultural differences, without automatically losing their various identities
 iv. Decentralization entails the distribution of power and resources among the central government and the constituent units

v. National Security is the protection of the state sovereignty and its territory from internal and external attack.

vi. The security model is an approach adopted by a state towards solving security challenges

vii. National Security outcome refers to the results of security implementation in the member states.

6. Review of the Literature

This literature review aims to compare and contrast centralized and decentralized security models in Nigeria and the USA, and their implications on national security outcomes in federal states, examining the historical, cultural, institutional, and constitutional contexts that shape these models.

6.1. Conceptual review: Security and National Security

Simonyi (2002) and Bhal (2014) opined that security is a neglected and contested concept, dating back to Wolfe's 1952 article. He emphasized that security as an academic field of study has been neglected, as reflected in various surveys on the subject. He further noted the work of Barry Buzan's view of security as an "undeveloped concept" and found a gap in the conceptualization of security. Security as a contested concept was believed to be portrayed as an essentially contested concept due to the ambiguity of its meaning (Adhikari, 2024). This further signifies that security may fulfil the requirement for its classification as an essentially contested concept based on its conflicting perspectives. This contest suggests that no agreement could be reached or attained on the general security perspective because there are always alternatives to be foregone. This attests to the costs associated with pursuing security, such as the loss of other objectives that could have been accomplished with the money and resources spent on security. The importance of security to the survival of the state and its citizens is more preferable than the cost spent on security because it is about upholding the state's core values, which are in the state regardless of the costs incurred (Alumona, 2019).

Bakreski & Bardjieva (2024) contest that security is no longer monopolized by the state as the only actor recognized in the international system to determine what constitutes

security. He argued further that the traditional perspective of security does not challenge the fundamental nature of security (ontology) but focuses on the essentiality of security. This further established the social perspective of security as an intersubjective practice, which is a shared responsibility between individuals and the group. This emphasized human perception of security to determine what security is and what it does not connote, depending on its context. More precisely, security could be approached based on its essence, which signifies the core nature of security, a concept that is the anchor upon which security stands, and governance of security, which emphasizes how security is being managed and implemented.

Mrozek & Galiczek (2022) argued that etymologically, the term "security" originates from the Latin words "sine cura, securitas," meaning certainty and security. Security is the state of being freed from fear and having a considerable level of peace and confidence (Mrozek & Galiczek, 2022). Korzeniowski (2016) averred that the provision of security and safety is within the power of the state because the state possesses enormous power in shaping security architecture at the national and international levels, with the power to influence its security outcome. Security issues are a global phenomenon, and National Security concerns the safekeeping of the nation as a whole, the ability of the state to defend or protect its homeland and its citizens from internal and external threats (Obronna, 2022).

National security comprises all aspects of security, such as military, energy, cultural, environmental, economic, cyber security, political, and human security, as argued by (ROK President's Office (2018). Afolabi & Bodunde 2020) viewed national security as the capability of a state to guide and protect its national and territorial integrity, its assets, and entire members of the state.

According to Olaniyan & Omotola (2015)

"Security connotes safety or freedom from danger and threats to the survival of individuals, the nation, and the international system at both internal and external levels. "The concept of 'national security' has been a subject of intense academic debate over the years. The debate has given rise to two dominant perspectives: pax atomic, or pax armamenta, and pax mundi. The former typifies a military-based security framework, with emphasis on traditional military approaches, and the latter emphasizes non-military security frameworks that place the people at the center."

Lippmann, W., Lasswell, H., Wolfers, A., Brown, H., & Maier, C. (1996). National security is otherwise known as national defense. It comprises the military, cyberattacks, and the state and non-state actors who have a great impact on the outcome of security issues in the world. It involves the protection of the state and its members from events that could harm or cause damage to them and their properties. According to Powell (2014), the concept of security as a "relational concept" is not substantive; rather, the information of security entails the understanding of security from the perspective of security for whom, security of what, security against what, and security by whom. An answer to these fundamental security questions establishes it as a silent concept, which mostly depends on the level at which it is applied. The "rational concept of security" is neither abstract nor conservative because it goes beyond the maintenance of the status quo. Powell further argued that security could be expressed as a "negative and positive concept". The negative perspective of the concept of security validates the inherent nature of man that feels secure when nothing negative happens to them. The idea of security as a positive concept suggests its importance as an instrument to protect the values and interests of the state for posterity's sake in response to unforeseen threats.

National security is defined as the process of ensuring the safety and defense of a state, its citizens, economy, and institutions against internal and external threats (Hamza, 2024). It is quite awesome to recall that the National Security Organization in Nigeria was created by decree 27of 1976, immediately after the aborted coup masterminded by Dimka that led to the death of the former head of state, General Muritala Mohammed, charged with the responsibility to coordinate internal security, foreign intelligence, and counterintelligence activities, and ensuring that crimes are detected and prevented. This was able to reduce insecurity to a minimum level, but failed to provide total security.

6.2. Homeland Security

Searching for a solution to tackle terrorism, especially during the 9/11 attack on the U.S institutions, led to the establishment of a model in 2002, known as the Homeland Security model, which has hitherto prevented the occurrence of such a provocative attack. Homeland security consists of 22 federal agencies that are responsible for the prevention of terrorism in the USA.

Homeland Security, according to Randol (2010), is the U.S. federal executive department granted power and authority constitutionally to be accountable for public security. It could be regarded as an interior, home, or public security ministry in other countries. The Secretary of DHS is in charge of homeland security and oversees its various components, such as the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), saddled with the responsibility of coordinating disasters and establishing a relief operational system. The Transportation Security Administration (TSA) helps to ensure that the national transportation system is secured. It is the responsibility of Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to see to the enforcement of customs, immigration, and agricultural laws, while the main focus of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) is to oversee the enforcement of immigration laws and investigate transnational crimes. A laudable impact of DHS in protecting the national security infrastructure and preventing of U.S from security threats can never be underplayed. Its overarching functions and dynamic structure strategically empower it to address a variety of security issues and ensure the protection and well-being of Americans.

"Homeland security is a concerted national effort to prevent terrorist attacks within the United States, reduce its vulnerability to terrorism, and minimize the damage and recover from attacks that do occur" (Siedschlag &Jerković, 2022). Its main components in the United States include preventing terrorist attacks through intelligence collection, counterterrorism tactics, and security procedures; reducing the country's susceptibility to attack through risk assessment, mitigation, and resilience building; and managing and recovering from attacks through emergency response, crisis management, and reconstruction efforts. This highlights the importance of a coordinated national effort to prevent, reduce vulnerability, and mitigate the USA's exposure to attack.

6.3. Federalism

Emeka (2019) defined federalism as a political system that has the challenge of conceptualization. (Anderson, 2008) argued that the word "federalism" has been proven as a long-established viable democracy and holds an important place in the world democratic system. The concept of federalism has been examined by different authors in the field of Political Science and International relations. (Chopan & Dar 2017) explained that the word "federal" has its root in the Latin word "foedus," which, having a similar meaning to the Hebrew word "brit," meaning a covenant. Federalism is a collaborative partnership guided

by a covenant, with internal arrangements dependent on a mutual commitment to each partner's integrity and the promotion of unity. In Hebrew, "shalom," meaning peace, is related to "brit," emphasizing the importance of achieving covenantal wholeness and genuine peace. Federalism should, in reality, be placed on a separate continuum based on non-centralization, or the effective union of unity and diversity, rather than the centralization-decentralization continuum. A notable scholar on federalism (Olulu & Udeorah, 2018) examined federalism as a:

> "Political concept in which power to govern is shared between National and Sub-national governments, creating what is often referred to as a federation. In a federal arrangement, each tier of government is coordinated and independent in its limited sphere of authority and should also have appropriate taxing powers to exploit its independent sources of revenue."

According to Ojo (2009), Nigerian federalism is "convoluted," stressing its challenges despite its significance. He lauded Nigeria's federalism as an example in the deployment of a power-sharing approach to promote inter-ethnic cooperation and regional imbalance, and serving as a pillar to maintain Unity in diversity. (Bulmer, 2017) conceptualized Federalism as a constitutional framework that shares power among governmental tiers and grants each federation independence to act within a specific area of jurisdiction, and shares power according to agreed principles. This system combines self-government and shared governance. He noted that federalism is common in a country with a multicultural system or having a wider geographical area. Federal states include Nigeria, the United States, Argentina, Belgium, Canada, Germany, India, Malaysia, Pakistan, Spain, and South Africa, among others.

In conceptualizing federalism, Bulmer (2017) differentiated between "competitive, cooperative, and asymmetrical" federalism. Both the national and subnational institutions in federal states in a competitive federalism were regarded as totally different institutions with overlapping territorial jurisdiction, which occupy separate legal spheres and are independent of each other in carrying out their responsibilities. Cooperative federalism regards both the state and local government as partners in government, working together to share responsibilities and power as a common good, and constituent units have substantial

involvement in the formulation of federal policies, where the federal government depends on the state for the policy to be implemented. In asymmetrical federalism, different part of the country's territory is granted autonomy at different levels. These differences in autonomy may be a result of responses in capacity to issues, which is based on the development of each territory. A notable example is Spain and Canada.

Piate & Ukere (2024) quoted K.C. Wheare (1963), who defined federalism as a governmental system where the powers of government are shared between central and regional governments to ensure coordination and independence within specified sectors. The principle of federalism entails that the power of government is divided among levels of government with a codified constitution and coordinated function, rather than subordinating them to a two-level government. This means that for a system to be regarded as Federal, there must be an existence of power division among levels of government within their sphere of action, and each is independent of the others.

6.4. Centralization and Decentralization

In federal states, the two predominant systems are Centralized and Decentralized, which define the level of autonomy granted to sub-units, and this depends on the state's historical context, economic development, and cultural identity, among other factors. Nigeria, France, and Russia are centralized states, while the United States of America and Germany are decentralized.

Datta (2021) defined decentralization as the transfer of authority and responsibility from the central government to elected subnational authorities, such as the state and regional governments, to avail them of some level of autonomy. There are three interconnected aspects of decentralization: political, administrative, and fiscal. The success of decentralization depends on how it is implemented and managed. Closing the gap between government and the people at the grassroots, decentralization enhances citizen participation and improves public service delivery to meet citizens' needs. This explained decentralization as a constitutional instrument that permits the decision-making power to be shared between the center and its constituent units or even different levels of government, such as regional, state, or local governments.

Njie &Adesopo (2023) defined Centralization as a system of government where there is a concentration of power at the Centre without the devolution of power to the constituent

units, while Decentralization is a system of government where there is devolution of power, sharing of power among the federal government units, or transfer of political power from the Federal government to the constituent units. David & Abubakar (2024) explained that centralization involves concentrating decision-making and power at the top of an organization, allowing for a coordinated response to crises. However, it can lead to slow decision-making and limited flexibility. On the other hand, decentralization involves delegating more authority and decision-making power to lower levels of an organization, enabling quicker decisions and tailored responses to local conditions. Despite this, decentralization has the challenge of a poor coordinating mechanism and consistency in decision-making processes.

Huxley & Schneiderman (2018) examined centralization as the constitutional method by which decision-making authority is granted to the central government. Ojo (2015) emphasized the need to ensure a balanced application between centralized and decentralized security models for a federal state like Nigeria. Although he affirmed that, while a total centralized approach might not be best for the country as a result of various needs and potential vulnerabilities, a decentralized approach could lead to conflicts and inefficiencies.

6.5. Security Model

The focus of security models differs from one another, ranging from traditional realist perspectives, which emphasized military power and state survival, to more contemporary approaches that considered economic, societal, and environmental security. Different actors expressed this concept based on their perspectives, interests, and values. A security model is a broad framework of analysis across different fields of study. In political science, Buzan & Hansen (2012) define security models as frameworks that analyze how states and societies protect themselves from threats, both internal and external. Buzan and Hansen's work on the traditionalist approach to security has undergone substantial changes. The traditionalist approach is characterized by three main elements: military focus, which emphasizes military security and the balance of power; state-centricity, which views the state as the main actor in the international system; and realism, which emphasizes the anarchical nature of the international system and the significance of the need for self-help.

Nigeria and the USA are federal states with different security models, constitutionally established to solve security challenges in each state. The literature on centralized and

decentralized security models in federal states is enormous and diverse, and debate on its implications on national security outcomes in federal states has become a subject of discourse in recent years, especially in federal states like Nigeria and the United States.

7. Empirical Review

Generally, security challenges are global issues, and federal states are not excepted due to the structural nature of numerous ethnic groups and diverse religious inclinations, as well as ethnic biases as a result of the government's inability to provide effective and sufficient security for its citizens (Nwankwo et al., 2023). Jester (2022) investigates security as a unifying component in each of the global issues we face in the world today, and for that reason, it becomes a central theme in International Relations. Relations (2014) claimed that many emerging societal security challenges require a synergy between various actors who need to work towards similar or relatively identical objectives, especially in crisis management and responses to disasters. Awotayo & Omitola (2024) have evaluated the security architectures in Nigeria and argued that the lack of a decentralized security infrastructure has worsened the already existing insecurity problems in the country.

Centralized and decentralized security frameworks underscore two different governance systems, which represent two sides of the same coin, as well as two limiting organizational structures and management paradigms that shape decision-making in organizations, institutions, and government bodies. Centralization and decentralization were viewed by Falk & Raundalen (2021) and Cornito (2021) within the context of a global crisis and explored their impact on managing global crises. The authors discuss how these strategies can be effectively combined to address crises. A systematic study of the two security models of centralized and decentralized systems highlights the strengths and weaknesses of the approaches and their impacts on security architecture in a federal state (Kharel & Acharya, 2023). It further established differences in the way these models operate and in the handling of respective security threats.

Egara (2025) opined that security issues have become a major challenge in Nigeria, with terrorism, kidnappings, banditry, and communal clashes remaining a persistent concern, with great implications for the nation's social, economic, and political development and stability.

He added that Nigeria and the USA are not exempt from the security issues that plague the nation as a whole, which are exacerbated by the antecedents of ethno-religious conflicts, economic disparities, governmental failure, and constitutional weakness worldwide. This threat has undermined the nation's stability and left it on the verge of ruin, terror, and despair.

Berebon (2025) in the "Nexus between Security, Human Development, and Economic Stability" examined the complex relationship between security, human development, and economic stability in Nigeria. According to the study, Nigerian insecurity has had a detrimental effect on many facets of national life, such as a slowdown in economic growth, a lack of a safe environment that prevents young people from finding work, and a threat to internal security from both new and preexisting security issues. The research emphasizes the interconnectedness between economic stability, human development, and security. It illustrated security as a crucial factor for development, influencing human and economic growth by fostering a stable environment for investment, innovation, and progress.

The study also looks at how economic stability creates the foundation for security by allowing governments to manage resources and efficiently handle security concerns, while human development, which includes education, healthcare, and skill development, drives economic growth and stability. It highlighted the interconnectedness of historical, social, political, and economic variables and their impact on the Nigerian security system. In addition to poverty, poor administration, and a weak political system, security challenges are complicated and linked to the improper integration of people from various regions and ethnic groups in the service of national security (Olaniyan & Omotola, 2015; Odalonu, 2022; OAS, 2022; Siegle & O'Mahoney, 2007; Booth, 2007).

Adams & Ogbonnaya (2014) "Ethnic and Regional Violence in Nigeria: Implications for National Security" provided a detailed explanation of the complexity of security challenges Nigeria is battling with. The authors examined various forms of violence, such as organized crime, gang crime, militant Islamist groups, farmer-herder conflicts, separatist movements, and violence perpetrated against civilians. The key findings highlight that Boko Haram and its affiliate, the Islamic State in West Africa (ISWA), remain significant threats to national security. Their activities have resulted in numerous casualties, the displacement of people, and economic losses. Organized criminal gangs have capitalized on the situation by engaging in lucrative kidnapping for ransom schemes, particularly in the North West region, leading to increased instability and insecurity in the country.

Omilusi (2016), in his journal article "The Multi-Dimensional Impacts of Insurgency and Armed Conflicts on Nigeria," argued that terrorism and insurgencies have had great consequences on the state infrastructure, socioeconomic development, humanitarian crisis, and national security. He contended that the emergence of Islamic extremists and violence in Nigeria was a result of the inability of the state to manage the expansion of external terrorist organizations and their links to domestic religious groups. The article is organized around four primary themes: Infrastructure Collapse, which talks about the breakdown of infrastructure as a result of conflict; Humanitarian Crisis, which emphasizes the serious humanitarian effects of armed conflicts and insurgencies; National Security, which looks at how insurgency affects Nigeria's security; and Socio-Economic Impact, which explores the economic and social effects of insurgency, including loss of livelihoods, destruction of infrastructure, and the emergence of extremist groups.

Awotayo &Omitola (2024) pointed out that a state's security results may be significantly impacted by the security model it chooses to use. The results of security measures, information exchange, and the state's reaction to security threats may all be impacted by the political environment of Nigeria's centralized security system and the United States' decentralized security strategy. Additionally, the provision of a single command, consistent protocols, and better coordination across all of its domains are common to centralized systems; this could strengthen national security. Bulme (2017) claimed that security results can be greatly impacted by how the federal and state governments share security-related duties and authority. This will necessitate the formulation and implementation of a clear policy across all government institutions and proper accountability.

More so, within the federal states, as explained by the UN (2000) decentralized security model is commended for its flexibility in addressing issues at the local and regional levels, improving local security by utilizing local expertise, and encouraging community involvement through involvement in local security operations. Inequality in the distribution and allocation of resources within its realm is the major challenge.

Kharel & Acharya (2023) argued that giving the central government too many decision-making responsibilities could result in inefficiencies, corruption, and power abuse, as well as delays in decision-making while navigating hierarchical processes. Hollenbeck et al. (2011), lack of flexibility and comprehensiveness in responding to local problems, addressing regional issues, or adjusting to change may impede or postpone the prompt response to

community needs, weaken local autonomy and decision-making authority, and create vulnerabilities as the central authority may be jeopardized. Ogunnubi (2022) pointed out that the idea of decentralization allows for the possibility of extending governance to the local level through local government structures. The security architecture in Nigeria is centralized, establishing the federal government as a dominant actor in the security system. The Nigerian police force is responsible for maintaining law and order (Esq. et al., 2015), Department of State Security Services (DSS) saddled with the responsibility of handling domestic intelligence and counterterrorism operations (DSS, 2015), Nigerian Armed Forces comprises of Nigerian Army, Navy and Nigerian Air forces who are responsible for external security and defense of the state (Thompson, 2021) and the National Security Adviser (NSA) who serves as the chief security adviser to the President to coordinate national security policies, are the major players in Nigeria's security system (Shaffer, 2023). Awotayo & Omitola (2024) called for the examination of the role of federalism in decentralizing the security approach to strengthen security measures across the country.

The decentralized security model is in operation in the USA, which allows for power distribution among levels of government. The key players in USA security architecture include federal Bureau of investigation (FBI) who key focus is on domestic intelligence and law enforcement, The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) have the responsibility of preventing and responding to terrorist threats and other security issues in the USA which are at the federal level while state and local security enforcement agents are the state police and local police, who are responsible for the maintenance of laws and order within theirs jurisdiction as argued by (Bates, 2023). Devine (2022) explained that in the USA, Intelligence agents such as the CIA and National Security Agency are saddled with the responsibility of external defense without deviating from internal protection of the state. Fisher (2014) accentuated that the National Guard is a reserved component of the U.S Armed Forces that could be called at any time to give security support to the state and federal authorities in when crisis erupts, and the private security companies who provides security support in the area of cyber security which the virtual aspect of security and highly sensitive and also involves in intelligence gathering.

Luitel (2024) critically examined the role of non-state actors in shaping the security systems of a state and provided a guide to the understanding of their impact in Nigeria and the USA security system. In Nigeria, non-state actors such as Boko Haram and Militant

herder groups have contributed to civil unrest and violence over resources, while non-state actors such as vigilantes, Civil Society Organizations, and traditional rulers have contributed immensely to protecting local communities, supporting community-based security initiatives, and maintaining order and resolving conflicts in their communities, respectively (Ademi & Vula, 2023; Omale, Theophilus Ocholi; Shuibu & Bayo, 2025). In the United States of America, the roles of non-state actors such as private military companies, cybersecurity firms, and community-based organizations also play a significant role in decentralized security provision in the USA through the provision of security training, cybersecurity, and security of critical infrastructure and support of homeland security could not be underplayed, especially through their partnerships with government agencies and community-based initiatives (Frank, 2017). Although the United States of America is facing threats from terrorist groups, non-state actors are causing significant threats to national security and posing cyber threats to its critical infrastructure.

8. Integrative Review

The study of fiscal federalism and its implications for the state of economic security has been a major debate among scholars of federalism. Scholars such as Olulu&Udeorah (2018); Olu-Adeyemi (2017) and Great (2024) examined Nigeria federalism on "Fiscal Federalism and the State of Economy in Nigeria", "Federalism and the National Integration in Nigeria" and "True Federalism and National Development in Nigeria" respectively, found a correlation in the outcome of their finding with the emphasis on the need for restructuring or true federalism in the Nigeria centralized system of federalism.

More specifically, the researchers adopted a qualitative research method, and data were collected through secondary data collection, and a critical analysis of the existing literature was conducted. The findings, among others, revealed limited state autonomy, which is paramount to the Nigerian centralized security system. The literature suggested that to promote economic development in Nigeria and ensure a notch-touch service delivery, there is a need for decentralization of power and resources to the state and local government.

9. Historical Review

Traditionally, the resurgence of terrorism in the world with the September 11, 2001, attack, which was a deadly and provocative attack on the most vital institutions of America, the World Trade Center and Pentagon, by Osama Bin Laden and his fundamentalist group known as Al-Qaeda which added strategic dimensions to the debate on international security (Booth, 2007; McElreath et al., 2021). The logic of the plan and preparation that led to the deliberate attack by Osama Bin Laden was explored in three ways. The first was the group's ideology, which was based on the belief that the presence of the USA in Saudi Arabia and its extreme support for Israel was an insult to Islam, which aggravated his actions for such a provocative attack. The second area was the structure of Al-Qaeda, which was centralized with different operatives dispersed in various countries, established Osama Bin Laden as the leader of the group, and Khalid Sheikh Mohammed (KSM) was the intelligence planner of the attack. Thirdly, he was able to conduct reconnaissance and surveillance on most revered institutions of the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon (Reynolds, 2018; Gunaratna & Nielsen, 2008; Pamela, 2023).

NCTA (2004), (report of 9/11 report), critically examined the nature of the 9/11 attacks on the United States institutions and highlighted the failure of US intelligence agencies to detect and prevent the plot, as well as the role of al-Qaeda's ideological and operational evolution in the provocative attack. Four major areas were examined to describe the nature of the attack. The commercial airlines, such as American Airlines of number AA11, United Airlines Flight 77 with number UA77, and United Airlines Flight 93 with number UAF93, were provocatively hijacked. Secondly, Flight AA11 and US175 were deliberately crashed into the World Trade Center (the Twin Towers in New York City). The third strategy was at the Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia, which was destroyed through the crashing of AA77 Flight, and the fourth was the crashing of UA93, which was an intended attack on the white house or the USA Capitol before it crashed into a field in Shanksville, Pennsylvania, after an attempt to overcome the hijackers by the passengers failed.

A retrospective into the factors that contributed to the attack, an unforgettable moment in contemporary history, DHS (2019); the 9/11 Commission Report (2004), and Camerino (2020), revealed several notable intertwined factors, such as the rise of Islamist terrorism,

intelligence failures, and weaknesses in aviation security, as contributing to the attacks. The report emphasized the importance of understanding evolving terrorist threats and the need for continuous attention to detail and adaptive response strategies. Some of the cited reasons behind the 9/11 attacks by Osama include US military presence in Saudi Arabia, support for Israel, and objections to American culture as untouchable (Rosthauser, 2010).

The first observed factor could be the lack of intelligence sharing by the USA intelligence agencies, which believed they could have had some information but failed to share the information with the expected security agencies (DHS, 2019; 9/11 Commission Report, 2004). The insufficient security measures at airports enabled the hijackers to board planes without being noticed, Camerino (2020). Underestimating the ability and capabilities of Osama Bin Laden and his fundamentalist group was also a contributory factor. Lastly, the complacency and inadequate preparation could be another factor because, before the attack by Al-Qaeda, the USA had not experienced such a provocative attack under the assumption that the country was secure (DHS, 2019).

As argued by National Fire Academy (2000) the United State of American quickly switched into action by immediately deployed firefighters, police, and medical personnel to the scenes of the attack to rescue those who were trapped and provide medical assistance, the launch of war on Terror, which was a military campaign globally with a focus on combating terrorism and extremism, the passage of USA Patriot Act to established a comprehensive and inclusive surveillance powers strengthen law enforcement agencies and improved intelligence gathering, and the creation of Department of Homeland Security (DHS) which consist of 22 departments to coordinate national effort and combat terrorists threats. DHS (2019) claimed that the 9/11 attack on USA institutions claimed thousands of lives, and the impact of the attack is evident on global politics, international relations, national security policy, religious perspectives, technology advancement, and internet improvement, among others. This political dimension may also capture ideological or religious goals. This was corroborated by (UNODC, 2009) when differentiated between victimizing and criminal terrorists. While terrorist acts are major crimes, it is crucial to keep in mind that victimizing terrorists differs from criminal victimization in that the former includes an intrinsic political component.

Homeland Security (2003) proclaimed that a major revamp of national security rules and procedures resulting from the 9/11 attacks had a dramatic influence on the U.S security

architecture, leading to a significant overhaul of its national security policies and procedures, with an effect on the security system, resulting in significant shifts in the security approach toward terrorism and insurgency in the world. Some of the identified impacts include: Restructuring National Security Organizations as the USA's reaction to the September 11 attacks, which led to the establishment of a security sector in 2002 known as the Department of Homeland Security, which united 22 disparate departments and organizations under one roof to enhance coordination and communication among national security agencies. Changes in Counterterrorism Techniques after 9/11 had a major impact, placing more emphasis on intelligence collection, international collaboration, and preventative measures, and increasing funding for cybersecurity, border security, and intelligence services.

Development of a strategic balance between security and civil freedoms led to policies such as the PATRIOT Act of the USA, which supports law enforcement agencies in monitoring capabilities.

The global Consequences of the 9/11 attacks had a wide range of repercussions, including increased military interventions, international wars on terror, and a reorganization of international relations. Goldberg et al. (2020) claimed that the Pentagon symbolized America's might and power at home and abroad after the end of World War II for over half a century, under the assumption that the nation was safe from invasion. Wars et al., (2003) argued the attack on the U.S. Pentagon on September 11, 2001, was a wake-up call to the United States and showed that it was not immune to security threats; hence, the need for the enhancement of its security infrastructure through the fortification of its security apparatuses and measures that led to the creation of a security model in 2002.

Arutselvan (2022) described how the establishment of the Department of Homeland Security was a major leap forward in reducing American vulnerability, especially after the September 11 attacks that dramatically changed American security policy. The Department of Homeland has 22 federal establishments, which include the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Coast Guard in the U.S.A., and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which placed greater emphasis on ensuring security and safety for its members. The collaboration and integration strategy through a decentralized system among state and regional governments and private organizations strengthened and solidified the U.S. security system beyond the 9/11 attack for the implementation of the recommendations of the reports of the Commission Act of 2007.   The development of insecurity in

Nigeria and, most importantly, terrorism, has given a new perspective to Nigeria's security system. Boko Haram is the most prevailing threat to the peace of the country, with other actors such as Islamic States West African Provinces (ISWAP), Yan Bindiga, Yan Tadda, with the challenge of kidnapping and all sorts of atrocities ravaging the country, explained the unpredictable nature of security challenges in Nigeria (Forum, 2020).

Mamman (2020) and Afzal (2020) avowed that Boko Haram insurgency is regarded as the deadliest insurgency in the world, which began as an opposition to Western education in Nigeria in the late 2000s. It later became an agitator for the establishment of the Islamic Caliphate and the terrorist group as we have it today. The group has executed successful attacks on both the military, nonmilitary, and infrastructural architecture in Nigeria, such as bombing, assassination, kidnapping, causing death and displacement of several people (Asfura-Heim &Mcquaid 2015). The government has indeed made several attempts to address the insecurity challenges, but the outcomes have yielded little success, which validates the threat the group remains a significant threat to its national security.

In addition, ethnic militancy, especially the Niger Delta militants, had caused serious havoc to the Nigerian economy and the death of innocent individuals and government officials. (Henry 2015) echoed that to be in control of oil resources, citing land and water pollution as a result of oil spillage as the major environmental challenges that have not been addressed by the federal government. This, among other reasons, led to the kidnapping of oil workers and the engagement in other atrocities in the country.

There is no doubt that this has had serious implications for Nigerian national security outcomes, such as rendering the government incapable of maintaining law and order.

Implications of terrorism on Nigerian national security outcomes are severe, such as economic loss, humanitarian crisis, and regional and political instability.

Joshua & Damilola (2021) highlighted that Chapter Four of the 1999 Nigerian Constitution lays out certain rights for its citizens, while Chapter Two outlines the government's obligations, which include the government's primary duty to protect citizens' lives and property from both internal and external threats. This further demonstrates that the methods used by various nations, as outlined in their constitutions, and the practicality of the models used, will significantly influence the best approaches for resolving the security issues that the states face.

Michael (2020) stated that a thorough knowledge of the decentralization framework may be gained by looking at a variety of constitutional developments, especially the Littleton Constitution of 1954, the Macpherson Constitution of 1951, and the Richard Constitution of 1946. Richard's constitution laid the country's decentralized foundation through the introduction of a regional system in Nigeria and assigned a regional council in each of the three regions (North, West, and East), and allowed for some degree of participation in governance and decision-making. Although through Macpherson's constitution of 1951, more autonomy was granted to the regional government, the Lyttleton Constitution of 1954 established a profound federal structure by further decentralizing the existing structure and clarifying the responsibility and power of government. This further empowers the regional administrations to implement their programs without interference from the national government. As a result, regions have considerable authority over their local affairs. Akpan (2019) showed that the Lyttleton Constitution of 1954 established a system of quasi-federalism in Nigeria while maintaining the governance framework established by Richard and Macpherson. Both the 1979 Constitution and the Republican Constitution of 1963 strengthened this position (Ogunnubi, 2022).

The Rights (1787) outlined how the US Constitution, particularly the original version ratified in 1788 and in operation in 1789, established a decentralized security model and functioned as a symbol of the US federal government, as the country's constitutional development demonstrates. The Militia Clauses (Article I, Section 8) are made up of citizen-soldiers and give Congress the authority to organize, equip, and discipline the militia. Therefore, this clause encourages a decentralized security strategy that places more emphasis on local militias than on a centralized standing force. According to the Constitution's Article I, Section 10 on State Defense Responsibilities, states are not allowed to have armies or wage war without Congress's consent. Despite granting the state the authority to defend itself under specific conditions, Article I, Section 8 recognizes the value of state defense and was founded on Federalism and Shared Powers, which permit the separation of powers between the federal government and individual states and bolster a decentralized security model. Emergency response, homeland security, and law enforcement fall under the jurisdiction of state governments.

Thomas &Aghedo (2014) noted that the centralization of the security approach, which has roots in the historical development of the security services, is the cause of Nigeria's

inadequate security delivery and ongoing security upheaval. The Nigerian Police was established by the British colonial ruler as a temporary solution to the West African Frontier Force's resistance. Implementing the imperial Acts of 1807 and 1833, which ultimately put a stop to slavery and the slave trade in all its manifestations and built a colonial divide-and-rule system that made it easier for raw resources to reach the city, was the goal of the Police's centralized organization.

Comparative federalism is a substantial body of literature, particularly when it comes to important topics like national security and the challenges governments face, such as terrorism, the spread of WMDs, cybercrime, poor governance, insurgencies, and corruption. (Ritz & Hensley, 2004; Shaffer, 2023; Awotayo et al., 2023). It is necessary to conduct an intellectual investigation into the central question of how the constitutional framework has affected the security architecture in both nations. As a result, this study will examine the two disparate constitutional frameworks of Nigeria and the USA, and how they affect national security outcomes.

10. Theoretical Review

Literature on security theories gives a more in-depth analysis of the study under review. A review of realist theory, also known as realism or international relations theory, propounded by Thomas Hobbes in 1651 and developed by Hans Morgenthau in 1948, provides more insight into the interplay of power in a nation's security architecture (Zhang, 2017; Falode, 2015). The tenet of realism is based on the state-centric approach and describes the connection between power, security, and self-interest in international relations. The major principle of realism in international relations is the state, its survival, and self-help. The state is considered the primary actor, driven by its national interests, security, and need for survival. Each state prioritizes its survival and relies on military strength for security. States rely on one another for the protection of their interest and sovereignty in the absence of a centralized authority. Yılmaz & Chowdury (2024); Lomia (2020) accentuated that realism has evolved into various forms over time, including "Classical Realism", which described the nature of man and morality in international relations. This was influenced by thinkers like Thucydides, Machiavelli, and Hobbes; Structural Realism (Neorealism), which emphasized

power distribution among states in the international scene. This school of thought was led by scholars such as Kenneth Waltz. "Offensive Realism", advocated for states to maximize power and influence for security, as proposed by John Mearsheimer; and "Defensive Realism", prioritizing security and the status quo, influenced by scholars like Robert Jervis (Falode, 2015).

Because states will use every means at their disposal to secure their survival and security in anarchical international systems, this theory led to the conclusion that international relations would be marked by conflict, competition, and the pursuit of power. The theory's observed flaws include an excessive emphasis on military might, a failure to consider other types of power, such as economic, cultural, and soft power, non-state actors, and transnational issues in determining security outcomes, and a focus on state sovereignty at the expense of other security-related factors, such as human rights, economic growth, and environmental preservation.

Lucinescu (2021), in the context of the security system, looked at Human Security Theory, which was propounded by Mahbub ul Haq in 1994 and developed by the United Nations Development Programme. Its central idea was a shift away from state-centric security and focuses on protecting individuals from threats like poverty, hunger, disease, and environmental degradation. This theory underscores the necessity of safeguarding individuals and communities from diverse threats, encompassing economic security (ensuring access to fundamental needs such as food, shelter, water and healthcare) food security is about averting hunger and malnutrition, health security is based on protecting against diseases and ensuring healthcare accessibility, environmental security helps in alleviating natural disasters and environmental degradation, personal security ensured prevention of violence, crime, and human right infringements, and community security which helps in maintaining cultural identity, social cohesion, and overall well-being.

The outcome of the theory was that the protection of individual security will necessitate the enhancement of both national and global security. If human development were addressed, the world would become a safer and more peaceful place to live. Human security theory did not adequately address the impact of power disparities on both individual and collective security, which was regarded as the major gap, in addition to not taking into consideration the cultural and environmental factors that affect human security in different communities and locations.

The theory of centralization was propounded in 1932 by Carl Schmitt, as presented in his work "Political," which highlighted the importance of having a powerful central authority in ensuring national security, as examined by (Howland, 2018). Schmitt contends that the moral, social, and economic domains are not the same as the political domain. Politics is inherently characterized by rivalry, conflict, and the possibility of bloodshed. The foundation of his philosophy is the friend-enemy differences, which he views as the primary criterion of politics. This difference is not founded on moral or ideological differences, but rather on the possibility of conflict and the necessity of group action. Schmitt highlights the strong connection between the idea of sovereignty and his conception of the political. According to him, sovereignty is more than just having institutional or legal authority; it also includes the capacity to establish a state of exception, which permits the suspension of regular laws and the adoption of extraordinary actions in times of emergency.

Nonetheless, several shortcomings and criticisms are discernible. Schmitt's theory might have resulted in marginalization and exclusion since it did not adequately address the interests and worries of different groups within a society. Additionally, it places too much emphasis on state sovereignty, which may breed authoritarianism and disregard for the liberties and rights of individuals.

In 1956, Robert Dahl propounded the theory of Decentralization, as outlined in his work "A Preface to Democratic Theory," which highlights the necessity of decentralized decision-making in democratic administration and security, according to (Fabbrini, 2003). Kit further inferred that decentralization does not have the capacity to address power disparities among varied groups in a plural society, which excludes minority groups from decision-making processes, is the observed gap in this theory. Robert Dahl presents the idea of polyarchy to characterize a system of governance in which authority is shared by multiple groups as opposed to being centralized in the hands of a select few or a single person. This method places a strong emphasis on pluralism, which holds that different viewpoints, interests, and groups that can affect decision-making processes can coexist in a healthy society. Additionally, he sees democracy as a dynamic process rather than a set of institutions or a static structure. He highlights the significance of constant engagement, compromise, and equilibrium in democratic governance. His research explored how democratic institutions can protect individual freedoms while concurrently attending to the demands and goals of society as a whole.

Essentially, Dahl's theory provides insights into democracy as a complex and dynamic system that values the continuous pursuit of a comprehensive and equal participation of citizens in the affairs of government and the existence of decentralization of power. This calls for a more robust study of security in the federal states, where researchers could examine both theoretical and practical applications of federalism and its dynamic impact on the state and security governance. As a result of the interplay between centralization, decentralization, development, and security, there is no single fit approach to security issues. (Carpenter et al., 2016). The importance of security to the survival of a state can never be undermined; the gaps observed indicated the need for an inclusive security model that touches base with all aspects of human life to reduce insecurity to a minimum.

The security architecture in Nigeria's centralized system underscores the unresolved crisis on security issues at the national, state, and local levels. Bala (2020) claimed that the comparative study of centralized and decentralized security models in federal states stresses the need to put security into a proper context through the understanding of diverse impacts of historical, political, constitutional, and environmental issues on security in the United States and Nigeria.

Yusuf &Mohd (2023) averred that rather than addressing the underlying causes of security problems in Nigeria, which are rooted in constitutional inadequacies, the primary government responses are geared toward the symptoms of insecurity. The constant attack by Boko Haram, Islamic State's West African Provinces in the Northeast, destruction of infrastructure, bombing, kidnapping and community displacement and migration, economic instability, breakdown of laws and order, and intensive poverty across various institutions in the state, among other issues, are the symptoms of terrorism and violence.

11. Methodological Review

Moliki et al., (2020) examined "Federalism, National Security, and State Policing in Nigeria Fourth Republic". The essence of the study was to examine the impact of the police in the state security in the fourth republic (1999-2018). The author adopted a mixed method of research design, and data was collected the means of primary and secondary sources. The analysis of data was through the use of chi-square statistics, and propositions from the theory

were analyzed through content analysis. The theoretical position of the scholar was analyzed through content analysis. Findings revealed that the Nigerian Police have failed to solve various security challenges in Nigeria caused by structural imbalances. The observed gap in the literature was the lack of comparative analysis with other federal systems on security issues and limited access to data or information on sensitive issues.

Bryan (2012) examined "Leadership Decapitation and the End of Terrorist Groups." The argument was that if the leader of a terrorist group can be overpowered, there is a possibility to bring an end to the terrorist challenges, believing that the ideology of the terrorist mostly resides with the leaders. The outcome of this mostly depends on group characteristics, the structure of the leadership, and the ideology of the terrorist group. Bryan conducted a quantitative research study to analyze the impact of decapitating a leader on the lifespan of a terrorist organization. The study utilized a quantitative research design, a dataset of 207 terrorist organizations, and drew on concepts from leadership, organizational behavior, and terrorism studies to develop a framework for understanding the effects of leadership decapitation.

The research approach involved modeling the time-to-event (group dissolution) and examining the influence of leadership decapitation on group longevity using survival analysis, specifically, the Cox proportional hazards model, which serves as a control for other factors that could affect the life span of the group. The compilation of the dataset was through the Global Terrorism Database and the RAND Dataset of Global Incidents. The purpose of inferential statistics, such as survival analysis and Cox proportional hazards models, was to determine the correlation relationship between leadership decapitation and the group life span, while descriptive statistics provided an overview of the dataset, including the frequency and distribution of leadership decapitation events. The finding revealed that the strategy of leadership decapitation has a short effect and life span, especially when it involves religion or separatist groups that have the capacity to adapt and survive after losing their leader. It is, however, effective when the group is in its formative stage. The observed gap was the lack of comparative analysis across different terrorism incidents involving different groups.

An overview of security index in Nigeria and the USA on four (4) parameters was reviewed to provide insight into the understanding of how different security indexes played out in both countries (NCSI, 2022; Economic s al., 2024; Department of Defense & Fiscal, 2023).

Country	Terrorism Index	Global Peace Index	Cybersecurity Index	Security Spending
Nigeria	Index score of 7.658 in 2025 ranked 6th globally	Ranked 147 out of 163 countries (2024)	43rd globally in 2024 with an index score of 61.67.	$3.58 billion in 2024
USA	Index score of 4.066, ranking 34th globally.	Ranked 132 out of 163 countries (2024)	The USA ranked 2nd globally in 2024 with an index score of 95.64.	$855 billion in 2024

12. Discussion

The study revealed the role of federalism in shaping security models and enhances policies development in Nigeria and United States of America. Both country have different security models with Nigeria national security model characterized with strong central system control by the federal government while the United States of America security model is decentralized with the sharing of security responsibilities among the federal, state and local government.

The study also shows differences in terms of responses to security threats in both countries. Nigeria, as a centralized political system have difficulty in enhancing quick response to security challenges due to bureaucratic processes involved. The United States of America decentralized political system is praised for its ability to respond quickly to security challenges with more power granted to state and local authorities.

Despite the measures put in place by both countries, security threats persist. The dynamism of security system validates the need for a dynamic solution to meet specific security need.

13. Conclusion and Recommendation

The comparative study of federalism and national security models in Nigeria and United State of America is an analysis of the important of strength and weakness of security models in federal States and their impact on security outcomes. Security challenges are a global issue of which federal political systems are not exempt. The peculiarity of each security model in Nigeria and the United States of America, and their impacts on national security outcomes, reflects each constitutional provision and differences in state responses to security threats. Despite both Nigeria and the United States of America established measures to tackle their peculiar security issues, insecurity persists.

A hybrid method is recommended for both Nigeria and United States of America for an inclusive response to security system. In a hybrid system, Nigeria political system will be able to respond quickly to local security challenges through a decentralized system while United States of America political system will be able to respond quickly to external security challenges through a centralized security system. This will help to ensure a comprehensive synergy among security architectures towards a sustainable governance.

[1] Saheed Babajide Owonikoko, PhD, is a Senior Lecturer and Researcher with the Centre for Peace and Security Studies, Modibbo Adama University, Yola, Nigeria. He can be reached at owonikoko.babajide@gmail.com. Ikenna Mike Alumona, PhD, is a Professor of Comparative Politics and Security Governance at Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam, Nigeria, and a Visiting Senior Fellow at the Athena Centre for Policy and Leadership, Abuja. He can be reached at ikennaalumona@yahoo.com.

References

- Adams, D., & Ogbonnaya, U. M. (2014). Ethnic and Regional Violence in Nigeria: Implications for National Security. *Journal of Politics and Law*, *7*(3). https://doi.org/10.5539/jpl.v7n3p20
- Ademi, M., & Vula, V. (2023). The Role of Civil Society for Prevention and Combat of Violent Extremism and Radicalization Leading To Terrorism-War. *Access to Justice in Eastern Europe*, *6*(3), 192–203. https://doi.org/10.33327/AJEE-18-6.3-n000309
- Adhikari, A. S. (2024). *The Concept of International Security*. *August*. https://doi.org/10.31947/hjirs.v4i2.34797
- Administered, P. L., & Archives, N. (2015). George W. Bush Presidential Library and Museum. In *Choice Reviews Online* (Vol. 52, Issue 10, pp. 52-5077-52 5077). https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.190242
- Afolabi, M. B., & Bodunde, O. D. (2020). Concept of Security Threats. *Readings in Intelligence and Security Studies*, *2*, 12–28.
- Afzal, M. (2020). From "Western education is forbidden" to the world's deadliest terrorist group. *Foreign Policy at Brookings*, *April* 2–28. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/FP_20200507_nigeria_boko_haram_afzal.pdf
- Agunbiade, O. (2024). *INSECURITY AND NIGERIA'S SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT*. *7*(2), 166–181. https://doi.org/10.52589/AJSSHR-PGKPNW8K

- Akpan, U. J. (2019). A Survey into different constitutional developments offers a great insight into the decentralization system, especially the Richard Constitution of 1946, the Macpherson Constitution of 1951, and the Lyttleton Constitution of 1954. *The International Journal of Humanities & Social Studies*, *7*(2), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.24940/theijhss/2019/v7/i2/hs1708-108

- Alumona, I. M. (2019). Internal Security Management in Nigeria. In *Internal Security Management in Nigeria* (Issue June). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-8215-4

- Amsey, M. I. D. R. (2012). *AMERICAN FEDERALISM AND THE TRAGEDY OF GONZALES V RAICH. 1*(2005).

- Anderson, G. (2008). *Federalism: An Introduction*. Oxford University Press.

- Arutselvan, K. (2022). Message From the Director. *Proceedings - International Conference on Applied Artificial Intelligence and Computing, ICAAIC 2022*. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICAAIC53929.2022.9793009

- Asfura-Heim, P., & McQuaid, J. (2015). Diagnosing the Boko Haram Conflict: Grievances, Motivations, and Institutional Resilience in Northeast Nigeria. *CNA Analysis & Solutions, January*, 1–92. https://www.cna.org/cna_files/pdf/DOP-2014-U-009272-Final.pdf

- Atobatele, A. J. (2022). *Herdsmen's / Farmers' Conflicts and Sustainable National Development in. June.*

- Awotayo, O. O., Oderinde, S. L., & Olaniran, A. F. (2023). *Terrorism and Arms Proliferation in Sub-Saharan Africa : A Comprehensive Analysis. October 2024*.

- Awotayo, O. O., & Omitola, B. O. (2024). Decentralizing security architecture: evaluating federalism's role in enhancing security frameworks in Nigeria. *Law and Safety*, *93*(2), 68–75. https://doi.org/10.32631/pb.2024.2.06

- Bakreski, O., & Bardjieva Miovska, L. (2024). THE POSITION AND ROLE OF STATE AND NON-STATE ACTORS IN THE 21st CENTURY. *Security Dialogues /Безбедносни Дијалози*, *15*(1), 35–49. https://doi.org/10.47054/sd24151035b

- Bala, B. G. S. (2020). *Nigeria's Security Architecture for the future*. Muhamsaid Commercial Press.

- Bates, C. (2023). Navigating Homeland Security: A Strategic Evolution Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). *European Modern Studies Journal*, *7*(6), 39–41. https://doi.org/10.59573/emsj.7(6).2023.4

- Berebon, C. (2025). *The Nexus Between Security, Human Development, and Economic Stability: Addressing Insecurity as a Threat to National Growth in Nigeria. January*.

- Bhal, J. de. (2014). Security: An Essentially Contested Concept? *E-International Relations, Lasswell 1936*, 1–5. https://www.e-ir.info/2014/08/24/security-an-essentially-contested-concept/#:~:text=Thus%2C, security is best understood, static definitions have inherent problems.

- Booth, K. (2007). Theory of World Security. In *Theory of World Security*. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511840210

- Bryan C. Price. (2012). Leadership Decapitation and the Impact on Terrorist Groups. *Quarterly Journal: International Security*.

- Bulmer, E. (2017). Federalism International IDEA Constitution-Building Primer 12. In *International IDEA: Vol. International*.

- Buzan, B., & Hansen, L. (2012). International Security Studies post-Cold War: the traditionalists. In *The Evolution of International Security Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511817762.008

- Camerino, A. (2020). *Department of Political Science Master''s Degree in International Relations - Global Studies Chair of Geopolitical Scenarios and Political Risk Intelligence Failures in Countering Islamic Terrorism : A Comparative Analysis on the Strategic Surprises of t*.

- Carpenter, W. M., Wiencek, D. G., & Lilley, J. R. (2016). Asian Security Handbook. *Asian Security Handbook, January*, 1–47. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315289854

- Chopan, G. A., & Dar, A. R. (2017). *Concept of Federalism and its Development in Indian and US Politics. 04*(17), 141–150.

- Collins, O. O. C. E. E. O. C. (2024). Governance and Insecurity in Nigeria: The Nexus (2015-2023). *Ayaŋ*, *15*(1), 37–48.

- Cornito, C. M. (2021). Striking a Balance between Centralized and Decentralized Decision Making: A School-Based Management Practice for Optimum Performance. *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences*, *3*(4), 656–669. https://doi.org/10.46328/ijonses.217

- Datta, S. (2021). Making Decentralisation Work. In *Conservation and Society* (Vol. 19, Issue 4). https://doi.org/10.4103/cs.cs_20_81
- David, A. D., & Abubakar, M. F. (2024). *Evaluating the Effects of Centralization and Decentralization on Strategic Implementation at Federal University Wukari Evaluating the Effects of Centralization and Decentralization on Strategic Implementation at Federal University Wukari. October.* https://doi.org/10.62225/2583049X.2024.4.5.3327
- David, D., & Salifu, A. M. (2020). Security Architecture, Internal Policing, and Agitations for State Police. *Science Research*, *10*, 169–191.
- DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, & FISCAL. (2023). *2024 Defense Budget Overview: UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FISCAL YEAR 2024 BUDGET REQUEST. March 2023.* http://comptroller.defense.gov.
- Department of Homeland Security. (2019). Strategic Framework for countering terrorism and targeted violence *Homeland Security*, *September* 1–40. https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/19_0920_plcy_strategic-framework-countering-terrorism-targeted-violence.pdf
- Department of State Services. (2015). *State Security Service (Nigeria).*
- Devine, M. E. (2022). *Defense Primer: National and Defense Intelligence. 3003*(Ic), 4–6. https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IF/IF10525
- Economic, T., War, I., & Analysis, C. S. (2024). *Peace Index 2024.*
- Egara, O. W. (2025). *INSECURITY AND ITS ATTENDANT EFFECTS IN NIGERIA : A PHILOSOPHICAL. April.*
- Eghosa E. Osaghae, & Rotimi T. Suberu. (2005). *A History of Identities, Violence, and Stability in Nigeria. 6*, Report number 6. http://www.dfid.gov.uk/R4D/PDF/Outputs/Inequality/wp6.pdf
- Emeka Anthony. (2019). The Theory, Practice, and Current Trends in Federalism. *International Journal of Research in Tourism and Hospitality*, *5*(1), 30–40. https://doi.org/10.20431/2455-0043.0501005
- Emmanuel, O. O. (2009). Federalism and the search for national integration in Nigeria. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, *3*(9), 384–395.
- English, A., Lippmann, W., Lasswell, H., Wolfers, A., Brown, H., & Maier, C. (1996). *National security.*
- Esq., J. B., Junaidu Bello Marshall, E., & Esq., A. M. M. (2015). The Role of Police in Maintaining Public Order in Nigeria: Challenges and Way Forward. *International Journal of Research*, *2*(2), 1387–1400. http://edupediapublications.org/journals/index.php/ijr/article/view/1527
- Ezeani, E. O., Ani, C. K., Ezeibe, C., & Ubiebi, K. (2021). From a Religious Sect to a Terrorist Group: The Military and Boko Haram in Northeast Nigeria. *African Renaissance*, *18*(2), 125–145. https://doi.org/10.31920/2516-5305/2021/18n2a6
- Fabbrini, S. (2003). Bringing Robert A. Dahl's Theory of Democracy to Europe. *Annual Review of Political Science*, *6*(June), 119–137. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.6.010302.115514
- Falk, W., & Raundalen, K. (2021). Decentralization and centralization in the context of a global crisis. *Département d'Études Commerciales Université d'Uppsala.*
- Falode, A. (2015). *THE THEORETICAL FOUNDATION OF REALISM. March.*
- Federal Republic of Nigeria. (2013). *Terrorism_Bill.Pdf.* Federal Government Printer, Lagos.
- Fisher, S. (2014). United States National Guard. In *Persian Gulf War Encyclopedia: A Political, Social, and Military History* (pp. 475–476).
- Forum, N. (2020). *National Inherent Risk Assessment of Terrorist Financing in Nigeria. 1–121.*
- Frank, X. (2017). *Role of the U.S. government in the cybersecurity of private entities.*
- Gbandi, E. C., & Amissah, G. (2022). The nexus of leadership, insecurity, and development in Nigeria. *Amity Journal of Management Research*, *June*. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Eleazar-Gbandi/publication/361462856_The_Nexus_of_Leadership_Insecurity_and_Development_in_Nigeria_Introduction_and_Background_to_the_Study/links/62b2e9d31010dc02cc538377/The-Nexus-of-Leadership-Insecurity-and-Developm
- Goldberg, A., Papadopoulos, S., Putney, D., Berlage, N., & Welch, R. (2020). Defense Studies Series: Pentagon 9/11. In *Paper Knowledge. Toward a Media History of Documents*. Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.

- Great, A. (2024). Redefining the Nigerian System of Government: The Error of a Copied Democracy without True Federalism. *Open Journal of Political Science*, *14*(02), 177–192. https://doi.org/10.4236/ojps.2024.142011
- Gunaratna, R., & Nielsen, A. (2008). Al Qaeda in the tribal areas of Pakistan and beyond. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, *31*(9), 775–807. https://doi.org/10.1080/10576100802291568
- Hamza, A. (2024). *Federalism and Politics of Security Management in Nig. May.*
- Heins, L. (2019). National Counterterrorism Center. *Global Crime: An Encyclopedia of Cyber Theft, Weapons Sales, and Other Illegal Activities: Volume 1: AL: Volume 2: MZ*, *1–2*(August), 413–415.
- Henry ORHERO, I. (2015). Boko Haram as a Syndrome of the Unresolved National Question in Nigeria: The Dilemma. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development, www.iste.org ISSN*, *5*(18), 79–91.
- Hollenbeck, J. R., Ellis, A. P. J., Humphrey, S. E., Garza, A. S., & Ilgen, D. R. (2011). The quick response to local needs may be hampered or delayed due to the inflexibility of adapting to changes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *114*(1), 64–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2010.08.003
- Homeland Security. (2003). The Physical Protection of Critical Infrastructures and Key Assets The Physical Protection of Critical Infrastructures and Key Assets. *Most*, 96.
- HOUSE, T. W. (2012). *NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR INFORMATION SHARING AND SAFEGUARDING.*
- Howland, D. (2018). Carl Schmitt's Turn to Sovereignty in Jurisprudence. *Beijing Law Review*, *09*(02), 211–234. https://doi.org/10.4236/blr.2018.92015
- Huxley, A., & Schneiderman, H. (2018). Centralization and Decentralization. *Ends and Means*, *4*(6), 68–77. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351311847-7
- Ibrahim, D. S., & Olasupo, P. M. (2023). The Nigerian Military Operation Safe Haven (OPSH) Operation in Internal Security Management in Plateau State: Challenges and Prospects. *Journal of Political Science and Leadership Research*, *9*(1), 10–24. https://doi.org/10.56201/jpslr.v9.no1.2023.pg10.24
- Iherue, S. O. (2020). *Insecurity in Nigeria: a major impediment to national development*. *2*(1), 20–33.
- Information, S. D., & Recherche, E. T. D. E. (2006). *USA PATRIOT ACT OVERVIEW. March.*
- International Crises Group. (2018). Stopping Nigeria's Spiralling Farmer-Herder Violence. *Report 262 / Africa 26 July 2018*, *262*(July), 38. https://www.crisisgroup.org/africa/west-africa/nigeria/262-stopping-nigerias-spiralling-farmer-herder-violence
- Jester, N. (2022). International Security. *The Bush Doctrine and the War on Terrorism*, 164–177. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203028162-18
- Kharel, A. B., & Acharya, A. (2023). Centralized and Decentralized Federal System: A Comparative Analysis of Governance Structures and Policy Implementation. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, *4*(2), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.3126/ijmss.v4i2.57187
- Kitler, W. (2021). *National security: theory and practice* (Issue January).
- Kleinfeld, R. (2023). Polarization, Democracy, and Political Violence in the United States: What the Research Says. *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, September. https://carnegieendowment.org/2023/09/05/polarization-democracy-and-political-violence-in-united-states-what-research-says-pub-90457
- Korzeniowski, L. F. (2016). Securitology – security of a subject. *Securitologia*, *23*(1), 111–120. https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0009.2966
- Lanre, O. (2017). Federalism in Nigeria – Problems, Prospects and the Imperative of Restructuring. *International Journal Advances in Social Science and Humanities*, *5*(8), 40–52.
- Lansford, T. (2010). United States Department of Homeland Security. *The Encyclopedia of Middle East Wars: The United States in the Persian Gulf, Afghanistan, and Iraq Conflicts: Volume 1-5*, *4*(2018), 1364–1366.
- Lim, S., & Oh, J. (2025). Navigating Privacy: A Global Comparative Analysis of Data Protection Laws. *IET Information Security*, *2025*(1). https://doi.org/10.1049/ise2/5536763
- Lomia, E. (2020). Political Realism in International Relations: Classical Realism, Neo-realism, and Neo-Classical Realism. *International Journal of Social, Political and Economic Research*, *7*(3), 591–600. https://doi.org/10.46291/ijospervol7iss3pp591-600

- LUCINESCU, A. (2021). The Concept of Human Security Before the 1994 Human Development Report. Inquiry Into Its Evolution During the Cold War. *STRATEGIES XXI - Security and Defense Faculty*, *17*(1), 32–36. https://doi.org/10.53477/2668-2001-21-03

- Luitel, P. (2024). Role of Non-State Actors in National Security. *Unity Journal*, *5*(1), 57–75. https://doi.org/10.3126/unityj.v5i1.63160

- Lutz, J. M., & Lutz, B. J. (2013). Global terrorism Index 2024. *Global Terrorism*, 1–359. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203731321

- Mamman, Emmanual, B. (2020). *Public policy response to violence: Case study of Boko Haram insurgency in Nigeria*. 1–231. https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations

- McElreath, D. H., Doss, D. A., Russo, B., Etter, G., Van Slyke, J., Skinner, J., Corey, M., Jensen, C. J., Wigginton, M., & Nations, R. (2021). Introduction to homeland security: Third edition. In *Introduction to Homeland Security: Third Edition* (Issue September). https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429491962

- Michael, E. (2020). *CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE, 1914-1960. 2*, 242–248.

- Michaelsen, C. (2010). Reforming Australia's National Security Legislation: The Case For A Proportionality-Based Approach. *University Of Tasmania Law Review*, *29*(1), 31–48. http://www.austlii.edu.au/cgi-bin/download.cgi/cgi-bin/download.cgi/download/au/journals/UTasLawRw/2010/2.pdf

- Moliki, A. O., Nkwede, J. O., & Dauda, K. O. (2020). Federalism, National Security and State Policing System in Nigeria' s Fourth Republic. *Islamic University Multidisciplinary Journal IUMJ*, *7*(2), 2020.

- Moss, K. (2018). Nigerian Terror: The Rise of Boko Haram. *Senior Honors Project*, 1–124. https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/honors201019/607

- Mrozek, J., & Gawliczek, P. (2022). The concept of national security in the light of Aristotle's philosophy of Politics. *Journal of Scientific Papers "Social Development and Security," 12*(6), 19–30. https://doi.org/10.33445/sds.2022.12.6.3

- National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. (2004). The 9/11 Commission Report. In *W.W. Norton & Company*. https://doi.org/10.1097/00000446-197006000-00015

- National Fire Academy. (2000). *Emergency response to terrorism: tactical considerations : emergency medical services : student manual. March*.

- NCSI. (2022). *The Global Terrorism Index (GTI. 10*, 4–6.

- Ndema, S. C. (2024). *Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations : A Case for the American-Type Federal System in Nigeria. 11*(1), 259–281.

- Njie, A., & Adesopo, A. (2023). *Centralization is the system of government where there is the concentration of power at the Centre without devolution of power to the constituent units*. *3*(1), 107–131. https://doi.org/10.48028/iiprds/ijsrpaop.v3.i1.12

- Nwankwo, U., Nwanchor, E., Chike, O., & Orji-Egwu, O. (2023). Media, Security Challenges and the Future of Nigeria: A Theoretical Overview. *African Journal of Politics and Administrative Studies*, *16*(2), 313–341. https://doi.org/10.4314/ajpas.v16i2.17

- OAS. (2022). *Olaniyan, Azeez Omotola, Shola*. https://www.oas.org/en/topics/multidimensional_security.asp

- Obronna, W. (2022). *National security challenges and threats. 279*(2), 109–123.

- Odalonu, B. H. (2022). Worsening Insecurity in Nigeria and its Implications on Governance and National Development. *African Journal of Humanities & Contemporary Education Research*, *5*(1), 31–49. www.afropolitanjournals.com

- Ogedengbe;, J. A. ; O. T. A. Q. O. (2024). *STATES' AUTONOMY IN NIGERIAN FEDERALISM: DELIGHT OR AN ABERRATION? 1*, 81–94.

- Ogunnubi, O. O. (2022). Decentralisation and local governance in Nigeria: issues, challenges and prospects. *Commonwealth Journal of Local Governance*, *27*, 5–16. https://doi.org/10.5130/cjlg.vi27.7935

- Ogunsanya, A. O. (2021). *Adesoji Olaitan Ogunsanya*.

- Oikhala, G. I. (2022). Survival Strategies of Internal Security in Nigeria : The Amotekun Option. *Journal of Administrative Science*, *19*(1), 99–135.

- Ojo, E. O. (2015). *Federalism and the search for national integration in Nigeria. October 2009*.

- Olajide, A. (2023). *A Comparative Study of Structural Federalism in Nigeria and the United States of America. August*, 0–17.
- Olaniyan, A. (2020). *Steven Pierce. Moral Economies of Corruption: State Formation and Political Culture in Nigeria. Durham, North Carolina* (Issue August). Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/asr.2020.31
- Olaniyan, A., & Omotola, S. (2015). Ethnic crises and national security in Nigeria. *Defense and Security Analysis*, *31*(4), 303–318. https://doi.org/10.1080/14751798.2015.1087104
- Oliphant Chair, R. (2017). *Report of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security Protecting Canadians and their Rights: A New Road Map for Canada's National Security 42 nd PARLIAMENT, 1 st SESSION. May.* http://www.parl.gc.ca
- Olulu, R. M., & F, S. A. (2018). *Fiscal Federalism in Nigeria : Implication to the Economy of States. II*(Xi), 99–110.
- Oluwaniyi, O. (2011). Post-Amnesty programme in the Niger Delta: Challenges and prospects. *Conflict Trends.* http://reference.sabinet.co.za/sa_epublication_article/accordc_2011_n4_a7
- OMALE, THEOPHILUS OCHOLI; SHUIBU, M. E. &, & BAYO, A. (2025). AN ASSESSMENT OF THE ROLE OF TRADITIONAL RULERS IN THE MAINTENANCE OF PEACE AND SECURITY IN KOGI EAST SENATORIAL DISTRICT. *BERKELEY JOURNAL OF Humanities and Social Science (BJHSS)*, *7*(6), 85–100.
- Omilusi, M. (2016). The Multi-Dimensional Impacts of Insurgency and Armed Conflicts on Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities*, *4*(2), 29–39. https://socialscienceresearch.org/index.php/GJHSS/article/view/1781/1722
- Omitola, B. (2020). *Transnational organised crimes and the challenges of security in Nigeria Scanned by CamScanner. October.*
- Pamela. (2023). THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA'S OPPOSITION TO NORMALIZATION WITH ISRAEL. In *Security* (Issue December).
- Piate, S. M., & Ukere, E. E. (2024). Federalism, fiscal autonomy and rural development. *Journal of Political Discourse*, *2*(2), 132–139.
- Pitcavage, M. (2019). *SURVEYING THE LANDSCAPE OF THE AMERICAN FAR RIGHT About the Program on Extremism. August.*
- Powell, R. (2014). *THE CONCEPT OF SECURITY. June 2012.*
- Randol, M. A. (2010). The department of homeland security intelligence enterprise: Operational overview and oversight challenges for congress. *Department of Homeland Security Intelligence Enterprise: Overview and Issues*, 1–55.
- Relations, C. for T. (2014). *Global Flow Security: A New Security Agenda for the Transatlantic Community in 2030.* Washington, DC: Center for Transatlantic Relations, 2014.
- Reynolds, J. M. (2018). Killing in the Name of Care. *Levinas Studies*, *12*(18), 141–164. https://doi.org/10.5840/levinas20197163
- Richards, A. (2018). Defining terrorism. *Routledge Handbook of Terrorism and Counterterrorism*, 13–21. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315744636
- Richman, D. C., & Seo, S. (2020). How Federalism Built the FBI, Sustained Local Police, and Left Out the States. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, *421.* https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3714325
- Rights, U. S. B. of. (1787). *Constitution of the United States.*
- Ritz, M. W., & Hensley, R. G. (2004). THE HOMELAND SECURITY PAPERS : Stemming the Tide of Terror. In *Continuum* (Issue February).
- ROK President's Office. (2018). *National Security Strategy* (Issue December).
- Rosthauser, R. C. (2010). *Terrorism Conflict: How the United States Responds To Al Qaeda Violence and Expressed Grievances.*
- Salt, A. (2018). Transformation and the War in Afghanistan. *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, *12*(1), 98–126.
- Shaffer, R. (2023). Internal security management in Nigeria: perspectives, challenges and lessons. In *Intelligence and National Security* (Vol. 38, Issue 3). https://doi.org/10.1080/02684527.2022.2090506
- Siedschlag, A., & Jerković, A. (2022). *Empirical Study of the Evolution of Homeland Security An Empirical Study of the Evolution of Homeland Security Definitions anAnd the Public Perception of Homeland Security Definitions and the Public Perception of Homeland Security.* https://commons.erau.edu/publication

- Siegle, & O'Mahoney. (2007). *Assessing the Merits of Decentralization*. 1–73. papers2://publication/uuid/297E414C-2AC5-4ED8-89AB-C4C03FEF0772
- Simonyi, M. (2002). What Is Security? *Securing Windows NT/2000, May 2015*. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781420031461.ch2
- Smith, R. K. M. (2014). 4. The International Bill of Human Rights. *Textbook on International Human Rights*, 37–51. https://doi.org/10.1093/he/9780199672813.003.0004
- Suberu, R. T. (2008). *Nigeria*.
- Taiye Joshua, O., & Bolade Damilola, A. (2021). Incessant Insecurity in Nigeria: Has the Country Returned to the State of Nature. *International Journal of Law and Society*, *4*(2), 89. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijls.20210402.15
- *The 9/11 commission report*. (2004).
- Thomas, A. N., & Aghedo, I. (2014). *SECURITY ARCHITECTURE AND INSECURITY MANAGEMENT : CONTEXT CONTENT AND CHALLENGES IN NIGERIA*. *4*(1), 22–36.
- Thompson, O. (2021). View of Mutiny, Desertion and State Response in the Nigeria Armed Forces and its Implications. *Ife Social Sciences Review*, *29*(1), 14–30. https://issr.oauife.edu.ng/index.php/issr/article/view/119/70
- Udeoba, C. E., & Eze, C. U. (2021). Government Strategies in Tackling Insecurity in Nigeria and the Way Forward. *NG-Journal of Social Development*, *10*(1), 93–97. https://doi.org/10.12816/0060694
- Ummah, M. S. (2019). Review of Australia's Counter Terrorism Machinery. In *Sustainability (Switzerland)* (Vol. 11, Issue 1). http://scioteca.caf.com/bitstream/handle/123456789/1091/RED2017-Eng-8ene.pdf?sequence=12&isAllowed=y%0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2008.06.005%0Ahttps://www.researchgate.net/publication/305320484_SISTEM_PEMBETUNGAN_TERPUSAT_STRATEGI_MELESTARI
- UN. (2000). *Decentralization: Conditions for Success*. 146.
- United Nations. (2023). *Our Common Agenda Policy Brief 9: A New Agenda for Peace. July*, 4–7. https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/default/files/document/files/2024/08/our-common-agenda-policy-brief-new-agenda-peace-en.pdf
- UNODC. (2009). *Handbook on criminal justice responses to terrorism*.
- Wambai Aminu, A., Hayewa, U., & Mamman, T. (2023). INSECURITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA. *Journal of Economics and Allied Research*, *8*(1), 283–295.
- Wars, W., War, C., States, U., & War, C. (2003). *The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 in the United States A brief discussion of their political and strategic consequences for securitization*. 3–18.
- WINS. (2018). *Evolving Security Threats and Advanced Security Technologies WINS Special Report Series. April*.
- Yılmaz, H. K., & Chowdury, S. R. H. (2024). Political Realism in International Relations: Classical Realism, Neo-realism, and Neo-Classical Realism. *International Journal*, *7*(2), 92–104. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Saeyd-Rashed-Chowdury/publication/382637244_Prof_Dr_Hasan_Kamil_Yilmaz_An_Outline_of_Sufism_and_Sufi_Orders_Ana_Hatlariyla_Tasavvuf_ve_Tarikatlar_29th_editionIstanbul_Ensar_Publication_2019_367p_ISBN_978-975-6794-30-2/
- Yusuf, A., & Mohd, S. (2023). Growth and Fiscal Effects of Insecurity on the Nigerian Economy. *European Journal of Development Research*, *35*(4), 743–769. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41287-022-00531-3
- Zhang, B. (2017). Hans Morgenthau, Realist Theory of International Leadership, and the Future of Global Order. *Chinese Political Science Review*, *2*(4), 512–530. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41111-017-0080-0