

National Defence and Strategic Capabilities: Positioning Nigeria for Greater Influence in Global Politics

Timothy O. Erinosh^{*}, Testimony O. Erinosh^{**}, Simon J. Otumala^{***} and Daniel O. Erinosh^{****}

Abstract

Defence and security initiatives and capabilities are crucial to a nation's development and recognition in the international system. There is a need to protect the citizenry and the territorial integrity of such a state, especially in the area of economic installations and also, present a posture of security viability. It is when a nation is well secured that it can be stable and recognized in the comity of nations. More importantly, the events that permeated the Second World War and beyond galvanized countries across the globe to embark on weaponry accumulation, including the Asian nations. However, Nigeria is yet to develop its own blueprint regarding the manufacturing of weapons of mass destruction, which is a dangerous signal that it could be overwhelmed in any military confrontation with any of the nations that have achieved military terrorism. This paper, therefore, explores the concept of national defence, the genesis of weapons of mass destruction, the raison d'être for Nigeria's involvement in the balance of terror and finally, the factors that may prevent the nation from accomplishing this military objective. The authors adopted qualitative approach and therefore relied on secondary sources derived from published books, journals and research reports. Data were historically interpreted through thematic analysis.

Keywords: National defence, international peace and security, global politics, weapons of mass destruction, defence policy

^{*} Department of History and Diplomatic Studies

Tai Solarin Federal University of Education

Ijagun, Ogun State

Email: erinoshoto@tasued.edu.ng

Phone: +2348065602523

^{**} Department of History

University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Oyo State

Email: testimonyerinosh@gmail.com

Phone: +2348137952590

^{***} Department of Political Science,

Federal College of Education, Abeokuta

sjotumala@fce-abeokuta.edu.ng

Phone: +2348064386176

^{****} Department of Political Science

Tai Solarin Federal University of Education,

Ijagun, Ogun Stat

Phone: +2348129977745

Email: dolayinka507@gmail.com

Introduction

Governments and nations invest a lot in the defence and security issues affecting them and every leader who values the continued existence of his country is expected not to handle defence matters outside its core national interest and objectives and must not be handled with levity. This is because peace and security are a necessary condition for achieving meaningful developments in nations across the globe. More importantly, the security of a country, its security programmes, policy and architecture are major issues in contemporary international system. Hence, national defence attracts the attention of serious-minded political and military leaders to ensure the preservation of the citizenry, political institutions, economic installations, and repressing internal crises and warding off external aggression.

Defence has to do with being prepared against an impending attack, a potential threat, or perceived insecurity from any known and unknown enemies. It implies the act of resisting an attack, which involves preparation to meet any perceived aggression. This realization, therefore, leads to the formulation of defence policies by countries in the world. A defense policy is a comprehensive framework of plans and strategies that guide the development, upkeep, and deployment of military forces to accomplish military objectives and, ultimately, support political aims.¹ As a result, a nation's armed forces consist of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

To uphold internal peace and security in Nigeria, the Ministry of Defence was established on October 1, 1958, with the official mandate of managing the nation's defense affairs through the framework of the Armed Forces.² To better grasp the focus of this study, it is appropriate to cite the Vision and Mission Statement of Nigeria's Defence Policy to assess the current state of military performance in comparison with global military trends, especially regarding weaponry. The Vision Statement of the Ministry of Defence is stated thus:

The vision of the Military, among others, is to have an armed force that is modernized, well-equipped, well-trained, and to have a highly professionalized military, capable of fulfilling its constitutional responsibilities of protecting the country from external aggression and internal strife.³

On the other hand, the National Defence Mission Statement posits:

The mission of the Ministry is to provide administrative and support services, timely and effectively, to enable the armed forces of the Federal Republic of Nigeria build and maintain a modern compact, strong, professional, mission-capable and mission ready Armed Forces for the defence of national territory, maritime interest, airspace and the protection and defence of the constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, and to contribute to peace-making and peace keeping duties worldwide under the regional and global organisations of which Nigeria is a member.⁴

The professional head of the nation's armed forces is the Chief of Defence Staff (CDS), while the President is the Commander-in-Chief.

Closely related to defence is security, which is an important principle in international relations. As Ogaba Oche has noted, it is necessary to determine what the internal values of a nation are and what nature of external threats they may be open to while assessing the needs and focus of a nation. At the nation-state level, Oche identifies three categories of values that serve as objects of security and are therefore safeguarded against threats. The first category concerns the fundamental idea and concept of the nation itself. The very emphasis of national security according to Oche connotes "that the nation, the feeling of nationhood, belonging to a particular community, and all its emotive connotations are values to be protected from threats".⁵ The second group of values relates to state institutions, particularly the whole structure of government, which includes its legislative, administrative, and judicial branches, as well as the laws and procedures that guide their functioning.⁶

The last set of values focuses on the physical base of the state itself. It consists of the population and territory, along with all the natural and human-made resources found within its boundaries. Thus, because of the need and requirement of states to defend their core national values, "they become apprehensive whenever their neighbours or antagonists acquire capabilities which they perceive as threats. Such perceptions compel states to increase their level of security."⁷

These values are otherwise referred to as national interests, which have to do with the welfare of the citizens and preservation of their national lifestyles. A nation's interests are often divided into core and secondary interests. As Akinyeye avers, "Core interests are those which a state holds very dearly and is prepared to make the utmost sacrifice for their protection. Such interests include the territorial integrity of the state and the preservation of its independence and sovereignty...the resources of a state which sustain the state and the welfare of its citizens."⁸ Secondary interest consists of those that a state aspires to protect, given the availability and enabling situations.⁹

Given the interdependent nature of national defence, security, and national interests, all countries endeavour to develop and implement policies aimed at safeguarding their citizens, property, mineral endowments, and other socio-economic possessions of the respective states. Since society is dynamic and ever-changing, many countries, especially the Western Powers, have devised nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction to combat international terrorism threatening their existence. However, it is unfortunate that Nigeria, like its sister African nations, has failed to borrow from Western military ingenuity, and this forms the thrust of this discourse.

Genesis and Development of Weapons of Mass Destruction

Before the outbreak of the Second World War (1939-45), the United States of America practiced what is called Splendid Isolationism. By this concept, the United States did not have any desire to go into any relationship with the other parts of the world, particularly Europe. This policy is otherwise known as the Monroe Doctrine, which stipulated that the American hemisphere was not to be colonized by Europeans in the

future. Thus, the Monroe Doctrine preserved Latin America for American influence because in 1867, the French troops were forced to withdraw from Mexico after the French had established Emperor Maximilian. And in 1895, the United States compelled Great Britain to settle the boundary between British Guyana and Venezuela by arbitration. In addition, after the end of the First World War (1918-18), in which the United States intervened and was even highly instrumental to the creation of the League of Nations in 1919 for maintaining global peace and security, America withdrew and went back to its isolationist policy, only to be brought out during the horrific Second World War. The aerial bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, two Japanese industrial centres, gave rise to the mad race for the accumulation of weapons of mass destruction.

The United States was the first nation to develop nuclear weapons and remains the only one to have used them in war. The country's initial nuclear programme began in 1939 under the National Bureau of Standards during Franklin Delano Roosevelt's presidency, with the primary goal of directing research and distributing funds. In 1940, the National Defense Research Committee (NDRC) was created to oversee projects, including uranium research, as part of its broader wartime responsibilities. By 1941, this research came under the supervision of Vannevar Bush within the OSRD's S-I Section, which worked to accelerate weapons development. In June 1942, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers assumed control of the atomic weapons project, while the OSRD continued to manage the scientific research. This marked the commencement of the Manhattan Project, officially known as the Manhattan Engineering District (MED), a military-controlled agency responsible for developing the first atomic weapons.

America's decision in 1939 to pursue the development of nuclear weapons during the Second World War was driven by the fear of competing with Nazi Germany in creating such a weapon. The United States invested substantially in producing plutonium through early nuclear reactors and in enriching Uranium-235 using both electromagnetic and gaseous diffusion methods. By mid-1945, these efforts had resulted in the production of three operational weapons. With this significant achievement, the United States ended the war by dropping atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945.

The Soviet Union, under Russia, started to develop its own atomic weapons as it emerged as America's rival in global politics. Their hegemonic drive galvanized the two superpowers to be fiercely competing for ascendancy and production of lethal weapons, and their accumulation became the ultimate motive of the two dominant powers. The Soviet Union detonated its first bomb in 1949. This development alarmed the United States. The Soviet Union did not relent in its ambition to outshine America in the mad race for armament and, as a result, diverted its financial, industrial, manpower, and other resources in this direction.

The stage was thus set for the research into, production, preservation, and application of weapons of mass destruction. This was brought about by the changes in weapon technology that have followed the development of the atomic bomb and then the hydrogen bomb – namely, changes in the destructive power of weapons and in the ability to deliver them.¹⁰ Western European powers, particularly Great Britain, did not remain passive

in the nuclear rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union. After the Second World War, America maintained closer ties with Europe through Britain's influence, beginning with the Brussels Pact of 1948 and later with the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) on 4 April 1949, a notable success of British post-war diplomacy.

The most significant aspect of Anglo-American defense relations, however, lay in the nuclear arena. Although nuclear cooperation ceased after the McMahon Act of 1946, Britain persistently urged the United States to reconsider and amend the legislation. Before testing its first atomic bomb, Britain struggled to restore wartime collaboration. However, following the Monte Bello test of 3 October 1953, which confirmed Britain's entry into the nuclear powers arena, the barriers to cooperation slowly began to fall. This gradual shift started with the Modus Vivendi agreement of 8 January 1948 and continued with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, which allowed the exchange of information on the external features of nuclear weapons, such as size, weight, shape, yield, and effect. As a result, Britain emerged as a producer of weapons of mass destruction and continued striving for progress in this new technological frontier.¹¹

In France, before 1958, the leaders of the Fourth Republic regarded defence policy as one of the most important instruments to achieve the objectives of French Foreign Policy. Thus, "supporters of the military nuclear programme in both the Fourth and the Fifth Republics saw nuclear weapons as an important instrument both to enhance the nation's political status and her military capability". France conducted its first nuclear test in 1960. This achievement was viewed as a move to restore France's rightful standing in international affairs and as part of its effort to secure equal status within the Atlantic Alliance alongside the United States and Great Britain.

Other European nations caught the nuclear fever as there arose the need to step up their defence strategies against both internal crises and external aggression. It is imperative to note that the production of weapons of mass destruction went beyond the European and American continents. Asian countries were not left behind in the race for the accumulation of dangerous weapons. The Southern Asian region harbours countries that were declared nuclear-weapon and nuclear/missile-capable states. It stretches from North Korea, China, India, Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, and Israel as components of consequences. Pakistan has become a Nuclear Weapons State (NWS), albeit covertly earlier and overtly in 1998.¹²

The proliferation of weapons led to the production of atomic, hydrogen, chemical, and nuclear weapons, thereby turning the international community into a tense arena due to the emergent balance of terror. This was the situation during the Cold War era and extended to the 21st century. This situation portended the use of naked force in the conduct of foreign affairs. While summing up the development, Sunmolu posits, "In short, force in international relations tends to be more obtrusive, direct, dramatic, and damaging. States, so to speak, are continuously flexing their muscles and cleaning their guns before their neighbours' windows."¹³ The research into and manufacturing of dangerous weapons resulted in the existence of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD). In fact, the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 was a major event that nearly dragged the international community into the

Third World War as the Soviet Union placed missiles in Cuba with the sole aim of detonating them and landing on American soil within thirty minutes. The two superpowers stood eyeball to eyeball. Fortunately, one (the Soviet Union) blinked, and the crisis ended.¹⁴

By 1972, the two superpowers had acquired destructive capabilities. According to Halperin, at the time, "American nuclear weapons have yields from tenths of a kiloton to one million tons on the warhead of the Minute man intercontinental missile and several million tons in large intercontinental bombers. Soviet warheads appear to have a similar range; the largest Soviet missile has a five-megaton warhead".¹⁵ He states further:

The fantastic increase in the destructive power of weapons has almost been matched by improvements in the ability to deliver these weapons. ICBMs (Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles) possessed by the Soviet Union and by the United States can reach any point on the globe from any other point within thirty to forty minutes with credible accuracy.¹⁶

In addition, both superpowers have thermonuclear weapons and both can deliver these weapons a million times more powerful than those used during the World War II and both can deliver these weapons with inter-continental missiles in about thirty minutes.

Despite the accumulation of weapons of mass destruction, the world leaders, especially American President John F. Kennedy, saw the need to create a peaceful atmosphere without which no development could and can take place. Thus, there arose the decision to sign the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), launched in 1969, aimed to curb the dangerous, costly, and escalating arms race. These negotiations produced two agreements: SALT I in 1972 and SALT II in 1979. However, although SALT II was signed, it was never ratified by the United States because of opposition in Congress. Even with the break-up of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War in 1990 and Russia re-emerging as a separate state, the arms race continued unabated. This was particularly true in the Asian and Middle East countries, with Iraq under President Saddam Hussein producing chemical weapons, which partly accounted for the Gulf War of 1990-1.

Theoretical Framework

This paper is anchored on the Realist Theory of International Relations, which provides a robust lens for understanding the pursuit of national defence, security, and power in the international system. The Realist school posits that the international arena is anarchic, meaning that there is no central authority capable of enforcing rules or guaranteeing the security of states. In such an environment, states are the primary actors, and their foremost objective is survival, which often time they pursue through the accumulation of power and the pursuit of national interests.

According to Hans J. Morgenthau, power is the central currency of international politics, and states act rationally to protect their sovereignty and promote their national interests. Similarly, Kenneth Waltz, in his structural or neorealist formulation, argues that the anarchic structure of the international system compels states to depend on self-help strategies such as initiating defense policy and developing weapons of mass destruction to

secure their existence. Consequently, security and power become interlinked; the more powerful a state is, the more secure it becomes in the face of potential external aggression.

From the realist standpoint, the production and possession of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) are not merely acts of aggression but strategic responses to the uncertainties of global politics and international environment.¹⁷ States seek to deter adversaries and preserve their autonomy by building credible military capabilities. The global arms race and the nuclearization of major powers such as the United States, Russia, China, and Britain can therefore be explained as rational outcomes of the security dilemma inherent in an anarchic world order (Craig, 2019).

Applying this theory to Nigeria's situation, the country's non-participation in the production of weapons of mass destruction represents a significant strategic vulnerability. Despite its regional influence and peacekeeping roles in Africa, Nigeria remains dependent on external powers for advanced military technology. Realism underscores that moral appeals or international laws cannot guarantee national survival; rather, a state must develop the capability to defend itself and deter threats independently.

Therefore, Nigeria's aspiration to become a relevant actor in global politics and a potential permanent member of the United Nations Security Council requires it to enhance its defence posture. Within the realist framework, power and security are prerequisites for prestige and recognition in the international system. Thus, the advocacy for Nigeria's participation in the research, production, and control of weapons of mass destruction aligns with the Realist logic of survival, deterrence, and pursuit of national interest in an anarchic global order.

The Need for Nigeria's Participation

It is disheartening to note that even though Nigeria became a sovereign nation in 1960, it felt complacent with its being pushed to the military backyard as far as nuclear weapons were concerned. It was only on 24 August 1976 that the major initiative of the then Federal Military Head of State, Lt. General Olusegun Obasanjo signed Decree No. 46, establishing the Nigerian Atomic Energy Commission (NEAC). By this decree, the commission was to deal with radioactive minerals; to construct and maintain nuclear installations for the purposes of generating electricity; to make arrangements with Universities and other institutions or persons in Nigeria for the conduct of research into matters connected with atomic energy or radioactive substances and to make grants to universities or other institutions or persons engaged in the production or use of atomic energy and radioactive substances; to advise the Federal Military Government on questions relating to atomic energy, with the responsibility for prospecting and mining. To the requisite manpower in nuclear science and technology, primary nuclear centres were established at the University of Ife (now Obafemi Awolowo University), the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, while the University of Ibadan, Ibadan, was named the secondary nuclear power centre. However, "the nuclear programme does not openly declare that Nigeria will produce a nuclear weapon today, tomorrow or some definite date. It merely envisages such a possibility through a learning process".¹⁸

By reading between the lines, one discovers Nigeria's apathy toward nuclear weapons production, which contradicts part of the nation's Defense Ministry's Mission Statement that states 'build and maintain a modern, compact, strong, professional, mission-capable, and mission-ready Armed Forces.' The military and professional politicians who have managed the affairs of the country should have awakened from their complacency by addressing the new technological innovations that Asian and Middle Eastern countries have borrowed from the West.

In fact, the main sources of threat in the world today are not conflicts between states, but within them. This truism accounts for the necessity to maintain internal security. Internal security generally involves upholding the national laws and defending against internal security threats. In Nigeria, internal security is handled by the Ministry of Interior, as opposed to the Defense Ministry. In Nigeria, the two major organizations saddled with internal security are the Nigeria Police Force and the State Security Service (now the Directorate of State Service... DSS). Other paramilitary security agencies that contribute significantly to the maintenance of internal security include the Nigeria Security and Civil Defence Corps, Immigration Service, Customs, Nigeria Drug Law Enforcement Agency, Nigeria Prisons, Federal Road Safety Corps and other organizations which have responsibility for the control of different aspects of domestic law and order.

The current security tension that permeates Nigeria is a major justification for the country to get involved in the manufacturing of weapons of mass destruction. The internal security of the country was threatened between 1960 and 2000 by religious and political intolerance, subversion, sabotage, espionage, smuggling, alien influx, armed robbery, mutiny and coup d'état, and civil unrest/revolutionary insurgency.¹⁹ Unfortunately, the threats to internal security have escalated further, assuming a very dangerous dimension. Contemporary Nigeria has been characterized by terrorist bombing, the Niger Delta militancy, Boko Haram insurgency among others.²⁰

Unfortunately, the threats to internal security have escalated further, assuming a very dangerous dimension. At the moment, the nation is characterized by terrorist bombing, Boko Haram insurgency, sectarian crisis, kidnapping, oil bunkering, maritime piracy, arms importation, airport security, AQI and Al-Qaeda in the Maghreb, Armed robbery, and election violence.²⁶ The poor performance and the subsequent inability of the law enforcement agencies to suppress internal agitators destabilizing the polity forced the government to engage the Nigerian Army, and later the Navy and Air Force to crush the fissiparous groups in the country. Indeed, the militants operating in the Niger Delta zone, Boko Haram insurgents, the AQIM, and Al-Qaeda in the Maghreb, smuggling and maritime piracy have been giving the government a serious headache. This is because the armed forces and security agencies have found it difficult to crush them due to poor military equipment, poor funding, the absence of cooperation among the various law enforcement operations, and the officers and men of the armed forces. If the country has developed its own weapons of mass destruction, the fear of their existence and presence (though nuclear weapons are not meant to be used against the citizens of the country) would have warned the insurgents that their intransigence may lead to the application of the weapons against

them while their foreign backers would have been warned of possible military assault from Nigeria. This is a terrible situation which disparages the image of the country whose military officers and men had successfully played prominent roles in peace keeping and peace enforcement in many parts of the world to have failed in maintaining internal stability.²¹ Thus, the nation needs to beef up its arsenal regarding weapons needed by the armed forces and paramilitary security agencies beside getting involved in the production of weapons of mass destruction.

The need for the country to swing into action and sponsor research and produce nuclear weapons is borne out of the desire of Nigerian leaders to have the nation included in the permanent membership of an expanded Security Council of the United Nations Organization. The five permanent members are: the United States, Russia, Britain, France, and China. These nations emerged as such when the United Nations was established due to the prominent roles they played during the Second World War. As Ibrahim Gambari has pointed out, Nigeria has played a significant role in the United Nations. For instance, Nigerians have served in leadership positions in the main organs of the supranational organization. Such personalities included the late Dr Teslim Elias, who was President of the International Court of Justice. Two distinguished legal luminaries, Daddy Onyeama and Bola Ajibola, also served on the World Court. Again, Nigeria has established itself as a strong advocate and reliable defender of Africa's concerns and interests at the United Nations especially on issues regarding decolonization and the war against Apartheid. In addition, Nigeria has served with notable achievements as a non-permanent member of the Security Council. Furthermore, the active roles successes the country has recorded in her overall involvement in the maintenance of international peace and security through active participation in and enormous contribution to the UN peacekeeping operations qualify Nigeria to be a permanent member on an expanded UN Security Council.²² Gambari, sheds light on the necessity for Nigeria to be a permanent member of the Security Council in the Future.²³ According to him:

Although the Security Council was formally established as just one of the principal organs of the UN, it is today clearly the organization's dominant political body. It is the only political organ in the UN system in which nations have conferred the power to take actions that bind them to maintain international peace and security.²⁴

The claims by Gambari are true. However, protagonists of this cause should remember that the current existing members- the Super Powers- were and are nuclear hegemony, and that for Nigeria to be fully recognized to join them in the future, it is advised to join the race for nuclear armament. This singular step will brighten its desire to get admitted to the club of countries calling the shots in the international system.

Furthermore, the strategic position that Nigeria occupies in Africa is a factor that makes it imperative for it to embark on production of weapons of mass destruction. Right from her attainment of independence, Nigeria has chosen Africa as the centre-piece of its foreign policy agenda. It has committed its financial, material, and manpower resources to prove to the whole world that it is the "Big Brother" of other African nations. Nigeria

dedicated its resources to the decolonization process of many African nations particularly the former Portuguese colonies and its bitter fight against Apartheid rule in South Africa; antagonism against racism as well as the formation of the Organization of Africa Unity (now African Union), and the Economic Community of West African States, and still on the list are Nigeria's impressive performances in peace keeping and peace-enforcement in Africa especially in Liberia, Sierra Leone and Cote d'Ivoire in addition to supervision of electoral processes on the continent.²⁵

Therefore, the country has become the main target of foreign powers, and this strategic position Nigeria occupies makes it vulnerable to foreign aggressors. It will be foolhardy for it to be basking in the euphoria of its past achievements and glories, without taking adequate precautionary measures located in nuclear, chemical, hydrogen, thermonuclear, and biological weaponry. Researching into and production of weapons of mass destruction will ultimately enhance Nigeria's prestige and influence in global affairs, besides making it combat-ready to undertake commando operations.

Nigeria needs to produce weapons of mass destruction due to the emergence of terrorism that threatens the entire global system. The concept of terrorism has been variously defined by scholars and writers. However, we shall adopt two of such connotations. The first is that of November 2004 as contained in a United Nations Security Council report which describes terrorism as any act "intended to cause death or serious bodily harm to civilians or non-combatants to intimidate a population or compelling a government or an international organization to do or abstain from doing any act."²⁶ The second conceptualization is put forward the U.S. Department of Defence which regards terrorism as "the calculated use of unlawful violence or threat of unlawful violence to inculcate fear, intended to coerce or to intimidate governments or societies in the pursuit of goals that are generally political, religious, or ideological."²⁷

It is no longer news that Nigeria is under siege, typified by the Boko Haram insurgency whose activities are being bankrolled by foreign backers. Boko Haram insurgents have killed people indiscriminately in the North-Eastern enclave of Nigeria. Their operations involve bombing public places and institutions, and the massive killing of innocent and harmless citizens.

Unfortunately, the government was unable to suppress the sect's henchmen during Dr. Goodluck Jonathan's presidency. The Muhammadu Buhari-led administration inherited the Boko Haram scourge, and it struggled to ensure the release of over 200 Chibok Secondary School girls who were abducted by the sect in April 2014.

It is rather sad that Nigerian leaders, particularly the presidency and the defence minister, turned a deaf ear to the warning given by Professor Bola Akinterinwa, a former Director-General of the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA), after the capture and killing of Osama Bin Laden, the al-Qaeda notorious leader in May 2011. Akinterinwa was reported to have urged the Federal Government to put all security agencies on red alert in view of reported anxiety in the Northern part of the country over fears about the likely reaction of Muslims in the area. He warned people who were jubilating not to rejoice. Akinterinwa asserts:

There are two schools of thought. One school says Bin Laden is a terrorist; therefore, a terrorist has been killed. So, they are jubilating. Another school of thought says he is a martyr who is defending a cause. So, they are talking in terms of martyrdom. So, they believe he died a martyr. They, too, are rejoicing. My position is that at the end of the day, there is no need for rejoicing, because bin Laden, for me, is an idea and an idea is indestructible.²⁸

Akinterinwa's pronouncement sounded and proved prophetic as the North East was thrown into utter confusion in 2013, and by 2014, the Boko Haram arrowhead and their Rampaging killer squad started terrorizing that part of the country. Therefore, it is instructive for the nation to build capable military installations towards warding off terrorist onslaughts. If the United States had not manufactured nuclear weapons, it would not have been necessary to deal decisively with Osama Bin Laden-led al-Qaeda, which was linked to the September 11, 2001, terrorist attack, Afghanistan, and Iraq under Saddam Hussein. Boko Haram

Factors that can Ensure the Success of the Armament Novelty

The nation's leaders, particularly top government functionaries, politicians in power, the military, and academics have diverse roles to play. To start with, the Federal and State Governments must develop the political will to embark on a nuclear programme aimed at manufacturing lethal weapons capable of devastating the nation's enemies' camps. The willingness gives rise to the mission and determination in this direction. The government must realize that the nation is exposed to the danger of aerial bombings. Secondly, the Government must be ready to finance the laudable programme. Finance must be made available to execute the project. Money is required for setting up the nuclear industrial centres, the equipment, manpower, and for research and other facilities. However, accountability, transparency, and public probity must be stipulated and strictly adhered to in the blueprint. This is to prevent corruption, which has stifled efforts in the fight against Boko Haram and bandits as it has become a cancer in the nation's body polity. The problem is how to get people who are not corrupt to manage and account for the monies released to execute the project.

In addition, it is high time that the nation's economy was industrialized; without industrialization of the economy, there is no way the country can bring off or achieve the noble objectives of producing weapons of mass destruction as they are industrially propelled. Hence, the era of raw material production must be jettisoned.

Furthermore, the government has to liaise with the academic community comprising universities, especially universities of science and technology, and research institutes that are technologically oriented. Nuclear physicists, geologists, and engineers, as well as biologists and chemical experts, must be engaged and well remunerated to get the best out of them. The universities, polytechnics, and research institutes must be well-funded if this aspiration is to be realized. The academics must train people and also acquire training in developed countries.

Finally, there is a need to enlighten the general public about the importance of embarking on the manufacturing of nuclear weaponry. This is very important to win the confidence and cooperation of the citizenry. The people must be educated on the importance of the project and the sacrifices they have to make if the country is to compete favourably with others in the comity of nations, with special references to war and strategic initiatives, and armament. These factors are very germane if the country is to be admitted to the nuclear club. It is therefore essential that they are taken into cognizance and implemented if the nation is to achieve military advancement and be strategically relevant.

Conclusion

This discourse deals with military and strategy. It examines the constitutional role of the armed forces and the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction by Western Powers like the United States, Britain, the Soviet Union (Russia), and France, as well as Asian and Middle Eastern countries like China, Iran, Pakistan, and Israel. It similarly highlights the need for Nigeria to participate in the production of atomic bombs, missiles, chemical, biological, and hydrogen weapons. It further underscores the factors that can ensure the realization of this technological innovation in Nigeria.

There is no doubt that Nigeria is mature enough to get involved in stepping up its military arsenal in order not to be caught unawares by any of those countries that have achieved the balance of terror. It is also shameful that Nigeria is lagging behind in economic, social, and strategic while its contemporaries in Asia and the Near East are making steady progress. It is axiomatic that the country will gain better recognition in global affairs, especially in Africa, if it successfully participates in the production of weapons of mass destruction.

References

- ¹ A. Akpuru-Aja, *Policy and Strategic Studies: Uncharted Waters of War and Peace in International Relations* (Abakaliki: Willy Rose and Appleseed Publishing Co., 2019). See also Hal Brands, *What Good Is Grand Strategy?: Power and Purpose in American Statecraft from Harry S. Truman to George W. Bush* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2014).
- ² Emeka Anyaoku, ed., *Review of Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Issues and Perspectives* (Lagos: Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, 2012).
- ³ Anyaoku, 103
- ⁴ Anyaoku, 104
- ⁵ O. Oche, "Principles of International Relations," in *Selected Readings on Nigeria's Foreign Policy and International Relations*, ed. R. A. Akindele and Bassey E. Ate, NIIA Enlightenment Course Series Vol. 1 (Lagos: Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, 2000), 2-3.
- ⁶ David H. Rosenbloom, Robert S. Kravchuk, and Richard M. Clerkin, *Public Administration: Understanding Management, Politics, and Law in the Public Sector* (New York: Routledge, 2022).

⁷ Y. Akinyeye, "African Security in Historical Perspectives," in *Beyond Conflict Resolution: Managing African Security in the 21st Century*, ed. R. A. Akindele and Bassey E. Ate (Lagos: Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, 2001).

⁸ Akinyeye, 18

⁹ David Omand, *Securing the State* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

¹⁰ Joseph Cirincione, *Bomb Scare: The History and Future of Nuclear Weapons* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007). See also A. Belous and V. Saladukha, "Modern Weapons: Possibilities and Limitations," in *Viruses, Hardware and Software Trojans: Attacks and Countermeasures* (Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020), 731–820.

¹¹ M. Fraser, *Weapons of Mass Distraction: Soft Power and American Empire* (London: Macmillan+ ORM, 2025).

¹² David Noble, *Forces of Production: A Social History of Industrial Automation* (New York: Routledge, 2017).

¹³ B. P. Sunmolu, "International Security, Balance of Power and Use of Force," in *Selected Readings on Nigeria's Foreign Policy*, ed. R. A. Akindele and Bassey A. Ate (Lagos: Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, 2001), 30–31.

¹⁴ B. Ogunbanjo, "Great Power Politics: Past, Present and Future," *Nigerian Journal of International Affairs* 28, nos. 1–2 (2002): 187.

¹⁵ Morton H. Halperin, *Contemporary Military Strategy* (London: Faber and Faber, 1972), 1.

¹⁶ Halperin

¹⁷ M. Kostić, "European Union and the Weapons of Mass Destruction: Policy, Threat, Response," *Romanian Review of Political Sciences and International Relations* 18 (2021): 135–55.

¹⁸ Emmanuel Monday Inyada, *Legal Framework for the Development of Nuclear Energy in Nigeria: Challenges and Prospects* (Long essay, Faculty of Law, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, 2017), PDF, accessed October 10, 2025. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3817922>.

¹⁹ D. Akpan and E. Ebenezer, "Strategic Implications of Inter-Agency Collaboration on National Security in Nigeria in View of Information Technology," *World Atlas Journal of Library and Information Science* 4, no. 1 (2018).

²⁰ S. S. Babaita, *An Analysis of Threats to Nigeria's Internal Security (2013–2018)* (Master's dissertation, Kwara State University, 2020). See also O. K. John, *The Threat of Insurgency to Peace and Security in West Africa: Nigeria in Perspective* (PhD diss., School of International and Area Studies, GOA University, India, 2022).

²¹ T. O. Erinosho, *Nigeria and ECOMOG Peace-Keeping Operations in Liberia and Sierra Leone* (PhD thesis, Department of History, University of Ibadan, 2010).

²² I. A. Gambari, "Nigeria and the United Nations: The Pursuit of National Interest through Multinationals in a Changing World Order," in *New Horizons for Nigeria in World Affairs*, ed. U. Joy Ogwu (Lagos: Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, 2005).

²³ Gambari

²⁴ Gambari, 106

²⁵ Erinosh, *Nigeria and ECOMOG*,

²⁶ D. Arowolo and T. Lawal, "Terrorism and Global Security," in *Contemporary Issues in International Relations*, ed. Dare Arowolo (Lagos: Princeway-Gbade Ent. (Nig) Ltd., 2008), 171.

²⁷ Arowolo and Lawal

²⁸ Bassey E Ate and Bola A Akinterinwa, *Cross border armed banditry in the north east: issues in national security and Nigeria's relations with its immediate neighbours* (Lagos: Nigerian Institute of International Affairs)