

The need to consolidate power has opened up for the struggle for power at all levels within society even outside elections. The presence of opposition groups which do not share the same ideology with those in the military has forced at times the military to act as custodians of the society and countries security as noted in Egypt. In developing countries, the lack of democratic means of changing governments has meant that military force has been made an alternative as noted in Gambia. Ideologies such as Marxism are relevant to understand how the military acts as gate keepers to defend the liberation movements in Southern Africa through open political support and ideological requirements for one to hold the highest office in government as noted in Zimbabwe.

Onder (2010) identified five theories of military intervention in politics which are socio-economic development theory, political development theory, the centrality of military theory, the conflict theory and regional differences theory. There is need to understand the different dimension which the military can use to be involved in politics, this can be through military rule usually in the form of a coup, as a military government where the administrative agency is managed by the armed forces and charged with the responsibility of exercising state power on behalf of the whole social classes in a given polity. It is therefore an institution of governance that is derived unconstitutionally, The concept of military intervention appears to be clearer when compared to military rule, military government and military regime. Military intervention in politics, in this context involves the exertion of influence on the political system either through direct or indirect participation in political issues. Moreover it can be seen as the unconstitutional takeover of political power from the civilians by the armed forces by brute force. Armed forces here include the army, the navy, the air force, the secret police and other sabotaging law enforcement agencies (acemoglu et al, 2010). Kunle (1986) posits that while there cannot be military rule without military intervention, there can be military intervention without military rule. This implies that a dissatisfied military might intervene to correct a societal anomie and install a new government not necessarily controlled by them. This is when the military intervenes in politics only to stabilise the political system by returning the rule of law as can be noted by the ouster of Jammeh in Gambia by ECOWAS. Lahm (1993) understands military intervention as the conscious act of displacing and supplanting an existing political order, a government, by soldiers with the objective either of governing or influencing the political affairs of the country

in particular direction determined largely by the interventionists themselves. It is directed at the political system of a state so as to accomplish certain predetermined objectives which may be political, economic, social or even military. Crick (1982) understands politics as an activity by which different interest groups within a political set up are conciliated by giving them a share of power in proportion to their importance within the state. Thus one can understand the definition as social relations involving continuous struggle for power or authority. Politics can be understood as the continuous struggle for power, it can manifest itself through wars and power struggles.

Finer (2008) argues that military intervention in politics can be explained through the personalist model. According to this model the military intervenes in politics for three reasons which are personal power enhancement, poor socio economic and also the personal interest of the military's top office holders. This is mainly common in developing countries where democracy is still at infant stage and also the exchange of power between governments is over shadowed by accusations of vote rigging, political assassinations and vote buying.

The corporatist model helps in also understanding another view on why the military is involved in politics. Welch (1987) is of the view that the military under the corporatist model sees itself as a corporate entity divorced from civilian life and sharing a collective interest, such as the maintenance of high military budget, the protection of military status, the protection of military rules, procedures, and norms. Thus any change to the status core can invite the military into the political system. This is also supported by the manifest destiny model coined by Finner (1988) which sees the military as the savior of the nation. Furthermore under this model the military justifies its intervention on the bases that civilian regimes suffer from mal administration and need hand holding by the military.

According Huntington (2002) the sources of military interventions in politics have not only been interest of the military itself, but it is also the result of weak political institutions and low political culture of the developing countries. The weak leadership and governance in Pakistan has become the major source of military interventions in the politics of Pakistan since its birth. Shuja nawaz is of the view that after the death of Quaid-e-azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah who was

the founder of Pakistan, the state is facing the problem of leadership. Recently general Pervez Musharraf on 12th October, 1999 and overthrows the civilian government of main Muhammadi Nawaz Sharif. In this case the military intervention was justified as the only way to strengthen political institutions as they needed hand holding.

Leite *et al* (2002) argues that a justified reason why the military intervenes in politics is to act in defense of human rights and also the constitution. Thus it intervenes in politics only to stabilise the political system by returning the rule of law as can be noted by the ouster of Jammeh in Gambia by ECOWAS. This can occur especially when there is a power vacuum which can be easily exploited by those sitting in power. This can be noted in Gambia where ECOWAS was forced to intervene in Gambia after Jammeh failed to accept the electoral results after he was defeated by Adam Barrow. In this case one can argue that the military intervened for a just cause to defend the constitution and also to uphold democracy of the people who had voted. One in this case is bound to justify such interventions by the military and support them as means of keeping checks and balances on the political system.

Finer (1988) argues that one of the theories which can help to explain military intervention in politics is through the socio economic development theory. According to this theory, the density of military interventions is more likely to decrease with increased socio-economic development status. This can help to explain why in Nigeria general Babangida removed Buhari from power in 1985 as he accused his administration of failing to revamp the nation economy that had declined during his rule. Babangida also complained of massive fraud in the issuance of import licenses and counter trade agreements. Huntington stressed and justified that the military will intervene when civilian governments lack legitimacy due to inadequate economic performance and an ineffective executive (Huntington 1969).

In line with the argument above, the communist model posits that there is a close relationship between the military and the civilian population. The communist model further on explains that the military engages in politics through the ruling political party and follows the ideology of the party. This is evidenced in Zimbabwe where the military once announced that anyone who wants to succeed the current president must have war credential and must have participated in the

liberation struggle as any other option is tantamount to undermining the gains of the independence. Perlmutter (1982) supports the Marxist approach by noting that the military identifies itself with the values of the ruling party and the military is not free from politics and its political role depends on the ruling political party. One in this case can note that the military is actively participating as gate keepers and also a deterrent force against imperialism. However under Locke, this is tantamount to eroding democracy as the people make a social contract with the state not the military and therefore governance is by cosent. Hence military intervention is not an option under the social contract theory and a threat to democracy.

Huntington (1995) is of the view that the military is most likely to intervene in politics especially in states lacking institutionalized political cultures, which suffer from economic hardship and social divisions. This school of thought has been associated with the environmentalist view that the prevailing state's socio-political and economic environment is responsible for military take over within society. They substantiate their argument by noting the case of Algeria in 1992 where the military intervened because it feared the outcome of multi-party elections where an Islamic movement was poised to win and form the next government. Thus the military conscious of its personal interest opted to abort the democratic process and take over power. The intervention came through when state of emergency was declared, troops were deployed to maintain peace, in this case one can argue that the declaration of a state of emergency and suspension of the constitution is as good as a military intervention in politics. However in developing countries state of emergencies have been used as a smoke to entrench military power and the ruling party in power.

Another reason why the military is involved in politics is when there is a fear and high probability of national disintegration. This view is emphasised by the belief that military intervention in politics is at times a necessary evil because civilian governments are often characterised by corruption and incapable of governing a country and as a result the country is plagued by widespread political, economic and social disorders. Finer (1975) argues that in such a situation military intervention becomes easy in the presence of a corrupt and incapable government governing a country and as a result the country is plagued by widespread political, economic and social disorders. This can be noted in Egypt where the former government of led by

Mohammed Morsi was removed from government just after one year by the former Egyptian military head Sisi after mass demonstrations against poor economic performance, the spread of terrorism in the Sinai peninsula and also the close link between Hamas an alleged terrorist movement and the Muslim brotherhood and the Morsi led government. As a result the military promised stability if the government failed to deal with the problems resulting in a military coup by the military head Sisi. One can note that militaries promise to hand over power but once in control they device ways of staying put in power as general Sisi went on to contest in the presidential election which he easily won. Thus one can argue that the military is at times involved in politics so as to maintain power within their influence and also to maintain the status core.

Involvement in politics by the military is made possible by concept of national security to include insecurities. The military is not only interested in devising military techniques and doctrine for confronting domestic insurgence but they are also interested in political and social reasons for the insurgency. Graeff (2003) argues that this can be noted when civilian dominated governments gain power and are not responsive to security demands. This can be noted in Turkey recently in 2016 when the military took over the country and suspended the constitution and declared a state of emergence accusing the government led by Tayip Erdogan of not tackling security threats from Isil and also supporting terrorist groups fighting Basher Assad in Syria. However the coup was short-lived as the civilians denounced such a threat to democracy and also the support received from the international system. One can note that a threat to internal security can force the military to intervene in the political system as defenders of national security.

The intervention of the military in politics has been supported by Reno (1998) from a conservative approach to politics which assumes the ideal of a “protected democracy,” in which the armed forces have a significant role in the political system. Burma/Myanmar is an example of deeply entrenched military rule. Soon after independence from Britain in 1948 the military became the most powerful institution. The coup by the State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC) re-established direct military rule, which continued for over 21 years until 30 March 2011. This was after the military dismissed the results of the elections in May 1990, which ended

in a landslide victory for the oppositional National League for Democracy (NLD). Huntington (1968) points out that the major driving factor behind the military intervention in politics is ideological difference and also a threat to national interest. The military only handed power after it succeeded in designing a political system that safeguarded its own core interests. Hence the military passed the new constitution which guaranteed 25% reserved seats for the military. One can conclude that the military still remains the arbiter of power in the country, though it has created new political institutions that might develop some autonomy of their own in the future.

In summation it can be argued that there is still a long way before the military is total divorced from politics due to the link between the rulers and the military which they share since the liberation struggle. There is also need for countries in the south to have charismatic leaders capable of initiating development and also balance the demands of the society and upholding national security so as to avoid social disorder. However there is need for the military to withdraw from politics so as to set a good democratic precedence and avoid the situation where coups are perceived as an alternative in the defending of democracy especially within Africa.

REFERENCE

Amuwo, Kunle (1986). *Military-inspired anti-bureaucratic corruption campaigns: an appraisal of Niger's experience*, *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 285-301.

Crick B. (1982). *In Defence Of Politics* (2nd edition). Penguin, Harmonds Worth New York Press.

Finer E (1975), *the man on the horseback: military intervention into politics*, Hammond worth press-penguin: London.

Finer, S. (1988), *The man on the horseback: the role of the military in politics*, 2nd Edition, West view Press: Boulder, CO.

Graeff, P. and Mehlkop, G. (2003). *The impacts of economic freedom on corruption: different patterns for rich and poor countries*. *European Journal of Political Economy*,

Huntington, S. (1968). *The political order in changing societies*, Yale University Press: New Haven, CT.

Lahm (1993). *Tracing Military Coups in Sub Saharan Africa*. University of Abuja Press.

Leite, C. and J. Weidmann (2002). *Does mother nature corrupt? natural resources, corruption and economic growth*. Chapter 7 in Abed, G. and S. Gupta (eds.): *Governance, corruption, and economic performance*. Washington DC: International Monetary Fund.

Perlmutter, Amos (1982). *Civil-military relations in socialist authoritarian and praetorian states: prospects and retrospects*. in Kolkowicz, R. and Korbonsk. London Press.

Rock, T. and Bonnet, H. (2004). *The comparative politics of corruption: accounting for the East Asian paradox in empirical studies of corruption, growth and investment*. World development report.

Welch C (1976), *soldier and state in Africa*, northwestern university press: Evanston.