Discussion on the relationship between politics, insecurity and internal displaced persons (IDPs) in North-Eastern Nigeria is particularly important today when the region has become so volatile under the current political dispensation. Insecurity is nowadays a topical issue in the North-Eastern region as developments reported on the region which often receive international publicity relates to insurgency, bombings, killings, abductions and other terror-related activities. The insecurity has led to painful displacement of thousands persons in the region. Many people have been forced to leave their homes as a result of the crisis and therefore become internal displaced persons. In other words, they sadly become refugees in their own country. The insecurity situation is both an issue demanding our attention and a problem calling for a resolution. This paper is a contribution to the ongoing discussion on the security problem in North-Eastern region of Nigeria from 2009 to 2015. It attempts to study and show the important, but complex and largely less talked about at least in the academic circles, the organic link between politics, insecurity and internal displaced persons in the region and elsewhere.
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1. Introduction

The discussion on the relationship between politics, insecurity and internally displaced persons (IDPs) in North-Eastern region of Nigeria will be prefaced by conceptual clarification of the basic terms: politics, security and internal displaced persons. Politics is “about living humans, that is to say, actual men and women and children, breathing, eating, crying, laughing, creating, dying, growing, struggling, organizing, people in history of which they are its products, its producers and its analysts” (waThiong’o, 2007). Politics is about the promotion and defense of a certain group interests through political means or otherwise. Democratic politics is concern with “the equality of citizens; the freedom of these citizens to associate with one another for the realization of their ideals and the defense and promotion of their interests; and the freedom of these citizens to choose between the different political platforms of the various political parties and candidates and see to the actualization of the platforms they have voted for, if their choices win” (Usman, 2014). Thus, politics deals with the operation of power in society and how human society is organized, how the machinery of power is operated, by whom and how that power is controlled and the ends to which the power is utilized in society (Rush, 1992). The class that wields power controls not only the productive forces in any given society, but determines the security of human life and property in that society as well.

Security deals with people’s lives and property. It is about the protection of live and property of people or citizens of a particular country thus making them move freely and exchange ideas, goods and services without hindrance. Security is centered on human life and the process of harnessing the means of life, and how they are produced, exchanged and shared out; the whole process which give rise to an orderly society where politics can be played to guarantee human security, freedom and positive development on a wider scale. But when the people’s lives and properties are taken away indiscriminately and, or their rights of freedom of association, movement, expression, religion, etc. are infringed, they could then be described to be in a state of insecurity, because their rights are not respected (Perouse de Montclos, 2014). In a situation where one feel in secured and, or unprotected he/she become unsafe and uncomfortable. Insecurity often leads to unnecessary physical and psychological disturbance and in certain instances lead to displacement of people who then necessarily move out in search for a safer and better condition of life elsewhere.

A displaced person is someone that has been forced to leave his/her home, state, region or
country as a result of war, conflict, insurgency, persecution, harassment or other related things that seriously discomforts him/her, thereby seeking for a safe haven. A displaced person is actually a refugee. Thus, IDPs are groups of people that have been directly and indirectly forced to leave their home or state, but ended up being accommodated as refugees within the country of their origin. In the course of history, different circumstances led to the displacement of people. Too often, political conflicts and other related military activities result in the displacement of people as witnessed in Somalia, Congo, Burundi, Chad, Bosnia, Sri Lanka, Iraq, Syria and Central African Republic. In Palestine for example, the arrival of the Jewish in the 1940s and their systematic military occupation of the Palestinian territory has led to the violent displacement and, or forceful deportation of Arabs from Palestine to other lands, under the watch of the United Nations. In the 1970s Cambodia, the Khmer Rouge government was so ruthless that it killed, staved and displaced many people in Cambodia. In the World’s newest nation of South Sudan, there is a serious problem of IDPs following the ethnic-based political rivalry and contest for power between the incumbent President (Salva Kiir) and his former Deputy President (General Reik Machar). This has caused indescribable sufferings among civilians in the country.

Politics and political contestations often result to insecurity which in turn causes displacement of people for several reasons. In Nigeria, politics has often been very competitive and thus characterized by violence. This paper therefore is set to examine how politics and insecurity promote the displacement of people in North-Eastern Nigeria between 2009 and 2015. Specifically, this paper briefly explore the geographical, historical and demographic backgrounds of the people of North-Eastern Nigeria and, in review, tries to give a clear understanding of Nigerian politics because politics deals with the operation of power and power relations in any society, the understanding of Nigerian power politics is necessary. To understand power politics in Nigeria, this paper further examine the political behavior of Nigerian politicians and why most of them rapaciously seek power for their selfish ends. Thus, it is necessary to discuss the Nigerian political settings within which politicians operate and how they politically antagonize and even systematically do way with the very people they are supposed to protect and serve.

2. Literature Review

Given the plethora of literature in the subject area of politics, insecurity and the displacement of people in the Nigeria political arena, this paper critically will examine the link between politics, insecurity and internally displaced persons (IDPs) in North-Eastern Nigeria. Firstly it will be ideal to describe the geographical, historical and demography of the people of North-Eastern Nigeria.
2.1. **Geographical, Historical and Demographic Description of North-Eastern Nigeria**

Geographically, the region is located in Northern Nigeria; it is the most northeasterly part of the northern region. The North-Eastern region is bounded in the north, northeast and east by the Republics of Niger, Chad and Cameroon respectively. The region’s southern and western boundaries run from Benue State through Kaduna, Kano and Jigawa States of Nigeria respectively. Spatially, the region has an estimated 21,637 million hectares (216,370 km$^2$) land area and about 6.4 million hectares of cultivatable land (Akko, 2013). Approximately the region’s land area accounts for thirty (30) percent of Nigerian landmass. Much of the land area has been covered by grassland or dry Savannah (Udo, 1980). Six (6) States of Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe, with a total of one hundred and twelve (112) Local Government Areas (LGAs) which constituted the geopolitical structure of the North-Eastern Region of Nigeria.

Historically, human colonization of the region dates back to 3,000 years ago. From available archaeological evidence the earliest man-made tools were discovered at Daima and Kusarkata in Borno State (Shaw, 1980). The region “is an area of diverse and heterogeneous ethnic groups.” (Abubakar, 1980) Different parts of the region have since the pre-colonial period came under the occupation of different ethnic and cultural groups. Demographically, the Kanuri, Shuwa-Arab, Bolewa, Kilba, Babur, Mbula, Bata, Yungur, Mboi, Lalna, Waja, Margi, Lunguda, Bachama, Higi, Fali, Pero, Dadiya, Wurkum, Awak, Tiv, Jukun, Kamo, Kanakuru, Chamba, Jera, Tula, Tera, Tangale, Kare, Kare, Mumuye and Fulani had been among the ethnic groups that inhabited the region from time immemorial. They had been able to establish, at different periods, diverse polities of varying sizes and importance, ranging from empires, kingdoms and chiefdoms.

In the course of the history of these indigenous groups, they have come in contact with many groups and interrelated at different levels. Thus, the Hausa, Angas, Dakarkari, Birom, Nupe, Igalu, Idoma, Igbirisa, Yoruba, Igbo, to mention but a few have also made the region their home in contemporary time. Based on the 2006 National Population Census, the North-Eastern region’s population stood at 18,971,965. By this figure, the region carries over thirteen percent (13%) of the total population of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. There can be no doubt that from 2006 to date, the population of the region has changed tremendously; sadly the insecurity problem has seriously affected the demography of the region as thousands of people have been killed and displaced internally and externally. In order to properly understand the dynamics of the security
situation in the region, it is necessary to examine the politics that is being played in relation to the region since the return of democracy and party politics in 1999 in Nigeria.

2.2. **Party Politics in Nigeria in Relation to the North-Eastern Region of Nigeria**

Party politics is an essential feature of democracy. Democratic politics was first observed in Nigeria in the 1950s (Dudley, 1982). Through the early 1960s and 1980s party politics or democratic politics was seen as the effective means of governance in Nigeria. No other time has party politics dominated the life of Nigerians than now following the return of civilian rule in 1999, which so far marked the end of “military rule” in Nigeria. The military, it should be pointed out, ruled by decree instead of governing through constitutional process. Democracy, on the other hand, is based on the constitutional provisions (Udo, 1980). With democratic politics, Nigerians are expected to be governed in such a way that the security of lives and property would be guaranteed; freedom of movement, expression and association, among other things, are supposed to be enjoyed by the citizenry as part of the “dividends of democracy” (Dudley, 1982). Nigerians living in all nooks and crones of the country have the right to support candidates from different nationally recognized political parties and vote for candidates of their interests, who they believe would work towards providing goods and services that will enhance the wellbeing of the people in his/her political constituency (Udo, 1980).

The return of democratic politics and civilian rule in 1999 was therefore, long awaited by most Nigerians. PDP and APP appealed to most electorates in the North-Eastern Region in particular. Following the 1999 General Elections, out of the six (6) states of the region these two political parties managed to form governments in equal number between them. The States of Borno, Yobe and Gombe came under the ANPP while in Adamawa, Taraba and Bauchi States PDP Governors won elections. Governors Mala Kachalla, Bukar Abba Ibrahim and Abubakar Habu Hashidu governed in Borno, Yobe and Gombe, respectively. Governors Boni Haruna, Joli Nyame and Ahmed Mu’azu governed Adamawa, Taraba and Bauchi, respectively.

The 2003 General Elections brought little, but remarkable change in the political field in the North-Eastern States. Meanwhile PDP retained power at the Federal level; it also seized power from ANPP in Gombe as Muhammadu Danjuma Goje of PDP won the Gubernatorial Election, thereby taking over from Habu Hashidu. In Borno, Senator Ali Modu Sherif of ANPP garnered support from all and the sundry and forced the incumbent Governor, Mala Kachallato defect to Alliance for Democracy (AC) and subsequently
defeated him in the Governorship Election. The political contest between Modu Sherif and Mala Kachalla was so bad that both candidates used all resources at their disposal to cling to power. Political thugs, security agents and clerics were corruptively used in the process.

In the North-Eastern States the 2007 Governorship Elections brought some twilight of hope for the opposition party as PDP lost Bauchi State, but retained Gombe, Adamawa and Taraba States. In Gombe, Governor Danjuma Goje returned elected while Murtala H. Nyako and Danbaba Suntai were equally elected as Governors of their respective States of Adamawa and Taraba. In Bauchi, Mallam Isa Yuguda won the Governorship Election under the platform of ANPP. He later crossed carpet to PDP, typical of ideologically groundless Nigerian politicians. Borno and Yobe States continued to be under the ANPP as Governor Modu Sherif returned elected in Borno and Senator Mamman Ali won the Governorship Election in Yobe. Governor Mamman Ali died midway and was replaced by his Deputy-Governor, Ibrahim Geidam.

During the 2011 General Elections in the North-Eastern region, the main opposition at the national level was Congress for Progressive Change (CPC), but ANPP, another opposition party was strong at the state and local levels, especially in Borno and Yobe States. Kashim Shettima and Governor Geidam contested for Gubernatorial Elections under the ANPP platform and won the elections in Borno and Yobe States, respectively. In Gombe and Bauchi, Ibrahim Hassan Dankwambo and Governor Isa Yuguda of the ruling PDP returned elected, respectively. In Adamawa and Taraba, PDP retained the States as Governors Murtala Nyako and Danbaba Suntai won the elections.

Meanwhile the administration was, as in everything of national importance, very slow in tackling the security problem in the region with all sense of responsibility and earnestness. This perhaps was coincidentally informed by the fact that the States of Borno and Yobe have always been under the control of the opposition party. The Governors and majority of the people in these states have overwhelmingly been staunch supporters of APC. Governor Nyako of Adamawa State though not popular with the people of Adamawa, his switch to APC had little to add to the party. Nonetheless, as far as PDP leadership was concerned, Adamawa had almost gone out of their hands, but typical of the shrewd-wily designs of the ruling party, they engineered the process of the impeachment of Governor Nyakoon the 15th of July, 2014, and his replacement by his Deputy Governor, James Bala Ngilari. At last, the ruling party successfully and politically reclaimed Adamawa State. Already Bauchi, Gombe and Taraba States were under the firm grip of PDP, but the ruling party was (and still is) aware that most of the electorates in these states are in support of APC.

Thus, the ruling party at the national level found it politically expedient to use the security
situation in the North-Eastern Region for its advantage as the 2015 General Elections approaches. The ongoing BH insurgency was said to be a serious challenge that could deter the process of the 2015 election exercise. Hence elections were initially said not to hold in the “insecurity-ridden states” in the region. This was repeatedly expressed by the National Security Adviser to President Jonathan. Another seemingly effective political strategy initiated by PDP led government was to cunningly declare “state of emergency” on all the states with “high level of insecurity” in the region. After the expiration of the life span of the “state of emergency” declared in May, 2013 for an initial period of six months, it was further extended for another six months in November, 2014; it expired in May, 2015 without achieving its stated objective. But interestingly President Jonathan took dramatic political steps to declare yet again “state of emergency” on the States of Yobe, Borno and Adamawa. Political pressure from the Federal Legislature, with the help of legislative members from the opposition parties justifiably forced the President to drop the idea of the sinister attempt made by the PDP led government to deny the people of the North-Eastern States the right to vote during the 2015 General Elections. The British Foreign Secretary, Philip Hammond keenly observed that “while we support Nigeria in its struggle against terrorism, the security situation should not be used as a reason to deny the Nigerian people from exercising their democratic rights.” It turned out that the rescheduling of the election was to allow BH related insurgency to take its course in the North-Eastern States with a view to further destabilizing the region and discouraging the region’s electorates to come out for the rescheduled 2015 General Elections. There is therefore, a reason to believe that to a certain degree the insecurity situation that affected most North-Eastern States on the eve of the General Elections in Nigeria was an artificial insecurity orchestrated by the power-monger politicians in order to achieve their political goals.

2.3. **Insecurity in North-Eastern Region of Nigeria and Government Response**

A careful study of the history of modern Nigeria would reveal that security challenges has been part and parcel of the Nigerian society, depending on the scale of the security problem at a particular period and area within the country. From the colonial period to contemporary time, Nigeria has faced a number of surmountable security challenges. In retrospect, the violent nature of the British colonial state was such that it developed the capacity to effectively contain, in a systematic political and military way, virtually all security challenges in colonial Nigeria (Tamuno, 1983). After the attainment of political independence from the British in 1960, different Nigerian leaders and governments manifestly displayed their abilities to handle security threats within and against the country, especially at the time of national emergency. It is worthwhile to say at this
juncture that the policies and programmes of the military leaders of Nigeria before and after the Nigerian Civil War (1967-1970) showed their willingness to adopt whatever measure they consider necessary to maintain law, order and keep Nigeria united (Okocha, 1994).

From 2009 the North-Eastern Region witnessed unprecedented insecurity and violence following the emergence of a local uprising with religious ideology and political meaning, and enjoyed massive support from politicians and ordinary individuals (Perouse de Montclos, 2014). The initiators of the uprising equally received material, logical, technical and military support from international organizations. Government forces attempts to crush the uprising through military means is yet to be achieved. It is albeit a religious based movement organized around the religion of Islam and led by the *Jama’atul Ahlis- Sunnah Lidda ’await wal Jihad* (People Committed to the Propagation of the Prophet’s Teaching and Jihad) better known as Boko Haram (BH), but many Muslims scholars do not subscribe to the BH views on religious matters. The history of the emergence and philosophy of this radical movement associated with the BH is full of intricacies. But satisfactory attempts have been made by certain Western and African scholars to discuss the history of the BH, their methods, message, approach as well as the views of their critics as documented in a recent joint publication of the African Studies Centre (ASC) and the French Institute for Research in Africa (IFRA). A number of the articles/chapters in the book have been read by the writer of this paper and accordingly cited in the endnotes. Here only the outlines of salient events that would shape our understanding of the relationship between politics, insecurity and IDPs will be made.

The root cause of BH is not unconnected to the failure of the Nigerian state to cater for its citizenry. It has been observed that democracy in Nigeria seem to have failed as evidenced in the travails of Nigerian politics and infidelity in the political system (Eseduwo, 2014). The politicians do not play according to the rule of the game and pander in cynicism. Although they operate through democratic means, they do not respect the democratic institutions and often made doses of promises, but failed to deliver (Harnischfeger, 2014). This, as will be shown in due course, make most Nigerian masses disillusioned with Western secular ways of development and questioned the legitimacy of the modern political elite that ruled and sadly neglected them. It is instructive to say that when the citizens realize they are neglected, unattended to and or maltreated by the state, they could potentially, with little ideological, logistical and material support from within and outside, rise in protest and even rebel against the state authorities.

In the meantime, the Nigerian government viewed the BH as a serious threat to the security of not only Borno, but the whole of North-Eastern Region. The then President Yar’adua directed the military to wipe out the BH militants within the short time
possible. The army launched an all-out offensive on the BH stronghold at Maiduguri with perhaps remarkable success. But there had been shocking reports on human right abuses by the security personnel. Many innocent people were killed alongside the BH members (Mohammed, 2014). Accordingly, the leader of the BH movement, Mohammed Yusuf was captured and extra-judicially killed in July, 2009. From this time up to July 2011 the security operatives carried out house-to-house search in certain quarters in Maiduguri and Yobe, believed to have been inhabited by the BH members. In the process of the punitive search and patrol many people were unnecessarily arrested, detained and tortured to death. Many more had been killed through the firing squad. Kyari Mohammed argued that, “the security agencies serially mismanaged the crisis from the outset, and in the process pushed the movement to the extreme end of the spectrum.” (Mohammed, 2014).

Meanwhile the Nigerian military operation did not completely purge BH from the region. They had been unable to effectively liquidate them, put an end to their military activities and control their spread. Indeed, the 2009 military onslaught on the group and numerous other innocent persons further radicalized the movement as many people that has suffered under the military operation, volunteered to join the group. Thus, within a short period of time the BH members and their sympathizers regrouped and continued challenging the Nigerian army. They, in the words of Marc-Antoine Perouse de Montclos:

> form an embryonic political group because of their targets, their rejection of the Western values, their contestation of a secular state, their manipulation by politicians, the legitimacy they built during the repression, and the fear they provoke in Borno and all over Nigeria (Perouse de Montclos, 2014)

In essence, after serious mobilization, the group decided to adopt a militaristic approach in pursing their cause after attempts to institutionalize their ideology through peaceful means has failed (Da’wah Coordination Council of Nigeria, 2009). Initially, the main targets and victims of the BH had been the security officials, local rulers, prominent politicians and Muslim clerics opposed to their views. They usually attack police station, prisons and law enforcement agencies which represent the state; schools which symbolize Western education and veritable agents of mental colonization; mosques and Muslim scholars who challenged their positions; politicians who rigged themselves into political offices and failed to deliver their promises, thereby by squandering public resources (Perouse de Montclos, 2014). Belatedly they changed their tactics by attacking non-combatants, innocent persons in order to draw the attention of the state (Mohammed, 2014). This therefore, demonstrates that the BH was not only against the state in its governmental affairs, but also the whole society which they judged unjust, corrupt, decadent, and perhaps un-Islamic. It could reasonably be difficult for one to reconcile
“the goal of enthroning sharia state as a precondition for the sustainable development of Nigeria vs. wanton destruction of lives and properties as a means to achieving such set goal” (Eseduwo, 2014). It is compelling to say that the BH has no clearly articulated political agenda, but has been totally against the secularity of the Nigerian state and its corruptive institutions and thus viewed workers in government establishments as *tagut* (off-limits) (Usman, 2014).

In the aftermath of the 2009 military assault against the BH, the remaining members that escaped got some support from people that have sympathy for the BH predicament. They therefore, started to operate outside Maiduguri, Capital of Borno State, the birth place of the insurgency, followed by Damaturu, Capital of Yobe State. They have been targeting Muslim and Christian communities alike, but media propaganda on the identity of the victims of the BH insurgency has been full of bias as critically observed by M. Perouse de Montclos that “attacks on Christian minorities in the North often make the headlines, but the massacres of the Muslim communities go unreported.” (Perouse de Montclos, 2014). There cannot be any doubt that the “Boko Haram divided and weakened the Muslim community” in Northern Nigeria as well as dimed its image. They advocated, albeit not in a peaceful way, for the transformation of the society based on their ideology, which has been a potential weapon and they have not been disposed to ignore it, but fervently awaits opportunity to launch it (Mahdi, 2008). By their actions, the BH has kept the old fear of a bloody revolution alive, though not in the manner of the Western-style revolution (Usman, 2014).

The BH represents a formidable attacking force and by choice, adopted both the military strategy of hit and run attack and physical confrontation with the government forces. It was observed that the BH has recently adopted a strategy of gun fire attack, and bomb blast in schools, mosques, churches, markets and motor parks (Usman, 2014). Initially, men were the principal actors in the military activities of the BH. Nowadays children and adult both male and female are being used to carry out deadly attacks. It has been said that the adults are usually enchanted and the young boys and girls are often lured by being given luxury snacks, sweet and explosive vests are mounted on them (with or without their consent) and then sent to enter crowds where the explosives and time-bombs are detonated (Mahdi, 2008). There are reports that some armed groups have been disguising and killing innocent people in the name of BH. A pogrom-like mass-killing of people has been perpetrated under the banner of BH, by mysterious militia group.

The BH insurgency and other related military activities carried out by government forces and mercenaries employed by the political elite to perpetrate violence in the North-Eastern Region has left thousands dead, thousands displaced, thousands maimed and shortchanged in the region. It is difficult to give account of the exact condition of people and the number of people killed in the course of the crisis. According to Famous E.
Eseduwo, in the period between 2009 and 2012 “more than one million, two hundred and sixteen persons have been killed and maimed by either the sect or the government security forces.” (Perouse de Montclos, 2014) From 2012 to date many other people had been killed. The Amnesty International report released on the 3rd of June, 2015 revealed that, Nigerian military forces alone have “extra judicially executed more than 1,200 people; they have arbitrarily arrested at least 20,000 people, mostly young men and boys… hundreds, if not thousands, of Nigerians have become victims of enforced disappearance; and at least 7,000 people have died in military detention as a result of starvation, extreme overcrowding and denial of medical assistance (Mahdi, 2008). The real BH also killed thousands of people for no reason. The perpetrators of these crimes against humanity among the military officers, the leaders of the BH militants and their financiers are not yet brought to justice. The physical and psychological traumas experienced by numerous innocent people, including the displaced persons as a result of the mischief of the militants and the political demagogues will always be remembered in history (Mahdi, 2008).

2.4. Insecurity and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in North-Eastern Nigeria and Elsewhere

Admittedly, the BH insurgency and what has been associated with it have lasting impacts on the North-Eastern States as could be discerned in the mass murder of people, wanton disruption of agricultural, commercial and administrative activities, torching of houses, worshiping centers, government establishments and displacement of thousands of people from the region. As noted earlier, 19 LGAs have been seriously affected by the crisis (Usman, 2014). Most of these LGAs came under the effective control of the BH. Thus, the inhabitants of these affected areas have had to leave or else get killed. Thousands of people have been forced to flee their ancestral homes. Thousands more have been injured, maimed, and killed while others have been forced to subscribe to the BH ideals in the areas occupied by the militants. Many people ran away for their lives and ultimately became displaced internally and externally (Usman, 2014). According to the International Organization for Migration (IOM), about 2.1 million people have been displaced by the BH insurgency.

It was disturbing that the then Commander of the Armed Forces of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, President Jonathan had not been very responsive to the plight of the victims of the insurgency. It seemed he did not show enough sympathy not only for the victims of the BH insurgency, but the whole North-Eastern States faced with a serious insecurity challenge. This was clear from his actions or inactions concerning the BH related security problem and its destructive consequences on abducted and displaced persons.
in the North-Eastern region. On the issue of the abducted persons, the Jonathan led government, for political gain, lied to the world that it had struck peace truce with the BH leadership on the 17\textsuperscript{th} of October, 2014, with a view to ending violence and insurgency in the region. The government also lied to the international community that it would secure the release of the abducted 200 Chibok girls as if they were the only people taken as hostages by the militants (Usman, 2014). Numerous civilians were abducted from Buni Yadi, Damboa, Abadam, Gwoza, Doron Baga and elsewhere in the North-Eastern region. In the meantime, the BH leaders quickly denied signing any peace deal with the Nigerian government officials.\textsuperscript{45} Hence the terrorist group continued to unleash mayhem on settlements in the region without intervention from government forces.

On the displaced persons, if not for the incessant public outcry and perhaps political pressure from the opposition and, or advise from President Jonathan political cabals, he never felt obliged to visit the places affected by the insurgency to commiserate with victims of the militants’ attacks nor sent delegates to assess the security situation in the region. Throughout the crisis period he only visited Borno three times; of course for political expediency (waThiong’o, 2007). He did not provide adequate disaster relief materials: clothing, food, shelter, etc. for the affected people. Most of the people that had been forced to leave their homes as a result of the crisis, the IDPs otherwise called refugees had been catered for by the neighboring states and local governments, philanthropic organizations and highly spirited, well-to-do individuals who supported them in the refugee centers and camps created in some states of Northern Nigeria and in the Republics of Niger, Chad and Cameroon. If not for the generosity of the aforementioned countries, states and local governments, private agencies and kind-hearted individuals what would have been the refugees’ fate? Their fundamental human rights have been abused and truncated; the rights to live a peaceful life, to shelter, and freedom of expression and of movement were denied and the federal government did little, if any, to put a smile on their face. It appeared as if the PDP led government and the political rulers of the country thought that all these were not their responsibilities.

Never before have Nigerians so much suffered and displaced as a result of a locally organized and coordinated crisis not even during the Nigerian Civil War. In the meantime, the nonchalant attitude of the ex-President has compelled us to surmise that he believed that the BH insurgency and insecurity is the problem of the North-Eastern Nigeria and thus Northerners should deal with it. Yet he claimed to have achieved a lot for Nigeria like no other Nigerian president; that his administration has transformed Nigeria. If Jonathan and his party stalwarts like to call what they have done to this country “Transformation Agenda”, then only an argument about its usage is involved (Usman, 2014; waThiong’o, 2007). The legacies of the Jonathan administration in the North-Eastern region and elsewhere in Nigeria are practical issues that are openly discussed across the country today.
In reality no other time was Nigeria so volatile and fragile than during the Jonathan led administration. The country was virtually polarized based on the “North-South Divide” because of the elite’s political interest. This is appalling, but what is very appalling is the bizarre attitude of the political elite and political office holders, showing no or little regard for the masses’ feelings, thereby treating them with contempt. During the crisis period, many people in the North-Eastern region found it difficult to cope under the strangulation of the dirty politics being played by dubious politicians in Nigeria. The people actually struggled merely to breathe fresh air and be secured. Already upset by the high-handedness and strange behavior of the political demagogues, the *talakawa* have used their voting power during the 2015 General Elections and changed the corrupt PDP government that had ruled the country since 1999. As far as security issues are concerned now, the new government of President Muhammadu Buhari has been liquidating the BH; things are beginning to return to normalcy in the North-Eastern Nigeria. Unfolding events in relation to the remarkable success of the Nigerian troops against the BH militants are increasingly making the hitherto complex phenomenon of the BH insurgency easy to understand (Usman, 2014). At any rate, the BH related acts of terrorism in the North-Eastern States and the political elite’s irresponsibility have received wide publicity. The importance of this meant that great publicity value could be extracted from the reports that are being published day-in, day-out (waThiong’o, 2007).

3. **Conclusion and Recommendations**

This paper analyzed the relationship between politics, insecurity and IDPs in the North-Eastern region of Nigeria. It is clear from the foregoing that the problem of insecurity in the region is not unconnected to the party politics played by certain irresponsible political elite who wielded power and wanted to retain that power at all cost. It has been shown that this is a common tendency among politicians in prismatic societies, wherein the course of the politicians’ mad drive to cling to, hold on to and exercise power, they not only systematically rigged elections, but also diabolically allow the people that they are supposed to protect and cater for, to be displaced and killed by political thugs, mercenaries and militants, because of their remote political interests. This has been the situation which North-Eastern Nigeria found itself under the Jonathan led government. It has been argued that the root cause of the insecurity which led to the massive displacement of people in the North-Eastern region has been the result of government neglect of its citizenry resulting from sheer mismanagement, profligacy, mediocrity, impunity, corruption and other abuses that had been perpetrated by the political elite long before Jonathan came to power. Sincere attempt was made to militarily contain the BH crisis by the Yar’adua administration. After Yar’adua, President Jonathan was not committed to tackle the problem outright. Instead he rather mischievously used the
crisis for his political advantage as evidenced in the way and manner his administration handled the whole situation: at a time when the BH insurgents had militarily occupied vast tract of land out of the Nigerian territory and had displaced and killed thousands, the Nigerian army were less equipped and under paid their allowances; the IDPs were not provided with the required relief materials by the federal government (Usman, 2014). To all intent and purposes, Jonathan had no genuine concern over the situation of the IDPs and thus did little to end spiral insurgency related to BH in the region. The 2015 Presidential election brought new government in Nigeria which has been working with remarkable success to end the crisis. Preliminary investigations by the Buhari led government have shown that certain key military and political figures in Jonathan led administration had been involved in the sponsorship and, or used mercenaries to stage attacks in the North-Eastern States, which they blamed on the BH insurgents, in order to either shamelessly make money out of the security situation in the region or actualise their political ambitions or both.
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