

Defence and Wider Government Policy

Mosses Eromedochene Ukpenumewu Tedheke, Ph.D.

Department of Political Science and Defence Studies (PSDS)

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

Nigerian Defence Academy

PMB 2109, Kaduna

Abstract

In this study we are concerned with the role of the military or defence in wider government policy. We are not approaching this from the point of view of a historical perspective and from the point of view of eclecticism based on the current dynamics of defence and wider government policy. Our view in this study is based on a holistic analysis and on historical materialism not anchored on eclecticism. According to Karl Marx, Frederick Engels and Vladimir I Lenin eclecticism is a senseless jumbo of materialism and idealism which places itself more on contemporaneous situations rather than the movement of history. This will not give us the logic of the inner kernel of the dynamics of the emergence of the military and the state in the long view of history. In this respect therefore, this research has investigated the emergence of the state and military in history and the contribution of the military in state building in the historical process. We have discovered that the military has been the inner kernel of the state and is the source of class/state power and therefore, has always been of wider government policy. It was instrumental to the emergence of the post-feudal Atlantic states as it employed violent force and capital force to build the modern powerful Atlantic states called by Thomas Hobbes as the great leviathan. This state which later expanded to include the North American, the Japanese, Australian and New Zealand used the killer machine in what is known as predatory accumulation to advance capital accumulation and as such the birth of the modern powerful advanced capitalist states. This opportunity is no longer available to Third World military and their states. These states and their militaries must conquer the minds of their people in science and technology to establish the base of power for a second independence and viable militaries based on science and technology. This is the only precondition that the military and the state must bring to bear on the backward capitalist societies. No more, no less'.

Introduction

In the historical process, the governance of a people was prior to the emergence of the state and the military. The first form of human society was the primitive communal system in little or no division of labour prevailed which was highly egalitarian because all things were owned in common. This was a society of the primeval order which was not only egalitarian but ownership of property was common arterially or collectively owned. Since collective ownership of property was the other of the day, the administrative process or governance was not only egalitarian but democratic and equally communistic because private property, the basis of classes and class power did not exist (Engels 1977). Karl Marx, the philosophical pair of Frederick Engels called the administrations of these primitive societies, primitive democracies or primitive communism. Since everyone in commune owns all the things or wealth of society in common, there were no rivalries and struggles for material wealth or possessions by individuals in the naked greed of later societies with the emergence of class power or state.

Politics was a derivative from policy, the dynamics or the directive principles of state or class power. Politics is a game of power play which cannot be properly understood without a thorough understanding of the science of societal power relations in which the military and indeed defence is strategically located. The confusions of understanding the science of society and its politics or power play is a product of the fetters placed on society by the prevailing ideology of power relations on social scientific knowledge. This is to make the dominated classes, since the emergence of man from the animal kingdom, incapable of deeper scientific comprehension of the prevailing dominant social order since the demise of the primeval order or pre-antiquity.

It is only with a thorough grasp of society and its historical development could one be able to have a clear vision of the historical process in the development of power relations, the historical emergence of the state, the military and indeed defence. It will equally afford us the privilege of knowing society's transformation in the historical process and the development of the different social formations, states and defence.

Prior to the birth of the state and indeed the rudiment of professional military, during the primitive communal order or primitive communism, society was egalitarian without social classes or class divisions in society. As such, there were no irreconcilable antagonistic relations that always inform class societies but only based on antagonistic blood or biological relations principally of inheritance. The relics of those societies still remain with us today of mother rights inheritance. Such are the cases of Ghana's (Kumasi) matrilineal system and the Ejaghan system here in Nigeria's Ikom area, Cross River state. In the case of Ejaghan, on a man's death his children will not inherit his property. Rather his property went to his mother's surviving eldest son or in the alternative to his sister's eldest surviving son (Tangban 2008:22).

Engels (1977) based a whole of one of his seminal works on mother rights and how father rights based on the emergence of private property overthrew mother rights to herald a climb to civilisation and indeed the dynamics of power relations or politics. According to Fredrick Engels, this resulted in the transformation of the gentile constitution based on blood ties of what he called *gentes* from which the word gentile is coined. This was based onegalitarianism of a naturally-grown democracy into what became a hateful aristocracy. The naturally-grown democracy of the gentile constitution had grown out of society that knew no internal contradictions, and was adapted only for such a society. It had no coercive power except public opinion. However, a society had come into being by force of all its economic conditions of existence, had to split up into free men and slaves. into exploited poor and exploiting rich, a society that was not only incapable of reconciling these antagonisms but had to drive them more and more to a head (Engels 1977:165). In trying to reconcile antagonistic contradictions which met with failures the need for a professional military, from the ashes of *the strategy of the armed people* cannot be over emphasised.

The point of disagreement between Fredrick Engels and Chiekh Anta Diop, an Africa of Senegal is that matriarchy was not universal but of Southern Cradle while patriarchy was of Northern Cradle. According to Sheikh Anta Diop, "It is unlikely that such geographically different cradles as the Eurasian Steppes-favourable to nomadic life-and the Southern regions of the globe and in particular Africa-favourable to agriculture and sedentary way of life-could have produced the same type of social organisation. This criticism gains importance if the influence of environment on social and political forms is admitted. In supposing that matriarchy organized in the South and patriarchy in the North, that the former preceded the later in the Mediterranean basin and in Western Asia both systems were super imposed on each other in certain regions, the hypothesis of a universal transition from one to the other ceases to be necessary..."(Diop 1988:21-2). According to Chiekh Anta Diop, the zone between the *Northern Cradle and the Southern Cradle* is the zone of *Confluence* of the Mediterranean region is of cultural interpenetration between the Eurasia nomadic people and the agricultural sedentary people of the South in Africa (Diop 1989:47-102).

The intellectual dispute between Fredrick Engels and Chiekh Anta Diop is the idea of the universalisation of matriarchy in historical origin and its succession by patriarchy. They did not dispute the historical emergence of the military which according to Engels was a product of material development arising from the collapse of the primitive communal system (Engels 1977). Fredrick Engels said that the collapse of the primeval order was a product of economic division of labour resulting in the accumulation of wealth in a group that was quite few but very powerful because of its economic might which brought about irreconcilable antagonistic relations and there arose a need to hold these antagonisms in check or just to alleviate it. This gave birth to security apparatus of the strong to hold the weak in-check and hence the emergence of the state or class power in history. And this state cannot exist without a monopoly of force or the institution of coercion which is the inner kernel of the state.

The reconciliations of these antagonisms or antagonistic relations since the emergence of class power have been the basis of politics or the game of power play from antiquity to date. The role of the military or defence can only be properly understood within the materialist analysis based on historical materialism and indeed the dialectical process. How do we see the military and indeed defence historically and what has been its place in historical power play in antiquity and post-antiquity struggles or politics? In the historical emergence of the state, what role did the change concept of defence and strategic thoughts from the primeval *armed people* or collective defence in the post antiquity epoches from slavery to the current dominant capitalist states?

How this role did negates the egalitarian order of the primitive communism of the gentile system and enthroned a hateful aristocracy? And how has this been maintained throughout the post pristine history? Unraveling the inner kernel of the theory of the state with the materialist weapon will give us the clue to “defence and wider government policy”.

The Power of Theory

Theory has power if only such a theory is not mutilated by the ruling global ideas, as such distorting the views it wants to put across. It was Thomas Hobbes who said in his *Leviathan* that there was a state of nature in which life was very hostile because there were no industry, no arts, “...no society (no community-my emphasis); and which is worst of all, initial fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short” (cited in Nisbet 1983:27). According to Thomas Hobbes, it was for this reason of endemic and internecine conflict or turmoil which made men to surrender their individual authority to a central sovereign which became a monopoly of force or the state in his time based on the absolute monarchy. However, the voodoo theorising made Thomas Hobbes to go into and saw the state of nature that existed 30 million year ago in his 18th century in which he lived.

This voodoo mechanics of the orisingis not only restricted to philosophers of capital or liberalism which has been taken away by Marxist literature. The Marxist theory of the state provides us with the tools and sources of those monopolies of forces. Marxist postulated that this monopoly of force is the product of the irreconcilable class antagonisms in post-pristine society. This monopoly of force or what Thomas Hobbes calls the *Great Leviathan* which he likens to a *Great Whale* or the *Great Crocodile* has its inner strength or vitality in the military which Frederick Engels identified in his seminal work, *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. Other social thinkers, the compares of Thomas Hobbes, like John Hocke, Jean-jarques Rousseau amongst others posit the monopoly of force or *social contract* as the quintessence of the state (Frolov 1984:385).

The classical theorists of the state during antiquity saw the state as a teleological growth from the individual, the family, the community to the state. They did not see the state as monopoly of force neither did their compares of the Middle Ages who postulated the *divine origin of the state*. However, the Greek philosophers of classical antiquity had opened up like the Marxist thinkers, as they saw the *Guardian* as the protector of the state. The Guardians were the soldiers in the Greek city states and in the case of the Athenian city state they were the forces behind the 90,000 free citizens superintending over 400,000 slaves (Engels 1977). The Guardian (or soldier-my emphasis) was seen by the Greek philosophers as quitecentral to the sustenance of the state (Plato 1979) which was somehow wrapped up in the *voodoo shroud* of the monopoly of force of the central sovereign by their later liberal incarnates of the 16th, 17th, 18th and 19th centuries. This voodoo mechanics of theorising is an ideological coloration to prove the neutrality of the state and indeed the infrastructures of defence, the inner kernel of each class infested social formations.

In no epoch was this shroud so obvious than in the middle Ages in the theorising the origin of the state as of divine injunction. This was spearheaded by Saint Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, Roman Catholic clerics of the middle Ages. According to Nisbet (1983:97), “Society was conceived by the medieval philosophers as a great chain of being ranging from the smallest organism at the bottom all the way to God at the top, and each link, however humble, was deemed vital in the divine chain.” This *divine origin of the state* covered in the shroud of “God” at the top was broken by another shroud of the *social contract* whose “God” is now the sovereign who derive its monopoly of force from the subjects. The subjects are said to have surrendered their individual sovereignty to a central sovereign who became a monopoly of force or the *Great Leviathan*. This was according to Hobbes, for the individuals in the state of nature to escape its brutalities. We should thank goodness that at least the chips were getting down to philosophers of the liberal capitalism as they have striped the “God” of voodoo naked as they were making us to know that, that god was in men and abstract somewhere in the sovereign.

Lenin (1985:76-7) said, to this day the question of the state has often been confused with religious questions, building a doctrine very often complex one with ideological, philosophical approach and argumentations. It claims that the state is something divine, something supernatural, that it is a certain force by vatu’s of which mankind lives. It is seen as a force of divine origin which confers on people, or can confer on people, or which brings with it something that is not of man but is given to him from without or above. Lenin (1985:77) stressed that:

The most reliable thing in question of social science and one thing that is most necessary in order really to acquire the habit of approaching this question correctly and not allowing oneself to get lost in the mass of detail or in the immense variety of conflicting opinions-the most important thing if one is to approach this question scientifically, is not to forget the underlying historical question, but to examine every question from the standpoint of how the given phenomenon arose in history and what were the principal stages in its development, to examine what it has become today.

The more the contradictions of how the society of private property bites harder and in order to retain the hegemony of class rule of the minority dominant classes over the majority dominated classes, the more the voodoo in theory or philosophy. In the slave states, the philosopher king was the only one that is said to have seen the end of light in the tunnel and therefore it is only him alone that can rule as he has been properly polished. The soldier Guardians were the silver which according to the Greek philosophers can be polished to become gold hence Aristotle spent his life time to polish Alexander the Great of Macedonia to become the gold from the silver Guardian. Who says that wonders will ever seize? As the fathers of Greek philosophy realized a self-fulfilling prophecy, why not? If not the soldier with the force of arms could take over the reins of the state and the philosopher with the gold rendered powerless in the affairs of the polity. However, the conquered slaves, the brutalised and subjugated slaves, who were the bronze “cannot” be polished to become “gold” but must remain in their stead to toil for the rest of the free society. This Greek philosopher’s say is “justice”. In the feudal epoch, the feudal lord or king was said to be the representative of the divine, so he must rule. Nevertheless, the place of the soldier (Guardian according to the Greek-my emphasis) was equally guaranteed as land was the means of accumulation. This gave birth to land warfare theories which were the basis of what we refer to later as *predatory accumulation*. Now in the modern liberal capitalist state, it is the central sovereign who got his authority from the mass of the people because they want to escape the brutality of the state of nature and its internecine conflicts. As such they are said to have surrendered their individual sovereignty to a central sovereign that became a monopoly of force or *the social contract*. What all these philosophers or theorist were trying to cover was nothing but the class characters and class oppressions of those states.

The fact that humanity has been petrified in stupefaction in the name of philosophy, theory and scholarship is quite terrifying. We thank goodness; however, that from time to time in the historical process hyperbolas occur to jolt us from the historical petrifications that we have found ourselves. In this respect, therefore, the correct approach to the question of the state, to remove us from the mess we have found ourselves was postulated by Frederick Engels in his seminal work, *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. According to Lenin (1985:78) “It begins with the historical sketch of the origin of the state... it should first of all be noted that the state has not always existed. There was a time when there was no state. It appears wherever and whenever a division of society into classes appears”. According to Engels (1977:170):

The state, then, had not existed from all eternity. There have been societies that did without it, that had no idea of the state and state power. At a certain stage of economic development, which was necessarily bound up which split of society into classes, the state became a necessity owing to this split.

Thus Engels (1977:166) concludes that:

The state is by no means a power forced on society from without. Rather it is a product of society at a certain stage of development. It is the admission that this society has become entangled in insoluble contradictions with itself, that it has split into irreconcilable antagonisms which it is powerless to dispel. But in order that this antagonisms, classes with conflicting economic interest, might not consume themselves and society in fruitless struggle, it becomes necessary to have power seemingly standing above society that would alleviate the conflict and keep it within the bounds of “order”, and this power arisen out of society, but placing itself above it, and alienating itself more and more from it, is the state.

The state has always been a certain apparatus which stood always outside society and consisted of a group of people engaged solely, or almost solely, or mainly in ruling. People are divided into the ruled and into specialists in ruling; those who rose above society are called rulers, statesmen. This apparatus, this group of people who rule others, always possess certain means of coercion of physical force. This is irrespective of whether this violence over people is expressed in the epoch of slavery, or in the fire-arms which appeared in the Middle Ages or, finally modern weapons, which in the twentieth century are the technical marvels and are based entirely on the latest achievements of modern technology (Lenin, 1985:82).

This institution of physical force or so-called *social contract* is quite impossible without an apparatus which compels the slaves to remain in slavery, which kept one part of society subjected to and oppressed by the other. It is quite impossible to compel the greater part of the society to work systematically for other part of society without a permanent apparatus of coercion (Lenin 1985:83), which Thomas Hobbes calls *the Great Leviathan*.

The state's main features are: first, the division of subjects according to territory which is a common feature of all states. The second distinguishing feature is the establishment of public power which no longer directly coincides with the population organising itself as an armed force. This special public power became very necessary because a self-acting armed organisation of the population has become impossible since the split of society into irreconcilable class antagonistic relations. In Athens, the free citizens were 90,000 as against 365,000 slaves. As such, the people's army of Athenian democracy was an aristocratic public power against the slaves. The public power exist in every state which consists not merely of armed men but also of gendarmerie (police-my emphasis) and other material adjuncts, prisons and institutions of coercion of all kinds, of which gentile society knew nothing (Engels, 1977:167). The overthrow of the gentile order and its *security strategy of the armed people* gave birth from its ruins or ashes to the historical emergence of class power, the professional military and indeed the state.

The Military in Pre-Capitalist Class Societies

We now return to the centralised sovereignty or the monopoly of force. In the words of Lenin (1985:83-4) force is impossible without a permanent apparatus to compel the servile part of society to acquiescence. As there was no antagonistic class divisions in primeval society prior to slavery, there were no apparatus of this nature. However, when classes appeared, irreconcilable antagonisms appeared, everywhere and always. In antiquity as this division grew and took firmer hold, there also appeared a special institution-the state. The forms of state varied and were diverse even in ancient Greece and Rome that were then the most advance in culture and civilisation based entirely on slavery. According to Lenin, (1985:84):

At that time there was already a difference between monarchy and republic, between aristocracy and democracy. A monarchy is the power of a single person, a republic is the absence of any non-elected authority; and aristocracy is the power of small minority, a democracy is the power of people (democracy in Greece literally means the power of the people). All these differences arose in the epoch of slavery-despite these differences; the state in slave-owning epoch was a slave-owning state, irrespective of whether it was a monarchy or a republic, aristocratic or democratic.

The foregoing varieties of the state forms were the monopoly of the various forces or *social contracts*. The centralisation of power or authority is fundamental to all states which liberal scholars say is the key to understanding the state and politics. In Frederick Engel's definition of the state, he posited that the state was not forced on society from above but a product of insoluble and indeed irreconcilable contradictions as society split into irreconcilable antagonisms of conflicting economic interest. It was these crises of interest between the dominant and the dominated classes that forced the dominant classes to impose their authority over their various societies which were the states or social formations or the superstructures. In this respect, therefore, the "monopoly of force" which liberal scholars say is *Social Contract of the Great Leviathan* is nothing but the power of the dominant economic classes to rule the dominated classes.

However, we have been informed that there are in the foregoing various forms of such organisations of state power in antiquity and in the Middle Ages in Europe which were thoroughly studied by progressive historians, social scientists and indeed philosophers (Engels 1977).

Engels (1977:168) noted that, "...because the state arose from the need to hold class antagonism in check, but because it arose at the same time in the midst of the conflict of these classes, it is as a rule, the state of the most powerful, economically dominant class which through the medium of the state becomes also the politically dominant class and thus acquires means of holding down and exploiting the oppressed classes." This instrument of holding down the vast majority of the society to the whims and caprices of the dominant class or political force as we have seen is the state. However, the state or social formation has never been neutral because it is based on material property relations. From the primitive communal system or primitive communism, the relation of production was based on collective ownership of the means of production. In the slave system after the overthrow of the egalitarianism of the gentile order, the relations of production became antagonistic because of slavery or ownership of slaves.

In the feudal epoch, the ownership and control of land by the aristocracy became the order of the day with the serfs as the oppressed classes. This resulted in land warfare strategies in military strategic calculations. The transformation of the primitive communal system from a naturally-grown democracy to hateful aristocracy was a product of the division of labour that breached the gentile constitution prior to the emergence of civilisation. The gentile constitution of primeval society was based on the relations of production of subsistent economy. Equally, their security strategy was based on the *strategy of the armed people*. However, with the emergence of class power or the state, this *strategy of armed people* or the population organising itself as an armed force became increasingly impossible. In its place the nascent professional military arose that became the inner dynamics of class power or the state. Thus the collapse of the gentile constitution based on egalitarianism led to the collapse of its democratic defence or the *strategy of the armed people*. Engels (1977:160-1) said that under maturing gentile constitution:

The popular assembly was instituted wherever it did not exist. The military commander, the council and the popular assembly formed the organs of military democracy into which the gentile society have developed. A military democracy because war and organisation for war, was now regular functions of the life of the people. The wealth of their neighbours excited the greed of the people who began to regard acquisition of wealth as one of their main purposes in life. They were barbarians: plunder appeared to them easier even more honorably than productive work. War, once waged simply to avenge aggression or as means of enlarging territory that had become inadequate, was now waged for the sake of plunder alone, and became a regular profession.

With the emergence and increasing institution of public power, the robber wars for slaves and material riches increased the power of supreme commanders as well as sub-commanders. The customary election of successors from one family, especially after the appearance of the father right, was gradually transformed into hereditary succession, first tolerated, then claimed and finally usurped. Thus the foundation for hereditary royalty and hereditary nobility was laid. In this respect, the organs of the gentile constitution were gradually torn from its democratic root in the people, in gens, phratry and tribe, and the whole gentile order was transformed into its opposite. It was turn from the organisation of tribes for the free administration of their own affairs; it became an organisation for plundering and oppressing their neighbours. Correspondingly, its organs were transformed from instruments of the will of the people into the independent organs of public power for ruling and oppressing their own people (Engels, 1977:161). This was the historical origin of the military profession and indeed institution of public power as organs standing above society-the state or the superstructure.

The state apparatus has been a dominant instrument that forces the obedience to one class of the order subordinated classes. It has been through history the state of property owners against the propertiless classes. This was the historical origin of the property franchise. We have noted earlier that there are various forms of the state machine. The various forms of government in the various historical epochs vary extremely, for their essence was always the same. The slaves enjoyed no rights in the slave state and constituted an oppressed class, they were not regarded as human beings. It was the same thing in the feudal state. This is of immense importance. The peasant-serf was tied to the soil as such the essence of class society remained-society was based on class exploitation. Only the owners of the land could enjoy full rights; the peasant-serf had no rights at all. In practice their condition differed very little from the condition of slaves in the slave-owning states of antiquity (Lenin 1985;85).

The monopoly of force was not only a product of the liberal state of the post-Middle Ages epoch of capitalism. It has been a basic necessity for all states throughout history since the collapse of the primeval order or the primitive communal system of barbarism or pre-civilisation. It has been a product of the emergence of the state and since the overthrow of mother rights by father rights. Also it has been a product of material advancement and the enthronement of property rule and indeed the rule of wealth. The rule of property owners would not have been possible without the dissolution of the gentile constitution and its *security strategy of the armed people*. We have noted that the second distinguishing feature of the state is the establishment of the institution of *public power* which no longer directly coincides with the population organising itself as an armed force. This special public power became necessary because a self acting armed organisation of the population had become impossible since the split of society into classes (Engels 1977:167).

Lenin (1985:86)said, “Neither under slavery nor under feudal system could a small people dominate over the vast majority without coercion. History is full of constant attempts of the oppressed classes to throw off oppression”. The emergence of the state and its rule of politics based on “power, rule and authority” could not have been possible without a coercive force.

Somewhere politics is defined as the “power of A to make B do what the latter would not ordinarily have done.” This compelling power has three sources (i) the military with other security agencies; (ii) the control of economy such as craft, handicraft, industries or the means of production or property relations, and (iii) the ideological and the philosophical through which the ruling circle confuses the ruled masses to stupor. Of all the three, the military with other security agencies stand out as the guardian of the state in whatever form.

The Military in Capitalist Class Societies

The state as we have seen in liberalism was prior to the politics of that social formation which was based on material property relations hence property franchise. As Plato and Aristotle saw the guardian or military as the quintessence of the Greek city states, it was the same thing through the middle Ages and indeed the emergent nascent liberal state and even at its maturity today. Cilliers (1996:86) noted thus:

In Western Europe and the United States, unlike Africa, military institutions were of central importance in fashioning the type of nation-state that emerged. Starting with the American and French revolutions, military service came to be seen as an integral part of republican citizenship. In the nation-states of the West, widespread (albeit not universal) reliance on compulsory national military service played a role in shaping the predominant conception of citizenship, as did such well known social processes of industrialisation, urbanisation and modernisation generally.

Jonawitz (1975:71-6,83) observed that, “modern military institutions and modern parliamentary institutions arose simultaneously in the industrialized West. Military service (or atleast eligibility for such service if needed) became a hallmark of citizenship, and citizenship became a hallmark of democracy. Moreover, the citizen army backed by civilian reservists served not only as shield against foreign enemies and an instrument of national will, but also as a means for keeping the professional military class under political control.” Earlier on however in Europe, the military elite transferred its allegiance from monarchy to the emergent liberal regimes in the nineteenth century. The foregoing was not the same thing in some other nation-states of later industrialisation such as Japan and Russia, not to talk of the developing countries. These states bear little resemblance to what happened in the earlier states of industrialization (Cilliers 1996:86) where their militaries shifted allegiance to the emergent liberal states and thus subjected themselves under their political control.

From antiquity or slave-owning states to the feudal states of the middle Ages, the division of labour had not advanced to allow the head of administration to leave the military profession to the specialist of the profession of the arms. It was in the late 19th century, with the exception of the United States that had it earlier, that head of governments found it comfortable to be contented with only ceremonial commander-in-chief’s and as such the physical command of the military was left in the hands of the professionals. Even with the foregoing changes, most head of governments were ex-service military generals including the United States. In the process, the civilian control of the military became entrenched, especially, with the transfer of allegiance by the military from the absolute monarchy to their political masters, of the emergent limited property franchised democracies. This was done in the liberal states of property franchise prior to adult universal suffrage. Thus the military in the advanced democratising societies became the guardian of property franchise, adult male franchise and later the enthronement of universal adult suffrage of liberal democracy.

For almost half a century, from 1644 to 1688 the English Civil War raged between the dying feudal society and the emergent nascent capitalist society yearning to be born in the womb of feudalism. There was a great deal of agreement among the men who were to fight on opposing sides of the English Civil War of 1640s that the old regime (the ancien regime-my emphasis) must be dismantled. So there were continuous pressures to carry the revolution further, to consolidate what had already been attained. The battle for the soul of England was between the royalists, a combination of the feudal aristocracy and the landed gentry on the side of King Charles on the one hand and parliamentarians (emerging capitalists– my emphasis) under Oliver Cromwell on the other (Hill 1983:53,64-5). This was a war between the emerging dominant capitalist class and the old feudal order about to be displaced. The emerging class won the civil war and hence it was of a transformative value from the old relations of production of feudalism to a new one of capitalism or liberalism. It would have been suicidal for the military to owe allegiance to the old order. The same thing happened in France from 1789 to 1871.

We are having litanies of civil-military relations from the West because of the warped nature of the military and society in the backward societies. In the advanced capitalist societies, their armed forces developed endogenously. The contrary is the case for the armed forces of the Third World.

In Africa as in other Third World countries, armed forces have modernised exogenously, if at all, usually by importing, Western or Soviet technology and copying Western or Soviet doctrines and practices. Indeed, it is questionable whether most of the countries in Africa have *even* developed professional military forces in anything in the historical approach to African military like in the Western or even Soviet sense (Cilliers 1996:86). The Western and Soviet military sprang up from the dialectics of their material historical situations hence they are attached inextricably to those values of liberalism or otherwise, in all its facets of either capitalistic or social democratic. From the fourteenth century, gun powder came from the Arabs to Western Europe, and as every school child knows, according to Frederick Engels, it completely revolutionised the method of warfare. The introduction of gun powder and fire-arms, however, was not an act of force, but a step forward in industry, that is an economic advance (Engels 1978:205).

Engels (1978:205-6) further stressed, "Industry remains industry, whether it is applied to the production or destruction of things. And the introduction of fire arms had a revolutionising effect not only on the conduct of the war itself, but also on the political relationships of domination and subjection. The procurement of gun powder and fire-arms required industry and money, and both of these were in the hands of the burghers of the towns. From the onset, therefore, fire-arms were the weapons of the towns, and of the risen town-supported monarchy against the feudal nobility. The stone walls of the noblemen's castle, hitherto unapproachable, fell before the cannons of the burghers, and the bullets of the burghers' arquebuses pierced the armour of the knights. With the defeat of the nobility's armour-clad calvary, the nobility's supremacy was broken; with the development of the bourgeoisie, infantry and artillery became more and more the decisive type of arms; compelled by the development of artillery, the military profession had to add to its organisation industrial subsection, engineering. Frederick Engels has in the foregoing demonstrated the congruence between economic production and power. The burghers also known as burghers were the freemen or citizens of the borough. They were men of liberty who sought to put into the dustbin of history the dying feudalism and to put in its place liberalism, beginning with economic liberalism and later added to it political liberalism, or democracy. The pressures of the popular masses, the burghers that defeated the nobility were transformed into liberal democracy. In the words of Macpherson (1973:11) "...the extensive provision of social services would have come anyway, apart from the democratic franchise. It would have come from the sheer need of government to allay working class discontents that were dangerous to the stability of the state. What the addition of democracy to the liberal state did was simply to provide constitutional channels for popular pressures, pressures to which the governments would have had to yield in about the same measure anyway, merely to maintain public order and avoid revolution."

C.B. Macpherson exposed the whole truth of why democracy became the choice of both the burghers and the military. The militaries of Europe in about a century of revolutionary ferments, from which they had badly burnt their fingers, had no choice but to transfer their allegiance to the emergent liberal bourgeois states. In a situation where industry conditioned the military, they had no choice since the liberal economy determines levels of military strategy and liberal democracy. It has been the rule of the highest form of private property, a relation of production that conditions other relations in society, hence the subjection of the militaries of the advanced democracies to democratic values. They had no option but must become willing servants of the democratic process. However, the contrary are the cases of the Third World countries and hence the litany of tutoring of the civil-military relations' sermons from the Western World. This tutoring by the West is coming to an end in Asia and Latin America where they have started to domesticate the state through the congruence between the economy and society (substructure), the military and the state (superstructure). It is only when this congruence between a productive economy backed by science and technology is enthroned in Africa that we will end this litany of tutoring of civil-military relations.

Defence and the Dialectics of State Power

We have quoted Frederick Engels and also Vladimir I. Lenin's positions that the monopoly of the force which Thomas Hobbes talked about was nothing but the coercive class power of the dominant classes. As we have noted earlier, the state apparatus has been a dominant instrument that forces the obedience to one class of the other subordinated classes. Hence, the slave states were the organs of the slave masters in suppressing the slaves, also the feudal states were equally the organs of the feudal lords to suppress the serfs and the capitalist state being organs of the capitalists in suppressing the proletariat or the working class (Engels, 1977; Lenin, 1985; Marx and Engels 1977).

For Marxists, the dynamics of class power is always expressed in the state and the state is nothing but a historical material expression of class power or its coercive force-the military. Marx and Engels (1977) expressed their famous view that the capitalist state is nothing but the “Executive Committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie and its political power being merely the organised power of one class for oppressing another.” This is the Marxian primary view of the state. Hence Engels (1983:169)said: In most of the historical states, the rights of citizens are beside, apportioned according to their wealth, thus directly expressing the fact that the state is an organisation of the possessing class for its protection against the non-possessing class.

In all pre-capitalist states there have been situations of what SP. Reyna and R.E Downs called predatory accumulation. In other words, the military was the backbone for the advancement of state building and the material wealth acquisition by the dominant classes. In a footnote Reyna and Downs (2005:59) says that “Readers might note that force and power are defined as follows. “Force” is that which makes power, “Power” is the ability to make things occur. This ability results from force, the combination of resources whose utilisation generates power. So understood, there are many types of forces. Violent and capital forces are important... the key resources in “violent force” is the means of destruction. The resource in “capital force” is money. The combination or lack of combination of these two forces makes the difference between the pre-capitalist states and capitalist state forms. It equally makes the difference between the first or trail blazing states of Atlantic Europe and the late comer-England in the organisation of “defence and wider government policy.”

From all historical states, defence was the predatory force that was used by the administrators of the state that is governments, to garner material wealth through predatory accumulation from Medieval or the Middle Ages to the emergence of capitalism. However, their very penetrating theorising can be extended to cover the states of antiquity or the classical slave states. Nevertheless, the second part of their logic which is capital accumulation making up the military-capitalist complex and its co-ordinate management differentiates the modern state (capitalist state) from earlier forms of states in the historical process. Reyna and Downs (2005:22) defines “complexes” as groups of institutions in which force is concentrated. He also stressed that, “there have been logics of “capital accumulation” that move in the direction of increasing and concentrating capital force in capitalist complexes. There have also been logics of “predatory accumulation” that move in the direction of increasing and concentrating violent force within government complexes. However, the congruence between the two forces was absent in all pre-capitalist social formations or states, the institutions of class power.

The coordinate efficient management of violent force and capital force results in the military-capitalist complex, the structural dynamics that bulked up stately whales into Hobbes “Great Leviathan, a creature with the force of a “mortal God which turned out by 1763 to be England (Reyna& Downs 2005:23). The first comers in the coordinate management of the violent force and capital force to create the military-capitalist complex, was inchoate in application. Prior to the collapse of the feudalism and indeed from the slavery states of antiquity, violent force or predatory accumulation was the inner dynamics of the state and governance. In the slave states, it was the slaves as means of production that must be captured and owned through military power or violent force. After the capture of slaves they must be kept within the bounds of “order” which was the duty of the security outfits or defence. It would not have been possible if not for the military or the guardians for 90.000 free Athenians to hold the 360,000 slaves in-check without the guardians. It follows therefore that in the classical states of slavery the wider policy of defense and governance was to capture slaves and also to keep them in-check within the bounds of “order”

In the feudal age or epoch that is the Middle Ages or the medieval time, land control or ownership was the means of production as the expansions and control of more lands and the serfs that were tied to the land give the lord a better stead. In this respect therefore predatory accumulation took the form of land conquest and expansion for more tributes to enhance the fiscal regime of the feudal lords. This gave rise to land warfare strategies. The relations of production determined, therefore, military standing in the affairs of the slave state and government. The military became as in the slave state the central quintessential force in the state (Tedheke 2013: 50).The fact that the military was central in the dynamics of state power did not bring out in relief the congruence between violent force and capital force. This was to occur at the end of the middle Ages with the birth of capital. The fiscal regime of feudalism did not allow for the development of capital force in the feudal age as war was good for business but business was not good for war (Reyna& Downs, 2005).

The fact remained that the regimes of Atlantic Europe who wanted to institute a new order such as Spain, Portugal and France did not go far enough to centralised finances to finance wars. However, such regimes were different slightly from Medieval Europe because there was some degree of the application of violent force and capital force in Spain, Portugal and France. The weakness in the loose congruence between violent force and capital force was applied in breakaway Netherlands to bring out the beginning of the emergence of the Leviathan in Atlantic Europe. However, the lack of full centralisation of revenues equally led to the weakening of the emergent Great Leviathan in the Netherlands. It was in England that the behemoth was created that Thomas Hobbes described as *the Great Leviathan*.

The emergence of the Great Leviathan has been a product of *gun boat diplomacy* that turns others in Africa, Asia and Latin America, Caribbean and Oceania into killing fields of capital through predatory accumulation. It resulted in the genocidal extermination of the American Indians, and the Australian Aborigines. It turned Atlantic Europe to killing machines. This killing machine brutalised Africans in chattel slavery where according to Martin (2005) five hundred million Africans were taken into slavery. And out of every five persons taken, only one survived resulting in the loss of four hundred million Africans. *The realist theory* therefore rose out of these human brutalities by Atlantic Europe in *the Great Leviathan's* birth. One is not surprised about the theories that emanated from these brutalities or what the realists call *struggle for power* as the basis of international politics. This sad age of Euro-American civilisation, its darkest age of brutalities without which the Atlantic powers would not have risen is presented as a glowing past of Euro-American civilisation. These brutalities were products of violent force (military) and capital force (capitalism) as congruence between predatory accumulation and capital accumulation still lingering till date. In all these, the military or defence is central which has been till date the vocation of advanced military in Third World countries, the extension of gun boat diplomacy in the twenty first century. However, the Third World military cannot be a part of inflicting on itself this dastardly defence and wider government policy that gave birth to the emergence of the criminal Atlantic states. Instead of the conquest of people or others and brutalising them like Atlantic Europe and indeed Atlantic America and Pacific Asia, what Africa military need to do is to conquer their brains to become a vibrant military force, to advance science and technology. This is the only option available to the Nigerian and indeed African military. So far India, China, South Korea, Taiwan, Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, Brazil, South Africa amongst others is on the right track. Nigeria and indeed the rest of Africa cannot be the exceptions

Conclusion

The military has been a part of the superstructure or the state since the collapse of pristine order or the primitive communal system. Since then, the military has been defending the state or a particular social formation, its political forms and indeed the forms of production. The military in history is not seen as defending individual regime but rather they defend social formations and their political forms. According to Lenin (1976:17-18) “the reason why the omnipotence of wealth is *more sure* in democratic republic is that it does not depend on the bad political shell of capitalism. A democratic republic is the best possible political shell for capitalism, and, therefore, once capital has grasped this very best shell...it establishes its power so securely, so surely, that no change, either of persons, of institutions, or of parties in the bourgeois democratic republic can shake this power.” This power had its historical based in *the Great Leviathan* or the killer machine of Atlantic Europe, which robbed off on North America, Japan and Australia.

According to Macpherson (1993) the “...liberal democratic system is found only in countries where the economic system is wholly or predominantly that of the capitalist enterprise. It will be surprising if this close correspondence between liberal democracy and capitalism is merely co-incidental.” Therefore, the co-incidence between violent force and capital force in creating modern European states and by extension states of North America, Japan and Australia which were based on killing machines visited on the Third World states as the criminal duty of defence and wider government policy is always papered over by the philosophers of capital who dramatise these criminal occurrences in history. This voodoo philosophising has made it impossible for us to understand the two logics of defence through predatory accumulation and capital accumulation as wider government policy. In the present age of backward capital, the Third World cannot apply the same logic of Atlantic Europe in their capital accumulation. We have to device a better understanding and better approach based on rapid acquisition of science and technology for a second independence or self reliance anchored on transformational military, not that of criminal Atlantic Euro-America. This must become the inner kernel or wider government policy.

The Third World military must not remain the cock and shoot military which has been bequeathed to us by the colonial masters to weaken our resolve to stand as nations but we must gain our second independence by projecting modern military based on science and technology. The current Boko Haram insurgency and in Niger Delta militancy have exposed our military as a military not grounded in the science and dynamics of the material conditions of a modern military. We have no option in Third World and indeed in Nigeria but to modernise our military, not based on the flawed doctrine of transfer of technology based on flawed patent rights but on the dynamics of development based on *the principle of emulation* (Chang 2008 & Reinert 2008) which informed all Atlantic Euro-America. After they had climbed the ladder, the Atlantic powers removed the ladder of development theories and put in its place the mutating theory of *comparative advantage* which has kept the Third World technologically backward hence, nursing a technologically backward military. This is our bane which must be overcome!

Bibliography

- Ayoade, (1975) Lecture notes. Extra Mural Classes, University of Jos.
- Chang, H. *Bad Samaritans: The Myth of Free Trade and the Secret History of Capitalist* (New York: Bloomberg Press 2008).
- Cilliers, J. (1996) "Security and Transition in South Africa" Diamond, L. and Plattner, M.F. ed. *Civil –Military Relations and Democracy* (London: The John Hopkins University Press).
- Diop, C.A *The Cultural Unity of Black Africa: The Domains of Matriarchy & Patriarchy in Classical Antiquity* (London: Karnak House 1989).
- Engles, F. (1977) *Origin of the Family, Private property and The State* (Moscow: Progress Publishers).
- Engles, F.(1978) *Anti-Duhring* (Moscow: Progress Publishers).
- Frolov, I. *Dictionary of Philosophy* (Moscow: Progress Publishers 1984).
- Hill, C. (1983) *God's Own Englishman: Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (Harmonds worth Middlesex, England, Penguin Books).
- Janowitz, M. "Military Institutions and Citizenship in Western Societies" in *Armed Forces & Society*, Jan. 1976
- Lenin, V.I. "The State" in Borisov, E.F. and Libman, G.I. (1985) eds. *Reader on Social Science: ABC of Social and Political Knowledge*. (Moscow: Progress Publishers).
- Lenin, V.I. (1976), *The State and the Revolution* (Peking: Foreign Languages Press).
- Macpherson, C.B. (1973), *The Real World of Democracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Marx, K.(1978), *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (Peking: Foreign Languages Press).
- Nisbet, R.(1983), *The Social Philosophers –Community and Conflict in Western Thought* (New York: Washington Square Press Publication).
- Plato (1979) *The Republic of Plato* Translated by Cornforth, F.M (Oxford University Press).
- Reinert, E.S *How Rich Countries Got Rich and Why Poor Countries Stay Poor* (New York: Public Affairs 2008).
- Reyna, S. P and Downs, R.E eds *Deadly Developments, Capitalism, States and War-and Society* vol. 5 (Singapore: Gordon and Breach Publishers 2005).
- Rose, R. Mishler, W. and Haerpfer, C. (1998) *Democracy and Its Alternatives Understanding Post Communist Societies* (Cambridge, UK: Policy Press).
- Stone, L. (1972) *The Causes of the English Revolution 1529 – 1642* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd).
- Tangban, O.E. (2008) *The Ejagham Under Colonial Rule* (Kaduna's Prudent Printing and Publishing).
- Weber, M. (1947) *The Theory of Social and Economic Organisation*, Translated by Henderson, A.M and parsons. T (New York: Oxford University Press).