

**AN ASSESSMENT OF NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY
UNDER GOODLUCK JONATHAN'S ADMINISTRATION**

BY

**SHAIBU HADIZA
11/012991/ASS**

**BEING A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT
OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND STRATEGIC
STUDIES, IGBINEDION UNIVERSITY OKADA**

MAY, 2015

**AN ASSESSMENT OF NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY
UNDER GOODLUCK JONATHAN'S ADMINISTRATION**

BY

**SHAIBU HADIZA
11/012991/ASS**

**BEING A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT
OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND STRATEGIC
STUDIES, IGBINEDION UNIVERSITY OKADA**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE AWARD OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (B. Sc.)
DEGREE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND
STRATEGIC STUDIES**

MAY, 2015

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that **Shaibu Hadiza**, with matriculation number **11/012991/ASS** under my supervision carried out this project research and here approved as a requirement for the award of the Bachelor of Science (B.Sc.) degree in International Relations and Strategic Studies, Igbinedion University Okada.

.....
SHAIBU HADIZA
Student

.....
DATE

.....
DR. FEMI OLUFUMILADE
(PROJECT SUPERVISOR)

.....
DATE

.....
DR. FEMI OLUFUMILADE
HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

.....
DATE

.....
(EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR)

.....
DATE

DEDICATION

This project is dedicated to God Almighty and my lovely Mother and family.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I want to appreciate God for giving me the grace to complete this work successfully and I also want to say a big thank you to my head of department who is also my project supervisor for his unrelenting efforts throughout this research work, Dr. femi Olufunmilade and also I want to say a big thank you to Dr. Roosevelt Idehen, Dr. F.S.O Osaghae, Mr. Emeka Agba for there guidance and support throughout this work, I appreciate you.

My sincere gratitude goes to my Mother Mrs. Maryam Abdullahi for her prayers and monetary support and also your encouragement. God bless you mum.

And to my family for their support during the whole process, my big Mummy Mrs. Aisha Musa, Granma and sisters for their prayers and reassuring words

My friends, friends turned sister for their support in gathering materials in editing Ijeoma, Jemima, Lola, Happiness, Sandra, Moore and other thanks and God bless you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATION	iii
DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT ABSTRACT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background to the Study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the Research Problem	3
1.3 Objectives of the Study	3
1.4 Methodology of the Study	4
1.5 Significance of the Study	4
1.6 Scope of the Study	4
1.7 Limitations of the Study	5
CHAPTER TWO	6
LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	6
2.1 The Concept of Foreign Policy	6
2.2 National Interest.....	9
2.3 Objectives and Principles of Nigeria’s Foreign Policy Since Independence.....	12
2.4 Theoretical Framework.....	35
CHAPTER THREE	38
CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN NIGERIA’S FOREIGN POLICY	38
CHAPTER FOUR.....	49
FORERIGN POLICY UNDER THE JONATHAN ADMINISTRATION	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.1 Foreign Policy Initiatives Of Jonathan	51
4.2 Foreign Policy and the Challenges of Sustaining the Vision.....	61
CHAPTER FIVE	69
CONCLUSION, SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5.1 conclusion	69
5.2 Summary	69
5.3 Recommendations.....	73
References.....	77

ABSTRACT

The research work is an assessment of Nigeria Foreign Policies under Goodluck Jonathan Administration, the foreign policy in Nigeria has undergone certain process and transformation since 1960. The study started with historical evolution of Nigeria's foreign policy since 1960, the scope of this work is to assess Jonathan Administration from 2009-2015, the background of the problem of the study has been challenged with some problem; what are Nigeria's foreign policy? What are the changes to Nigeria foreign policy under Jonathan regime? Who conceives national roles and how are they conceived and assumed? To achieve these study have been able to answer questions; the objective of the study is; to analyze the changes in Nigeria's foreign policy, to examine the merits and demerits of Nigeria foreign policy, to account for the differences in the role of each political regime. The gathering and information of this work is mainly qualitative through the use of secondary data because of the peculiarity of the topic, the secondary data collection consist, books and journals, newspaper, and magazines, the internet materials from the rested sources was carefully persuade, analyzed and critiqued as appropriate. These study is significant because; the world is increasingly interconnected or globalized so foreign affairs has become more important than ever. Good foreign policies can be a leverage for Nigeria. How the rest of the world view a state is very important. This study is largely based on the theory of state relative autonomy theory which is situated within the ambit of neo-Marxist economy paradigm the theory of relative state autonomy depicts the degree of asoofness of the state in the discharge of its tarsus such as mediating interclass and intraclass struggle. The proponent and exponent of the theory holds that a state can exhibit either high or low relative autonomy.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

The Nigerian foreign policy has undergone certain processes and transformations since 1960 despite of its conservative posture. From the outset Nigerian foreign policy under Balewa's Administration (1960-1966) was predicated on certain principles or foreign policy thrusts; such as Africa, the centerpiece of Nigerian foreign policy; nonintervention in the internal affairs of other states; policy of good neighborliness; policy of non-alignment, policy of African decolonization; etc. Until recently, the policy of Africa, the centre-piece of Nigerian foreign policy or the Afro-centric philosophy of Nigeria's foreign policy remained the most enduring principle of Nigerian foreign policy. The African centeredness of Nigerian foreign policy revolves around: firstly, policy of African decolonization and eradication of racial discrimination such as apartheid in South Africa, etc; secondly, policy of pan-Africanism; thirdly, African cooperation, friendship and unity; and finally, technical/financial assistance to the African states (Aniche, 2009).

The African centeredness of Nigerian foreign policy has been vehemently criticized by scholars over the years. By 1985 under Babangida's Regime (1985-1993), Nigeria adopted a new foreign policy posture known as policy of economic diplomacy owing to the economic recession of the early and

mid-1980s. The policy of economic diplomacy then was aimed at achieving economic recovery through implementation of Breton Wood Institutions (BWIs) endorsed Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP). The implementation of Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) was, however, haphazard leading to the demise of economic diplomacy by 1990 as the two international finance institutions (IFIs) disengaged from Nigeria (Aniche, 2009).

Subsequently, the policy of economic diplomacy staged a comeback under Obasanjo's Civilian Administration (1999- 2007) when the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) reengaged Nigeria in 2001. This time around the policy of economic diplomacy was specifically targeted at obtaining debt relief, attracting foreign direct investment (FDI) and soliciting for more loans through implementation of Breton Woods Institutions (BWIs) loan conditionality. Nigeria began to implement the World Bank and International Economic Monetary Fund (IMF) endorsed National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) (Aniche, 2010; Okeke and Aniche, 2012a).

Following the reform of Nigeria's foreign policy under Yar'Adua's Administration in 2007, Nigeria adopted citizenship diplomacy in order to correct the anomalies of Nigerian foreign policy since independence.

Citizenship diplomacy was accelerated in order to boost Nigeria's image abroad battered by the many years of military rule and for achieving Nigerian foreign policy objectives and national interest, which were affected under Afro-centric philosophy of Nigerian foreign policy and economic diplomacy. This study seeks Nigeria Policy under the Jonathan Regime from 2011-2014.

1.2 Statement of the Research Problem

Against the background of the problem, the study has attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What are Nigerian foreign policies?
2. What are the changes to Nigeria foreign policies under Jonathan's Regime?
3. Who conceives national roles and how are they conceived and assumed?
4. Are there differences in the foreign policies of Jonathan and previous administrations?
5. What are the merits and demerits of Nigeria foreign policies?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objective of this research is to examine the foreign policies of President Goodluck Jonathan regime from 2009 – 2014. However the specific objectives are to:

1. Analyse the changes in Nigeria foreign policies

2. Examine the merits and demerits of Nigeria Foreign Policy.
3. Account for the differences in the roles of each political regime

1.4 Methodology of the Study

The gathering of data and information for this work is mainly through the use of secondary data because of the peculiarity of the topic. The secondary data collection consist: books and journals, Newspapers and magazines and the internet materials from the listed sources will be carefully perused, analyzed and critiqued as appropriate.

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study is significant and important because:

1. The world is increasingly inter-connected or "globalized" so foreign affair has become more important than ever.
2. Since the world is no longer a handful of individual states. we rely on one another for both economic and military support.
3. How the rest of the world views one state is very important. Harsh foreign policy is often coupled with military action or economic embargoes.
4. Good Foreign policies can be a leveraged for Nigeria.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The scope of this work is a an assessment of the foreign policy of the

Jonathan's administration between 2009-2015

1.7 Limitations of the Study

The Limitation of this study is lack of time to critically review all the existing literatures on the use of nuclear weapon as a source of deterrence and security.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 The Concept of Foreign Policy

Several attempts have been made to define the term 'Foreign Policy' though there is no universally accepted definition. According to George Modelski in his book, *A Theory of Foreign Policy*, 'Foreign policy is the system of activities evolved by communities for changing the behaviour of other states and for adjusting their own activities to the international environment'. According to him, foreign policy is the process of an activity in which two things are important. 1) what are the inputs which flow into it; and 2) what it produces as an output. The major task of any foreign policy is to throw light on the manner in which a state attempts to chart its course of action in world affairs in tune with changing times, along with changes in the behaviour of other states, thus aiming at achieving maximum advantage.

Hugh Gibson, another well-known expert, opined that Foreign policy is a well-rounded, comprehensive plan, based on knowledge and experience, for conducting the business of government with the rest of the world. It is aimed at promoting and protecting the interests of a nation. This calls for a clear understanding of what those interests are and how far we can hope to go with the means at our disposal. Anything less than this falls short of being a national policy (Frankel, 1978).

Whereas F.S. Northedge argues, Foreign policy is the use of political influence in order to induce other states to exercise their law-making power in a manner desired by the state concerned, it is an interaction between forces originating outside the country's borders and those working with them. Again, we have a working definition produced by Joseph Frankel, who writes that 'foreign policy consists of decisions and actions which involve to some appreciable extent, relations between one state and others.' (Frankel, 1978).

From the above definitions it can be concluded that the core of the concept of foreign policy is that it is an instrument in the hands of the nation-states to change the behaviour of other states to their own advantage. However, in order to bring an appreciable change in the behaviour of other states, one should possess the necessary economic resources to map out various strategies, for evaluating different kinds of capabilities, identify goals, initiate and evaluate specific decisions and actions, etc. It is also important to co-ordinate all these resources while formulating the concept of foreign policy. Generally, foreign policy aims at changing the behaviour of other states in a desirable manner and to achieve specific goals of national interest, namely, economic, political and the military. Also, to adjust a nation's own behaviour to ward off pressures and other adverse implications of international system and developments. In particular, it tries to preserve the state's territorial integrity and keeps the borders safe from the possible encroachment by enemies.

Foreign policy of a state is concerned with the behaviour of a state towards other states. It refers to the ways in which the central governments of sovereign states relate to each other and to the global system in order to achieve various goals or objectives. Through its foreign policy it endeavours to persuade others in accordance with one's own ends. It is primarily in proportion to its national power that its persuasive power is effective in this regard. However, even a powerful state cannot afford to enjoy a solo flight in this regard. It has to take into account, not only its own objectives and interests, aspirations and problems, but also those of other states. This process involves intricate processes of diplomacy. It is also based on the observations regarding the traditional behaviour of a given state. Moreover, a state while implementing its foreign policy cannot afford to ignore the rules of International law and canons of international morality. The whole essence of this prelude is that the term foreign policy cannot be studied in isolation from the factors that determine it.

So foreign policy is the bundle of principles and practices that regulate the intercourse of a state vis-à-vis other states. Through foreign policy a state seeks to achieve a variety of objectives. The objectives sought to be attained by a state are of different types and categories, yet there are certain objectives which are uniformly pursued by all states i.e. Political independence and territorial integrity, economic well-being and, prestige and status of a nation.

The formulation and implementation of a country's foreign policy is associated with several important issues one of which is the National interest of a state.

2.2 National Interest

An important concept associated with the formulation of a foreign policy is that of national interest. Since the term 'national interest' is used very frequently in domestic and international politics, its exact meaning remains vague. National interest may refer to several things at the same time. It may mean the aspirations of a country, its policies and programmes, as also emotions and debates surrounding them. Therefore, the term national interest has various meanings. But a simple definition may be as follows: National Interest is composed of different aspirations of the state, as also of the policies and programmes to fulfil these aspirations. National Interest is not a fixed singular notion; it is the collective product of a country's aspirations and interests.

National interest is not a value-free concept; it is linked to values like morality and altruism. No country in the world can ignore all values to fulfil its aspirations. National interest, if value-free, may become a threat to international peace and security. Experts like Joseph Frankel, Norman D. Palmer and Howard C. Perkins have pointed to the significance of values in the concept of national interest. A country's national interest can never be

mechanical, inhuman and absolutely selfish. It must respect the interests of other nations as well. In this world, every country formulates and implements its foreign policy to protect its own national interest. In doing so, it can never harm the interests of other states. In other words, if every country tries to protect its national interest in an aggressive manner, war would be inevitable and the world would be a dangerous place to live in. It is precisely because of this danger that the national interest of a state cannot be completely value-free.

However, an important debate crops up here. If the purpose of a country's foreign policy is to protect its own national interest, how can it respect and accommodate the national interests of others? Would a country respect others' interests at the cost of its own interests? The notions of cooperation and compromise are very important to solve this debate. A country would first try to protect its own interests as far as possible, and only then try to accommodate those of others. In other words, while protecting its national interests, a country must also cooperate with others and accommodate others as far as possible. When all other avenues of cooperation and compromise are closed, a nation may go to war to protect its interests. But normally states try to cooperate with one another and pursue their respective interests in an atmosphere of peace, because a peaceful condition is the most ideal condition to pursue national interest. In order to establish peace, every nation must be prepared to sacrifice some of its aims and aspirations and accommodate

others. National interest is thus never a value-free concept. Ethical, moral and altruistic issues are linked with it. (Aneek, 2010).

National interest is very well reflected in a country's foreign policy. A foreign policy is made and implemented to protect the national interest of a country. Since national interest is not value-free, a foreign policy cannot afford to be value-neutral as well. In other words, a foreign policy is never unnecessarily aggressive; it tries to respect values of mutual cooperation, understanding and peaceful coexistence. An aggressive foreign policy seldom succeeds in international relations. A flexible, accommodating foreign policy is more near to reality, and more likely to succeed. The success of a foreign policy depends on certain techniques and instruments as well. One such instrument of foreign policy is diplomacy.

Foreign policy is the category of actions a government takes which deals with defence, security, international political relations and international economic relations. It is the activity whereby a State deals with other States, non-governmental organizations, international organizations, and certain individuals. Thus, Frankel (1978) defines foreign policy as: ... a range of actions, as well as a set of principles influencing these actions, taken with reference to external situations and factors... the summation of thoughts, actions and principles on external affairs taken by decision-makers with the intention of achieving long-range goals and shortterm objectives.

Using the irreducible minimum and fundamental components, foreign policy consists of two elements: national *objectives* to be achieved and the means for achieving them. According to Pham (2007), the interaction between national goals and the resources for attaining them is the perennial subject of statecraft. In its ingredients the foreign policy of all nations, great and small, is the same. In short, the shaping of foreign policy is a dynamic process involving the interaction between a country's internal and external environments. The one propels the other.

2.3 Objectives and Principles of Nigeria's Foreign Policy Since Independence

Since independence, Nigeria's foreign policy has been guided by certain objective and

principles. These are:

1. the protection of the sovereign and territorial integrity of the Nigerian State;
2. the promotion of the economic and social well-being of Nigeria;
3. the enhancement of Nigeria's image and status in the world at large;
4. the promotion of unity as well as the total political, economic, social and cultural liberation of Nigeria and Africa;
5. the promotion of the rights of black people and others under colonial rule;

6. the promotion of international cooperation conducive to the consolidation of world peace and security, mutual respect and friendship among all peoples and states;

7. redressing the imbalance in the international power structures which has tended to frustrate the legitimate aspirations of developing countries;

8. respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of all nations; and

9. the promotion of world peace based on the principles of freedom, mutual respect and equality of the world (Akindele and Ate, 2000).

According to Akintola (2007):

From 1960 to date, Nigeria has maintained a relatively consistent foreign policy considering the fact that the country had experienced varied forms of government within this period. Right from independence, Africa was the centerpiece of Nigeria's foreign policy with emphasis on the emancipation, development and unity of Africans both within and outside the continent. Thus, Olusanya and Akindele (1986) have identified the following five major principles as influencing and guiding the conduct of Nigeria's foreign policy:

- non-alignment (not successful as she unabashedly tilted to the West)
- the legal equality of all states
- non-interference in the domestic affairs of other states
- multilateral diplomacy
- afrocentricism

1960-1966:

Fresh from colonial rule and basking in the euphoria of a newly independent nation, Nigeria made certain pronouncements that had stuck with her till the present, and perhaps, have been responsible for her foreign policy thrust till present. Nigeria's foreign policy immediately after independence till the first military coup was predominantly pro-British and guided by British interests. Thus, while claiming non-alignment as one of her policy objectives, Nigeria was clearly pro-British and pro-West generally. Thus, when Balewa courageously stated that while the government was responsible for its action, but that it would not allow the infiltration of communism into Nigeria, he was stating what later became obvious as the British government was consistently tele-guiding Nigeria's new leadership and actions towards rejecting the Soviet Union's communist ideology and even seeking or accepting any type of aid from them. This was made clear by the Institute of Army Education (1977)

which stated thus:

Would it be surprising therefore that when the Soviet Embassy was established in Lagos in 1961, the number of its diplomatic staff was limited to ten whereas no such restriction was placed on the diplomatic missions of West European countries or the United States of America. The Soviet embassy was allocated a paltry figure of five diplomatic car plates whereas

Britain and the United States of America were entitled to one hundred each. It can

therefore be asserted that even the opening of the Soviet embassy was grudgingly conceded: a camouflage to the outside world that Nigeria was non-aligned.

During the period 1960-1966, Nigeria's foreign policy was conservative, reactionary, pre-Western under an uncertain and timid administration that was totally aligned to the West in every trade and diplomatic relations. This was in total disagreement with the Prime Minister's avowal on the eve of independence that: We shall not blindly follow the lead of anyone; so far as is possible, the policy on each occasion will be selected with a proper independent objectivity in Nigeria's national interest. We consider it wrong for the Federal Government to associate itself as a matter of routine with any of the power blocs (House of Representatives Debates, 20th August 1960, Lagos).

However, this was not to be as "Balewa would hardly take any major foreign policy decisions without first consulting the British government (Idang, 1973). One notable feature of the period was that it was consistently pro-African and pro-Commonwealth in tune with Nigeria's British slant. According to Egbo (2003), "all sectors of the economy were not only controlled by the West, but were entirely dependent on their capitalist

orientation for the country's consumptive patterns and developmental efforts". This was the prevalent option as chosen by Balewa. However, there were lots of inconsistencies and contradictions in Balewa's foreign policy as could be seen from the following actions he took within the period:

- severing relations with France over their testing of an atomic bomb in the Sahara desert in 1961 just three months after independence;
- refusal to attend the maiden conference of the Non-aligned Movement in Belgrade;
- prevarication over the establishment of formal diplomatic ties with the Sino- Soviet bloc until December 1961;
- acceptance of the Anglo-Nigeria Defence Pact until he was forced to abrogate it by students and the opposition;
- refusing to train armed militia for Angolan national fighters waging a war against Portuguese colonialists despite Nigeria's avowed resolve to rid the continent of colonialism.

The above show that while the Africa policy was still intact, there were still a lot of other inconsistencies of that government which belied its definite foreign policy thrust.

1966-1975

This period under General Yakubu Gowon, was turbulent as well as interesting in Nigerian history as very significant events took place between 1966 and 1969 – the Nigerian civil war and the oil boom which “provided

Nigeria a new impetus to practice her non-aligned stance and position of neutrality in international events” (Egbo, 2003). Thus, the government of the day was involved with the civil war and the attitudes of former and new entrants into the alignment scope of the Nigerian State. For instance, faced with the British initial hesitation at supplying arms to the Nigerian government to launch the war against Biafra, the government had to turn to the Soviet who supplied all the weapons needed for the onslaught. This seeming advantage of the USSR in the ideological warfare led Britain to get involved in the war, so as to stave off the Soviet increasingly communist influence in Nigeria. Thus, the period was devoted to winning the civil war and maintaining the integrity of the Nigerian nation.

The period was a very vibrant decade of interesting foreign policy leaning as propaganda became a major aspect of Nigeria’s foreign policy. Coming out from a sapping civil war, Nigeria learnt a lot of lessons:

- there was need to come closer cooperation to other African states on matters that could promote both political and economic freedom to the continent;
- that Nigeria need not unnecessarily reject overtures of friendship from the Soviet Union;
- that Nigeria could disagree with Britain on issues it felt strongly about and still retain her status.

Moreover, this period witnessed the birth of oil as a very serious economic resource for Nigeria, and with her economy developing; Nigeria began a foreign policy that involved economic expansion into neighbouring African states. This would invariably lead to the formation of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in June 1975 involving fifteen West African countries (Institute of Army Education, 1977).

The period 1969-1975 was one of 'self-confidence'; a period when Nigerian foreign policy that was previously personalized especially by Gowon (who liked playing to the gallery), now turned to a low-profile policy deliberately made so for maximum effect and attention by world leaders. It was also very vibrant in the sense that far-reaching decisions were made at this time, which have stood the test of time.

1976-1979

This period saw a true manifestation of the Africa policy of Nigeria as the regime under Murtala Mohammed gave a well-defined, articulate, coherent and explicit policy for Africa that was not tainted with fear or deference to any bloc or country. In his address to the OAU in Addis Ababa, he gave notice of the direction that Africa was going to take in the new era, and with Nigeria's leadership. Part of his speech read thus: Africa has come of age, it is no longer in the orbit of any continental power. It should no longer tale

orders from any country however powerful. The fortunes of Africa are in our hands to make or mar.

This boldness exhibited by the Nigerian leader has been given as perhaps one of the many reasons given for his untimely elimination from the political scene. There is an issue of conspiracy by the West that could not stomach a revolutionary leader, a staunch believer in Africa and a soldier who was ready to do all it took to wrest Africa from the wrenches of the capitalist West that had continued to control the continent's destiny many years after the declaration of independence. Mohammed did not help matters with his forceful sparring with the United States on the Angolan crisis between UNITA and MPLA, where Nigeria recognized and supported the MPLA government as against the American support for UNITA. The short-lived leadership of Murtala Mohammed did not in any way derail Nigeria's foreign policy as his successor, General Olusegun Obasanjo, vowed to and followed the same trend. He was dedicated to the African spirit and was bold to take actions independent of Western influence. Obasanjo, to his credit, did a lot in terms of pushing Nigeria to the front-burner in international affairs by telling Britain and America some home truths despite the closeness, though without antagonizing them; and he went beyond that to the Soviet/Communist bloc to cultivate friendships that have endured till date. Although the domestic policies did not materialize to a lot of visible developmental progress,

Nigeria's foreign policy under Mohammed/Obasanjo regimes is the best so far as it received wide acceptability and respect in the global community.

1979-1983

Apart from making the usual remarks about maintaining the Afrocentric foreign policy of Nigeria, there was not much to be said about the foreign policy of Alhaji Shehu Shagari. He tried to keep up with the already established policy of his predecessor but could not because of series of problems that faced him and which he was incompetent to withstand. It is to his credit, though, that he spearheaded Africa's commitment to peaceful settlement of inter-state disputes like the Somalia/Ethiopia; Morocco/Polisario Movement over Western Sahara; and the Hissene Habre/Guokoni Weddeye crises in Chad (Egbo, 2003). However, there was no major issue that the regime tackled and the lackluster approach to issues made it impossible for Nigeria to impose her will on the continent as it had already started doing. Rather, the government is known to have caused bad blood and hostility towards Nigeria by some neighbouring states in the African continent with the expulsion of illegal aliens especially from Ghana. Moreover, it was during this time that the corruption in government led to the downward spiral in the Nigerian economy.

As succinctly noted by Egbo (2003): To any casual observer, the steam had gone out of Nigeria's foreign policy. The momentum and zeal which had

characterized Nigeria's foreign policy in the previous five years was eventually replaced with a lack of forthrightness and excessive caution in approaching issues. The regime lacked definite focus and fundamental framework, lapsed into unenthusiastic conceptualization and incoherent policy vacuum. The innovativeness and assertiveness of the last two regimes was lost. Shagari's foreign policy became a flash-back to the conservatism and legalism of the Balewa era, such that while lots of noises were made for good measure, the reality was one of incompetence and impotence borne out of indifference, confusion and political foot-dragging. This attitude created the opportunity for the military to come back into the political scene with the coup d'état of December 1984.

1983-1985

The General Mohammadu Buhari regime made it clear that his preoccupation was not foreign policy but to restore the tattered economy of Nigeria and put her back on the pedestal of moral rectitude. However, as no government can operate without a foreign policy objective, his foreign policy priority was to have more peace in Africa starting with her neighbours as seen in what it conceptualized as the 'concentric circle'.

As clearly adumbrated by Gambari (1989):

The pattern of concentric circle may be discernible in our attitude and response to foreign policy issues within the African continent and in the world at large. At the epicenter of these circles are the national economic and security interests of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, which are inextricably tied up with the security, stability and the economic and social well-being of our immediate neighbours. One of our principal priorities is to put on a more constructive footing relation with our neighbours with whom we share identical goals of regional stability and peace. It was during this period that the Quadripartite Agreements involving Nigeria and her three neighbours to the West (Benin, Ghana and Togo) were signed. But then, the regime showed inconsistency by indefinitely closing down Nigeria's borders as a measure against smuggling and money laundering in her much-vaunted fight against corruption. Another diplomatic *faux pas* committed by the regime was the attempted to forcefully bring back Alhaji Umaru Dikko to Nigeria from Britain in a crate. This action caused a serious infraction in the diplomatic relations between Nigeria and Britain. Moreover, the highhandedness and unbending and unyielding resolve of the regime in some of its actions brought about his overthrow; Buhari was accused of running a two-man show of himself and Idiagbon.

1985-1993

General Ibrahim Babangida saw foreign policy as an "issue-based pursuit reflecting a package of objectives and goals tied to the nation's security and

the well-being of Nigerians generally” (Adeniran, 2008:343-364). This he did not only by bringing the best personnel on board viz: Bolaji Akinyemi, Ike Nwachukwu, Rilwanu Lukman, and gave them the essential latitude to implement their strategies towards achieving the said goals. Thus, the many foreign policy issues such as the Technical Aid Corps (TAC) programme, the Concert of Medium Powers initiative and Economic Diplomacy as foreign policy thrusts, and which were well-received, had the inputs of many eggheads that IBB brought into his cabinet. It was also under his leadership of ECOWAS (1986- 1988), that the ECOWAS Protocol on Free Movement of Citizens actually took effect. This could be said to be the shining point of his leadership in terms of Nigeria’s Africa policy, as he not only reversed Buhari’s ill-conceived closure of borders to punish smaller neighbouring countries, he virtually took over ECOWAS, making Nigeria the arrowhead of the sub-regional organization.

As clearly expounded by Shagaya (2003):

Nigeria not only provided the bulk of the material and logistic support for ECOMOG operations but also the bulk of the personnel. Apart from the first Commander who was a Ghanaian, all subsequent Commanders were from the Nigerian military. That today Liberia is a united country owes much to the foresight and sacrifice of Nigeria ... the Babangida regime gave ECOWAS institutional relevance by not only donating land for the building of the

ECOWAS Secretariat but contributed 4.5 million dollars towards its construction.

Babangida also went beyond the continental level by taking bold steps such as restoring relations with Israel that had been severed since October 1973 over the Arab-Israel conflict. Thus, in all, Babangida's regime was credited with some achievements such as:

- (a). the revival of Nigeria's active commitment to ECOWAS by lifting boundary closures and restoring free movement within ECOWAS countries;
- (b). Nigeria's active intervention in inter-African affairs and conflicts, especially in West Africa, in the border wars between Mali and Burkina Faso and in the strained relations between Sierra Leone and Liberia;
- (c). the establishment and funding of Nigeria's Technical Aids Corps (TAC) which provides highly trained Nigerian personnel at little or no costs to needy African states;
- (d). the formation of the Lagos Forum of Medium Powers; and
- (e). the use of Nigeria's foreign policy to support and promote Nigeria's domestic economic policy (Ofoegbu, 1990).

Moreover, it was during this era that Nigeria got the most representation in the international scene through the United Nations. It was during this period that Obasanjo was selected as one of the three pioneer members of the International Eminent Personalities mandated to arbitrate in the South

African political debacle by the Commonwealth; in 1989, Nigeria's permanent representative to the United Nations, Joe Garba, was made President of the General Assembly in its 44th session; and also in 1990, Emeka Anyaoku was elected as the Secretary-General of the Commonwealth of Nations.

Despite all the above minimal successes, Babangida's regime is not taken to be the best time for Nigeria's foreign policy because "rhetoric, emptiness, inaction, policy somersault and indecision were to mark the second half of his tenure" (Egbo, 2003). As is already well known, Nigeria became a pariah nation after Babangida annulled what is arguably the freest and fairest election ever held in Nigeria.

1993-1998

Given that Abacha took over by force unnecessarily and at a time the world was gradually tilting towards liberal democracy, and given the opposition to such obvious palace coup on the Interim National Government of Chief Ernest Shonekan, Nigeria was generally hostile to most countries and became a pariah among the comity of nations. Thus, foreign policy during this period was "reactive and isolationist" (Akintola, 2007:462). For him, there was a need to fashion out a new foreign policy thrust for the country as the traditional position had become more or less in his estimation. Thus, he constituted a 50-member committee of every other interest group apart from

career diplomats, intellectuals and experts in the field of international relations and foreign policy. This deliberate action showed his hand early enough that he did not want anything except to direct what should happen without recourse to what had been the tradition.

Moreover, the regime was so brazen in disregard of diplomatic norms and showed marked disdain for finesse in relations with the diplomatic corps of other countries that left them stunned. The situation was not helped by such ignoble actions of Abacha as the unwarranted and unjustified killing of the Ogoni activist, Ken Saro-Wiwa and eight others despite huge outcry and pleas from the international community. Such traditional allies as Britain, United States, France, Germany, Canada and South Africa and many others temporarily withdrew diplomatic representations and support for Nigeria; and “in response to the isolation from the West and its associates, Abacha turned to Asia” (Akintola, 2007). This further alienated Nigeria from dominant powers of the world as Asia did not really do much for the foreign policy objectives of Nigeria. This was the situation Nigeria found herself till Abacha died suddenly on 8th June 1998.

1998-1999

Abacha's sudden death left Nigeria in the lurch of international isolationism, and thus the succeeding regime of General Abdulsalami Abubakar knew better than to try any form of perpetuation of himself in power. He quickly started the process of transition to democracy, released almost all political prisoners and generally "embarked on a foreign policy of rejuvenation and attempted to redeem Nigeria's image, most especially on the human rights front" (Akintola, 2007). Thus, his eleven-month regime could rightly be seen as an interregnum between military domination of Nigerian politics with its peculiar brand of foreign policy, and a democratic setting. Although he had to grapple with the issue of conflict situations in the African sub-region, he chose the path of peaceful enforcement in Sierra Leone and Guinea Bissau. His case was such that the domestic environment more or less dictated his foreign policy – he was more interested in salvaging Nigeria's image abroad and preparing for a democratic transition to civil rule, national reconciliation, respect for the rule of law, and human rights of citizens (Badmus and Ogunmola, 2003). Thus, during his time, and given that it was short, the Abubakar administration recorded such little successes in the international community as the re-admission of Nigeria into the Commonwealth of Nations, the improvement in relations with the European Union, Canada and the United States of America that had severed diplomatic relations with Nigeria, and peaceful leadership of ECOWAS.

1999-2007

We shall pursue a dynamic foreign policy to promote friendly relations with all nations and will continue to play a constructive role in the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity and other international bodies. We shall continue to honour existing agreements between Nigeria and other countries. It is our resolve to restore Nigeria fully to her previous prestigious position in the community of nations (Obasanjo, Inaugural Speech, 29th May 1999).

Nigeria's foreign policy after the successful transition to democratic governance was more of shuttle diplomacy beyond Africa embarked upon by President Obasanjo in order to win over a world that had overlooked Nigeria and would rather not have anything to do with her. Thus, the foreign policy, according to Agbu (2001):

Extends far beyond the concern for the well-being of the African continent... the debt burden, for instance, is not an exclusive African predicament, ... many countries in Asia, the Caribbean and South America face similar problems, hence the need for the harmonization of efforts (Agbu, 2001). This was corroborated by the former Foreign Affairs Minister, Sule Lamido's comments that while it may appear improper to dismiss Africa as the centerpiece of Nigeria's foreign policy, the core issue in contemporary international relations, which is economic, makes that prevailing doctrine inappropriate (Lamido, quoted in Agbu, 2001). Thus, Nigeria's foreign policy

in this era, rooted in support of democratic values, the principle of self-determination, human rights, rule of law, was bound to strengthen and institutionalize the culture of good governance and democratic culture at the domestic level.

At the regional level, Nigeria did not move away from her traditional Afrocentric stance. According to Obasanjo (2005); I believe that Africa should remain the centerpiece of our foreign policy. The renewed determination of African leaders, our strengthening of regional economic communities, the restructuring of the OAU into the AU, and a better global disposition towards Africa, the AU and the AU's programme, NEPAD, are indicators that we are indeed in a new Africa. The Africa that should be united, integrated, devoid of conflicts and violence, especially in the contemporary global system where there is no chronic conflicting ideological divide.

Thus, Nigeria created structures that would help in further bringing the country into greater reckoning in Africa, thereby making for peace and development in the continent. This was done through the creation of such important offices as the constitutional provision for the promotion of African integration and support for African unity – shown through the Ministry of Cooperation and Integration in Africa; and maintenance of peace and security in the West African sub-region – shown by Nigeria's leadership role in the

formation of ECOMOG, and her membership of the Gulf of Guinea Commission. Also, Nigeria played a key role in the “conceptualization of the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) and shift its focus from conflicts to economic development” (Adeniran, 2008).

The shuttle diplomacy of the Obasanjo government ensured that some sort of economic development came the way of Nigeria, although it is arguable whether the President’s globe-trotting yielded as much foreign investments as he made Nigerians believe. However, the fact was that a greater percentage of Nigeria’s foreign debts were radically reduced through outright cancellation and rescheduling, foreign investments started coming into Nigeria and jobs were created and people began to feel the impact of good foreign interactions with other states in the international system.

As noted by Adeniran (2008:): Under Obasanjo, Nigerian foreign policy was made to focus on wooing Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) with the federal government’s establishment of a one-stop investment agency (Nigerian Investment Promotion Commission, NIPC) and the initiative of encouraging Nigerians in the Diaspora to become involved in national development.

However, this was done through a half-hearted foreign policy that was centred on the domestic policy of core values of transparency, accountability, good governance, and the protection of fundamental human rights. Moreover,

given that Obasanjo tended to overshadow his foreign affairs ministers, the progress made in foreign policy during his era was overshadowed by his attempt to stay put in office through various means which eventually did not succeed and which made him lose some of the respect the international community had for him at the inception of his administration in 1999.

2007- 2009

At the beginning of Yar'adua's administration, Chief Ojo Maduekwe, the then Minister of Foreign Affairs, declared that the Yar'Adua administration will espouse what he called Citizens Diplomacy. In his words "Although every diplomatic activity must necessarily be centred on the protection of the welfare and wellbeing of the citizens of the country, this administration tried to put citizens as its focus, at least at a conceptual framework. That concept is yet to be properly articulated, its impact is yet to be felt and the result is yet to manifest" (Abba, 2009).

The criticisms that followed the introduction and articulation of this new foreign policy thrust have been so much so that nobody takes the government seriously in terms of foreign policy as the government seems to thrive on diplomatic gaffes. The extent of non-articulation and opacity of this newly fangled ludicrous foreign policy that was gleefully touted as the driver of Nigeria's policy was seen in the fact that this is a standard consular obligation owed Nigerians and not policy. In the two years of President Yar'Adua since

the administration, it became clear that the issue of foreign policy was not uppermost in the administration's plan. Much as it was not clear what the policy thrust was, the much-touted citizens diplomacy was not even clear on what it was meant to achieve as the proponent, Ojo Maduekwe, did not fully explain what he meant by that which is known to be an obligation – that when a country does not treat another country's nationals right, they could also get the same treatment for their own citizens. What this translated to was the the Yar'Adua's government did not have any foreign policy thrust apart from the traditional Africa-centredness that does not make much meaning anymore given the fact that the commitment to the African continent is now in doubt for a government that cannot sustain its economy or develop nor maintain its infrastructure. A country where citizens are not given the basic amenities with all the wealth that accrues from the petroleum resources the nation is blessed with cannot be serious about its citizens whether in Nigeria or outside the shores of the country. A country where virtually all the sectors of the economy are comatose cannot impose its will on other nations to treat its citizens right when they know Nigeria cannot really do anything, and its leadership does not have the will, to do anything even if provoked. This inactivity on the part of the President and his foreign policy team left Nigeria as onlookers in a fast moving world.

As further extrapolated by Abba (2009):

Nigeria's voice is not heard in major international fora: Nigeria has initiated nothing spectacular in the last two years at the dynamic global arena and, apart from bilateral agreements which are hardly followed up, Nigeria has gained nothing from diplomatic activities under this government. This is not what is expected of the anchor nation of the Black world... In the immediate sub-region of ECOWAS whose institutions Nigeria is hosting and substantially funding, Nigerians are not even employed as drivers. For instance, in the ECOWAS Community Court of Justice only 7 percent of the staff are Nigerians, and it is situated here in Abuja... no Nigerian has been elected in the AU commission for the last six years. A nation that has the largest population in Africa is not represented in the African Union Commission. Burkina Faso defeated Nigeria in 2007! Really, what manner of citizen diplomacy is it when the citizens lack representation?

The problem of representation in international affairs has also been giving scholars and the Nigerian populace problems to comprehend how a government refused to attend global events that other governments fight to ensure they are on board. It was on record that President Yar'Adua missed many opportunities to address the United Nations General Assembly, but rather sent his Foreign Affairs Minister, who lacked finesse and diplomatise and most often did not have the capacity to address certain key issues, and ended up either saying the wrong things or committing diplomatic *faux pas*

much to the embarrassment of the Nigerian citizens. An instance was when President Yar'Adua opted to go and open a University of Technology in Saudi Arabia when the General Assembly was scheduled to meet, and was eventually received by Governor of a State.

As noted by Onyekwere (2009):

The seemingly diplomatic indifference of President Umaru Yar'Adua's administration threatens the little gains the country earned under his predecessor just as the international community is reinventing stereotypes against Nigerians, while manufacturing companies relocate to neighbouring countries in droves.

The diplomatic faux pas committed by both the President and his Foreign Affairs Minister was enough to warrant harsh comments from commentators and scholars. On the purported non-recognition of Kosovo at a meeting in Egypt, Okulaja (2009) quoted Akin Oyebo of the Department of International Law and Diplomacy, University of Lagos, as follows:

A President is as good as his adviser and the present Nigerian foreign policy is unclear, quite sincerely, whether we are talking of Darfur, Kosovo or Honduras. There is a poverty of ideas in the Presidency, and I worry about how much of the situation he knows in Kosovo for him to just make such a statement. If he was advised on this at all, then he is ill-advised. A leader just doesn't make a statement, you must be certain about the ramifications of a policy. The Yar'Adua government therefore did not have foreign policy

thrust. There was no clear blueprint of what the government intended to achieve while relating to other nations. Its foreign policy did not seem to have any direction and was not able to yield any positive fruits in terms of achieving good objectives for Nigeria.

2.4 Theoretical Framework

This study is largely based on the theory of state relative autonomy theory, which is situated within the ambit of the neo-Marxist political economy paradigm. The theory of relative state autonomy depicts the degree of aloofness of the state in the discharge of its tasks such as mediating inter-class and intraclass struggles. Thus, this theory suggests that in any state, there are two levels of contradiction, primary and secondary. Primary contradiction depicts inter-class struggle or class struggle between two antagonistic classes such as the ruling class and the ruled class or the bourgeois class and the proletariat. Whereas, secondary contradiction is the intra-class struggle, denoting class conflicts within the ruling class or between different segments of the ruling-class. Marx and Engels (1977) demonstrated this intractable nature of class struggle in the preface of their book, that “the history of all the hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles” (Okeke and Aniche, 2012b).

The proponents and exponents of the theory hold that a state can exhibit either low or high relative autonomy (Alavi, 1972). A state exhibits relatively

high autonomy when there is high commodification of capital or excessive penetration of capital into the economy; such that the bourgeois class engages in accumulation of capital through direct exploitation of the working class or appropriation of surplus value, private capitalism, when they enter into social relationships of production. Here, the state is not interventionist; it does not intervene in the domestic economy like participating in the productive activities, public/state enterprises or controlling or nationalizing means of production. The role of state here is largely to regulate (Ake, 1976). By doing so, the state is relatively an impartial umpire mediating inter-class and intra-class struggles through harmonization and reconciliation of class interests (Ake, 1981; Okafor *et al.* 2012; Okeke and Aniche, 2012b).

The developed capitalist states of the West are, therefore, considered to exemplify this high degree of relative autonomy, and thus the high level of human rights observance and protection. On the other hand, a state exhibits relatively low autonomy when there is low commodification of capital or low penetration of (private) capital into the economy. The ruling class is constantly indulging in primitive accumulation of capital through embezzlement of public fund. A state constituted in this way becomes the only avenue for capital accumulation. The state is, thus, interventionist for engaging in productive activities, public corporation, by nationalization of major means of production. This state does not restrict itself to regulatory role and is hence compromised, such that instead of rising above class

struggle it is deeply immersed in it (Ake, 1985; Okafor *et al.*, 2012; Okeke and Aniche, 2012b).

The Nigerian state like other developing states exhibits a relatively low level of autonomy of the state as a result of low commodification of capital. Under the eclectic mixture of economy, pseudocapitalism or quasi-capitalism, Nigeria experiences the phenomenon of poor penetration of (private) capital into the economy. This gives rise to a parasitic petty bourgeois class whose major source of accumulation of capital is the state. So, the Nigerian state becomes the only avenue for primitive accumulation of capital through which the governing class. Petty bourgeoisie, produces and reproduces their dominance. The implication of the low autonomy of the Nigerian state is that it is heavily involved in the class struggle rather than rising above it; leading to intense struggle for the control of the state for primitive accumulation of capital (Ake, 2001; Okeke and Aniche, 2012b).

CHAPTER THREE

CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Man is a social being therefore friendships and relations have existed between humans since the beginning of human creation. As such, Nigerian foreign policy didn't just start at independence, it dates back to during the times of the Hausa emirates, the Igbo kingdoms and the Oyo empires unknowingly to them as there were no institutions to establish these policies but however, with the coming in colonial officers, diplomatic relations were established with such establishments like the consular authority in 1847 and the famous amalgamation of 1914. This brought Nigeria into the diplomatic world not as an independent state but as a colonial state.

Foreign policy is that type of action a state embarks upon in its interactions with other member states in the international environment, in the process of striving to attain its goals and objectives. It can also be seen as a set a principles that define the objective a given state pursues in process of its interactions with other international actors. The concept also denotes the strategy or planned course of action, related to external relations developed by decision makers aimed at achieving specific goals. However for this cause of study, foreign policy is defined as a planned course of action that aims at achieving a particular goal at a particular point in time based on specific reasons in the international system.

From the foregoing, one cannot help but denote that foreign policy is aimed at safeguarding a nation's national interest. A state's national interest is what propels its foreign policy. The issue of what constitutes Nigeria's national interest has however remained a matter of intense disagreement among scholars, never the less, the framework provided by Olajide Aluko (1981), Olusanya and Akindele (1986) and Aforika Nweke (1986) gives a fairly comprehensive detail which is beyond argument on aspects of Nigeria's national interest. Aluko states three issues with which he referred to as vital elements of Nigeria's national interest, these are self preservation of the country, the defense and maintenance of the country's independence and the economic and social well being of the people. He further identified some further elements as not constituting core or vital elements, these are; defense, preservation and promotion of way of life of Nigerian's especially their democratic values, enhancement of the country's standing in the comity of nations, especially in Africa and the promotion of world peace (Aluko, 1981), for Olusanya and Akindele, Nigeria's national interests are; the defense of the country's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, the restoration of human dignity to black men and women all over the world, the creation of relevant political and economic conditions in Africa and the rest of the world the promotion and improvement of economic well being of the Nigerian citizens and the promotion of world peace and justice. A lot of similarities are in this analysis but what are paramount are the changes of this

interests that have happened over time. At some regimes, some of these interests were core in Nigeria's foreign policy and in other regimes, they were not.

During the first republic, what was prominent was pro-westernism and conservatism. The British colonial heritage, the nature of domestic politics, the level of economic development and the character of the leaders especially the prime minister, Tafawa Balewa shaped the pattern of Nigeria's foreign policy that period. Britain continued to occupy prominent positions in Nigeria foreign relations in terms of trade, political ties and even the military as countries of the eastern bloc were not reckoned with in the conduct of Nigeria's foreign relations this was clearly shown shortly after independence when soviet union expressed its desire to open an embassy in Nigeria but the request was turned down with the excuse that Nigeria did not have enough resources to reciprocate by opening an embassy in Moscow. According to Dudley (1982), the Balewa government continued to take advise from the Britain regarding the approach to adopt towards the Soviet Union and other countries of the eastern bloc.

However, there was one instance when the Balewa government as a demonstration of its commitment to the defense of Africa's interest took an anti-west position. This was when it broke diplomatic relations with France in January 1961 following nuclear test in the Sahara desert in utter disregard for the opposition of African states to the test as the French ambassador and

his staff were given 48 hours to leave the country (Nwokedi, 1986). Though countries of the west especially Britain occupied special positions in Nigeria during this period, analyst could not entirely say the period was pro-western.

The first military coup in the country might have brought about a radical change in Nigeria foreign policy if it was successful as leaders of the coup espoused socialist (Ademoyega, 1981). Its failure ushered Nigeria into a significant era in its foreign policy. The event of the civil war compelled leaders to widen the scope of Nigeria's foreign policy beyond pro-westernism. Britain came to disagreements of some policies the Nigerian government attempted to pass such as the blockade of the waters around the Bonny to prevent Biafra from getting oil revenue and prevent arms and ammunitions from being imported through the ports. It was clear to Nigeria that the position of Britain was basically influenced by self interests. Another fact was when Britain placed an embargo on the sale of arms to the federal government of Nigeria from 1986. It was the Soviet Union that came to supply the federal government with much needed arms. This thus brought Soviet Union to the fore front of Nigeria's foreign relations, a country which it had refused in the past.

The economic boom during this period from the oil boom allowed the country to pursue an active foreign policy as the country did not depend on any nation to recover from the civil war. It also was so buoyant enough to commit 19.5 million to the common wealth fund for technical co-operation

and to offer to pay the salaries of the civil servants of Grenada. This also brought countries like the United States of America which bought 31 percent of Nigeria's oil in 1974 and more between 1976 and 1979 closer to Nigeria. The character of the head of state also had a strong influence on the country's foreign policy at that time. A phenomenon that has been termed "personal diplomacy" was attached to this period. His forgiving attitude and accommodating disposition came to positively influence Nigeria's foreign relations such as the establishment of the economic community of West African states (ECOWAS) in 1975 as Nigeria's leadership role in Africa became clearly manifested with the founding of ECOWAS.

The period between August 1975 to October 1979, is generally regarded as when Nigeria's support for and defense for African states was vigorously displayed. It was actively involved in every African country struggling to break the yoke of colonialism. It was during this period that the independence process in Angola became crisis ridden, Nigeria however supported and donated a huge amount to the group with socialist principles which pitched against the western powers including Britain and America. However, Nigeria stood its ground and won for its great accolade as the champion of Africa's interest. This was also proven in Nigeria's hard line position on the Rhodesian crisis. This enabled southern Rhodesia and Zimbabwe to gain sovereign statehood in April 1980.

In spite of the independence characterized pattern of Nigeria's foreign policy this period, an important feature of it was the special relationship which it established with the United States of America as the present Nigerian head of state Olusegun Obasanjo paid a visit to the United States in October 1977 and the president of the United States president Carter reciprocated by paying a visit to Nigeria in April 1978. The implication of this is that Nigeria has been upgraded in the international system as the previous attempt to pay this visit to the United States by General Gowon between 1974 and 1975 was unsuccessful. This also asserts the fact that at this point, Nigeria's foreign policy has become largely independent that is not anti west or in support of the west.

The period of 1979 and 1984 experienced a radical departure from the prevailing pattern of the previous as Nigeria's external policy came to assume a low profile like that obtained under Balewa's regime as the nature and character of the president Shehu Shagari was very conservative and the economic recession which hit the country were responsible for this. Relations with Britain became very cordial again but nevertheless, Shagari's administration continued to attention to African affairs. Crude petroleum continued to be sold at consolatory prices to a number of poor African countries, financial aid was also given to others like newly independent Zimbabwe and some organizations like SWAPO in Namibia. The set back of this regime was its expulsion of illegal aliens majority of which were

Ghanaian's in 1983. This questioned our spirit of brother hood and the ECOWAS treaty.

During the fifteen years of military rule from 1984 – 1999, the foreign policy was at first patently nationalistic and regional, some major development during this period were the closure of Nigerian borders in April 1984 and the attempt to kidnap and fly Umaru Dikko from London to Lagos in July 1984 which negatively affected Anglo-Nigerian relations during the whole regime. What was however clear during this period was that the action taken by the government was very unpopular to many countries.

Secondly, Nigeria began to play key roles in continental and global affairs under Babangida's regime in which borders that have been closed were reopened to the relieve of the country's neighbors. Babangida was later re-elected to be the chairman of both ECOWAS and OAU, he visited many countries in Europe, Asia and Africa, he established Technical Aid Corps to assist some African states with skilful Nigerians and tried to broker peace between Mali and Burkinafaso in December 1985. His support and goodwill also helped in the election of Joseph Garba as the president of the 44th session of the United Nations general assembly and chief emeka anyaoku as the secretary general of the common wealth in 1989. Also during the period, prince bola ajibola was elected to the international court of justice to complete the unexpired tenure of late Dr. Taslim Elias, and Mr. Rilwanu lukman was elected secretary general of OPEC. Nigeria also helped in

monitoring the group ECOMOG to restore peace to war torn Liberia and Sierra Leone. Tremendous success was recorded during this period in the international scene.

Thirdly, Nigeria recorded its worst period of external relations, an era that has been described as “area boy diplomacy” which was famous for brutality and violation of fundamental human rights. Nigeria was suspended from the commonwealth of nations and a lot of sanctions were imposed on the country. Nigeria thus became a pariah nation which sought friendship among isolated countries like Libya and North Korea.

The fourth was brief and very significant in Nigeria’s foreign relations as efforts were made to reverse the negative trend. The military president then Abdulsalami Abubakar started and convinced the international community of his sincerity of his transition program. Nigeria as such bounced back to recognition in the comity of nations and some sanctions against it were lifted.

The period from 1999-2007 envisaged high profile foreign policy pursuits with the resident numerous trips abroad which only however attracted little foreign investments in the country. Nigeria was integrated into the main stream of the global system once again and restored its place as the regional power by playing an important role in trying to find a solution to the faceoff between Britain and Zimbabwe over the land seizure from white farmers. It also continued to play a leading role in the resolution of crisis in Liberia

Sierra Leone, Cote D'Ivoire and Guinea-Bissau. It was also at the fore front of the establishment of a new partnership for Africa's development (NEPAD). Nigeria further led the negotiations leading to the stepping down of Liberian president Charles Taylor in August 2003. During the period however, Nigeria carried the image of corruption, drug peddling, and advanced fee fraud. There was also the loss of Bakasi to Cameroon

The Yar-Adua era suffered Nigeria's standing in the comity of nation because of his fragile health as the bulk of his trips abroad were for medical motives mainly to Saudi Arabia. Nigeria had no key representation in international gatherings because of his absence and refusal to delegate his vice. The foreign affairs minister Oyo Maduekwe was also involved in an embarrassing spat with the Nigerian ambassador to the United States, however, upon his death and the assenting of Goodluck Jonathan to the height of presidency sort to bounce the country back as he embarked on a trip to the United States but the country has been tagged the name a terrorist country with recent happenings such as the Abdulmutalab case and the bomb blast in Abuja on the 24th of December 2010.

From the above analysis, one cannot help but notice that each regime has its own peculiarity when it comes to foreign policy as factors such as the economy the nature and character of the president and the domestic politics affects each regime. There are always changes with the coming in of a new president, but one cannot however disregard the fact that that Nigeria's

foreign policy has maintained the same basic elements since 1960. The issues highlighted by Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa on 20 August 1960 were basically the same as those recommended by the commission set up by the Muritala/Osanjo's regime in 1975 headed by professor Adebayo Ayodeji to review Nigeria's foreign policy (Akinboye, 1999).

The basic reasons that have encouraged this continuity are:

- Ethnicity and religious factors: this allowed the country to require cautious positions on some issues such as the policy towards Israel. Nigeria found it difficult to maintain diplomatic ties with Israel for a very long time because of Muslim opposition and sympathy with the rest of the Arab Muslim world and in 1986, it was denied membership of the organization of Islamic conference. Even though ethnicity has not exacted much influence on the foreign policy process, religion has remained a major tool to build global alliance.
- Membership of international organization such as the United Nations has made the country to make certain rules and follow certain procedures in its foreign policy process like believing in the equality of states, obedience of the International Court of Justice ruling when it ceded Bakasi to Cameroon, non interference in the domestic affairs of other states, opposition to nuclear non proliferation, etc.
- Most populous black country: the analysis above clearly shows that Nigeria as in most if not every put itself in a position to be the big

brother in Africa i.e. the giant of Africa. This had made it at every point in time made Africa the center piece of its foreign policy even if at times, the help rendered gives nothing back in return. It wastes its resources stupidly and selflessly to the development and stability of other African countries whereas these could be used for the domestic development of the country.

- Ex British protectorate: this made the country's foreign policy at the first instance very pro-western and has given the west some certain sentiments when it comes to countries of the west as they still look up to them as superiors. Though some actions are made against Nigeria by the west at some certain periods, the country still comes back to have close ties with the west and it has continued to do so. Example was when Gowon maintained friendly tie still with Britain after it supported Biafra during the civil war. This is why many scholars conclude that Nigeria was non aligned only in theory especially under Balewa's government. Being the fact that Nigeria is a third world country, neo colonialism is a present phenomena.

CHAPTER FOUR

BACKGROUND TO THE JONATHAN ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY

4.0 The domestic of environment at the onslaught of the Jonathant Administration

According to President Jonathan, Nigeria's foreign policy was reviewed to reflect a “citizen-focused” foreign policy designed to “accord this vision of defending the dignity of humanity the highest priority” and connect foreign policy to domestic policy while placing a greater emphasis on economic diplomacy. Since the assumption of Goodluck Jonathan as the president of Nigeria, the country has acquired the unenviable notoriety as a veritable theatre of terrorism and implosions unleashed by the Boko Haram insurgency. Thus, this has posed serious insecurity to the country and a threat to foreigners and investors. Nigeria has remained on the front burner of contemporary global discourse. This security challenge has diminished the country's ability to command global respect (Ebert, 2011). Former Commonwealth Secretary General, Chief Emeka Anyaoku pointed out that: “the security in the land is a drag on our foreign policy no doubt, because our standing abroad depends on our domestic conditions. So to the extent that we have insecurity at home, it is a drawback to our foreign policy” (Anyaoku, 2013). This explains why America then gave Nigeria the condition that for it to be delisted from the list of countries on the terrorist watch list, the country must demonstrate seriousness by passing the anti-terrorist bill. To demonstrate the importance attached to security in the conduct and

prosecution of foreign policy, America then announced a \$7 million reward for anybody who could give information about the leaders of Boko Haram. As Ogunsanwo (2012) observed, the domestic architecture that represents the infrastructural foundation of Nigeria's foreign policy must be adequately re-worked in order to ensure that the country's foreign policy stand on a firmer ground. (Ogunsanwo, 2012)

Nigeria has been suffering from internal decay which poses a considerable threat to international order. The security debacle has created a common space within which we situate the health of Nigeria in global trade. So, while terrorism and proliferation of small arms and light weapons are clearly discernible, we must go to the root of the problem which has to do with poverty, illiteracy, and underdevelopment. Although, one cannot justify the act of terrorism and other means of protest or resistance by groups on political, philosophical, ideological, religious or ethnic grounds. At the same time, it cannot be ignored that there is a correlation between conditions of extreme poverty, injustice, hopelessness, marginalization, political oppression and the likelihood that people may take up terrorism as a means to vent their discontent (Agba E, 2015). It becomes most imperative for the government to address the socio-economic challenges that the people face in Nigeria to avoid further contradiction in our global quest for power and influence. The more insurgent movements continue to spring up from different parts of the country, they may for the purposes be regarded as quasi-

states, and then begin to exercise many of the functions of statehood, including the conduct of external relations.

4.1 FOREIGN POLICY INITIATIVES OF JONATHAN

4.1.1 Delisting Nigeria as a Nation of US terrorist Interest

In his capacity as the acting President, Jonathan embarked on a number of diplomatic shuttles, as part of a deliberate attempt to reassure the world that Nigeria was well and secure despite the internal political challenges especially with the challenges of succession it was going through. Nigeria literally returned to the international arena. One of the shuttles took him to the USA where he met with his American counterpart. The delisting of Nigeria from the discriminatory rule of the Department of Homeland Security on special screening of passengers on international flights to the United States that specifically targeted Nigerians (consequent upon the Christmas day attempted bombing a US airline by a Nigerian) was the effect of the re-invigorated diplomatic contact. Earlier he recalled Nigeria's ambassador to Libya in protest of suggestion by Muammar Gaddafi that Nigeria should separate into a Muslim North State and a Christian South. The action was aimed at checkmating the excesses of the then Libyan leader and sending a strong signal that Nigeria can no longer tolerate such undue interference in the nation's internal affairs from any State.

The relationship between Nigeria and US continued to improve under Jonathan. This is most exemplified in the signing of the first US–Nigeria Bi-national Commission, in April 2010. This Alao (2011) noted, aimed to establish a mechanism for sustained, bilateral, high-level dialogue to promote and increase diplomatic, economic and security co-operation between the two countries. The commission's main objectives are the following:

- Promote and co-ordinate the diplomatic, economic, military, commercial, technical, social and cultural co-operation between the two countries.
- Address areas of mutual interest and/or concern and develop strategies for tackling these issues with assistance and co-ordination from both governments.
- Assist in the implementation and follow-up of agreements and all other legal instruments already concluded between the governments.
- Create favourable conditions to carry out cooperation programmes and projects as may be decided by mutual consent and help to resolve any difficulties that may arise in carrying out any such programmes and/or projects.
- Evaluate the development of co-operation between the two countries as well as initiatives from each government aiming to expand co-operation to new areas.

It is evident from the above that the Commission's main focus is Nigeria's domestic priorities. These key domestic issues include good governance, electoral reform and preparations, transparency and anti-corruption, energy (electricity supply) reform and investment, as well as food and agricultural development (Alao, 2011), which are all key components of what Jonathan termed his transformation agenda.

4.1.2 Citizen Diplomacy

The foreign policy agenda of Yar'Adua of 'Citizen Diplomacy' was followed up by Jonathan with visible actions. Thus in all his diplomatic shuttles, for which he was, like Obasanjo, criticized, he took time to interact with Nigerians abroad and showed himself ready to take up their problems with host countries. In fact, he engineered a purposeful mobilisation and instrumentalisation of Nigerians in Diaspora for national development. Not only has the regime encouraged the formation of the Nigerians in Diaspora Organisation (NIDO) in all countries where there are Nigerians, it has gone further to establish a Diaspora Commission to take charge of the affairs of Nigerians in Diasporas and ensure their effective instrumentalisation. Remarkably this is a component of the foreign policy objectives of Vision 20:2020.

His prompt response to the denigrating deportation of Nigerians by South Africa *quid pro quo* sent a very strong signal that Nigeria "has come of age"

and that any attempt to denigrate her will have consequences. His diplomacy of consequence is one with visible actions. The diplomatic way he was able to manage the said Nigeria-South Africa face-off was highly welcomed by Nigerians. He was also quick to order the evacuation of Nigerians trapped in the crisis torn countries like Libya in 2011 and Egypt in January 2012. In fact Nigeria was the first to airlift her citizens from Egypt. In January 2012 Nigeria hosted the fifth Nigeria/EU dialogue aimed at streamlining migration in a globalizing world and in the interest of all parties. These affirmative action's projected vividly the citizen centred focus of Nigeria's Foreign Policy (Alao, 2011).

4.1.3 Economic Diplomacy

Shortly after his re-election as the president of Nigeria (2010), Jonathan directed a review of Nigeria's foreign policy, "to reflect current realities". According to him, "after 50 years of independence, it is time to review the country's foreign policy, in line with modern realities and international developments" (<http://dailytimes.com.ng>). In his address to the Presidential Advisory Committee on Foreign Affairs, earlier setup by Yar'Adua, he hinted the direction of the review, namely, foreign policy with focus on Nigeria's domestic priorities. Thus in a follow up seminar the President clearly noted that although the country had played a leading and facilitating role in the emancipation of the African continent from colonialism, racial discrimination and reintegration in the past, there was now need to focus on

new priorities and challenges, such as job creation, economic progress, poverty eradication and security, which, he said, were topmost on the nation's national agenda. According to him also,

in the era of globalization; at a time of grave challenges to national and international security such as we face from terrorism and transnational criminal networks; at a time of massive poverty and youth restiveness in our country, we have no choice but to adjust and adapt the way we conduct foreign policy. As we respond to the forces of globalization, our diplomacy must be put at the service of our domestic priorities (Jonathan, 2011).

Putting diplomacy at the service of domestic priorities is the driving phrase. Accordingly for him, Nigeria's diplomacy must articulate and vigorously market the country as an environment where business can thrive. Thus foreign policy came rightly to be seen as the externalization of domestic priorities and the aspirations of citizens. If Yar'Adua anchored his government's policies on "seven point agenda", Jonathan called his own "transformation agenda" which in essence entail all the elements of the seven point agenda. Its key priorities which include Real sector, Agriculture & Rural Development, Water Resources, Commerce & Industry, Mines & Steel Development, Physical Infrastructure, Defence and Security, etc address issues central to the people of Nigeria. It is such domestic priorities that have continued to propel Nigeria's actions and reactions on the international arena. As part of the economic diplomacy which is evidently at the centre stage of Vision 20:2020, strengthening of Nigeria's economic interest through the

protection of the country's businessmen and women wherever they exist in Africa and the rest of the world became a top priority of Government (<http://www.radionigeriaibadan.com>).

Today, more than ever, while the organized private sector are following the Nigerian diplomatic flag around the globe to generate needed development at home, Nigeria's diplomacy, at the same time is following trade and sources of foreign direct investment for the same reason. The administration is giving special attention to the improvement and strengthening of economic ties with the country's partners in the international community as a foundation for stability and growth. (<http://dailytimes.com.ng>). According to Jonathan (2011), Nigeria's foreign policy and diplomacy are now anchored on the realization of the Transformation Agenda through the attraction of Foreign Direct Investment. This, the Minister of Foreign Affairs re-echoed when he observed:

“We believe that foreign policy must be used to support domestic programmes of government because your primary responsibility is to ensure that there is peace, progress and economic development Africa and we are using our foreign policy today to support all government efforts in that direction”
(<http://www.compassnewspaper.org/index.php/politics/90-front-page-/5430-jonathan-receives-revised-foreign-policy>)

Some successes have been registered as Nigeria is number one investment destination in Africa with \$8.9 billion according to UNCTAD's 2012 Investment Report. For the first time, there are conscious efforts by Nigeria to ensure that her sacrifices of lives and resources towards restoring peace to

many countries in Africa no longer go without commensurate national benefit. It marked a paradigm shift in Nigeria's foreign policy. To recall is that over the years, Nigeria had merely made sacrifices without returns. In the current dispensation, Nigeria's foreign policy while upholding Nigeria's leadership in Africa, strives to ensure that such role supports and benefits domestic programmes. This means that focusing on Nigeria's domestic priorities has not meant the abandonment of African issues. In fact in partnership with the African Union, Nigeria continues to lead the process for democracy and development in the continent. The main focus of this initiative is to see that at least within the continent there are true democracies where people elect their leaders. This policy focus according to the President is very much compatible with Nigeria's economic diplomacy. In his words,

“economic diplomacy is entirely compatible with democracy promotion, for at least two reasons. First, building a strong economy will help us build a strong, stable, prosperous and peaceful country, where democracy will thrive and business will flourish, and where citizens can live and pursue their dreams with dignity under the protection of the law. Second, it is in Nigeria's interest to promote the culture of democracy across Africa, since it is the surest way to guarantee peace, justice and happiness in the continent” (Jonathan, 2011).

4.1.4 Chairman of ECOWAS

It is on this commitment that the regime and through its leadership in ECOWAS effectively managed the ouster of Laurent Gbagbo of Cote D'Ivoire when he refused to hand over power, after the 2010 Presidential

elections in that country. Similar crisis of self-perpetuation in office in Niger was also dealt with by the regime. The regime's quick recognition of the National Transitional Council of Libya sent a clear message to Muammar Gaddafi to quit. This move has been criticised as falling into a Western plot and a betrayal of AU. Nevertheless, for Jonathan it was in Nigeria's national interest. To note is that the relations between Nigeria and Libya at the material time was not the best since the Libyan strong man's unprovoked meddling in Nigeria's internal affairs. As the Chairman of ECOWAS for two years Nigeria gradually returned to its position as a very highly influential player in the sub-regional and continental affairs and received accolade by the end of her tenure in February 2012. Nigeria's intervention in the crisis that rocked Mali and support for the democratic process there has led to the conduct of election that ushered in a new Government in that country (Abba, 2009).

4.1.5 Diplomacy of Consequence

Globally, Nigeria strives to deepen partnerships with other countries. This partnership for the President must be anchored on mutual respect and responsiveness. In the absence of "mutual respect and responsiveness" consequences would follow. This was exemplified in the "Iran arms scandal". To recall is that on the 26th October, 2010 Nigeria's relations with Iran became turbulent as a result of the discovery of thirteen containers arms and ammunitions surreptitiously shipped to Nigeria from Iran. This was

happening at a time of growing insecurity in Nigeria. Iranian Mission not only got an immediate response, but Nigeria promptly reported the incident to the United Nations.

4.1.6 Policy of Independent View

Perhaps where Nigeria exhibited courage and asserted the independence of her foreign policy was at the United Nations General Assembly's vote on admission of Palestine as Non-member State of the body. Prior to the voting, most Third World countries were under immense pressure from Israel and United States to vote no! Nigeria was among the majority that voted for the admission of the State of Palestine in the UN. Similar to the above is the President's position on the International Criminal Court vis-à-vis its planned trial of the Kenyan President which clearly shows courage and independence in foreign policy (Gambari, 2008).

4.1.7 Nigerians in International Position

Nigeria's visibility on the globe outside the peacekeeping/peace enforcement operations began picking up under the regime. Through lobbying and campaigning, Nigerian candidates got into positions in international organizations: Presidency of the Executive Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) based in Montreal, Canada; member UN Committee on the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW); AU Commissioner for Political Affairs; Commissioner

Political, Peace and Security at the ECOWAS Commission. In October 2011 Nigeria was also elected to the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), Vice Presidency of INTERPOL representing Africa. In November the same year, Nigeria was elected to the Executive Board of UNESCO for a term of four years while Nigeria's Attorney General and Minister of Justice, Hon. Mohammed Bello Adoke, was re-elected to the International Law Commission. Others include the election of Dr. Chile Eboe-Osuji as one of the six judges of the International Criminal Court (ICC) in a tightly contested election in New York in November, 2011 and the election of Nigeria as the first President of the Executive Board of the United Nations Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment: UN Women (Abati, 2012).

4.1.8 Continued Quest for Permanent membership at the UNSC

Jonathan has also pursued Nigeria's desire for permanent membership in a yet to be reformed UN Security Council with proactive diplomacy. In May 2011 Nigeria discussed this with France, one of the key powers, and received France's promise of support in this regard (Ikuomola, 2011). Similar support came from China during the historic visit of the President to that country. The recent election in 2013 of Nigeria as non-permanent member of Security Council is an expression faith in Nigeria by the international community. Measured in terms of Nigeria's visibility in the global community and the amount of foreign direct investment and foreign trade inflow which are

indices of effective engagement with outside world, Nigeria under Jonathan has made significant progress touching all the objectives of the Vision 20:2020. It is perhaps these efforts that have earned the Nigerian President international recognition of being among 100 most influential leaders of the world in 2012 by *Times International* magazine. Challenges, however, still abound in all the spheres including the key priorities in his transformation agenda. It is perhaps the enormity of these challenges that have made scholars describe the Vision as myth (Itua, 2011) or over ambitious (Olutokun, 2013).

4.2 FOREIGN POLICY AND THE CHALLENGES OF SUSTAINING THE VISION 20/20/0 UNDER THE GOODLUCK JONATHAN'S ADMINISTRATION

More than external challenges, it is internal challenges that are the dampening factor in Nigeria's attainment of great power status which Vision 20:2020 envisages. Key internal challenges include Poor governance, insecurity of lives and property, power supply (Olutokun, 2013), the quality of the nation's educational institutions; its capacity to innovate; the quality of its democracy and the ability to build consensus and resolve conflicts (Okere, 2012). More specifically, the insurgency in the North, the collapse of public education, growing unemployment, oil dependent economy, dilapidated economic infrastructure among others are major issues that deserve attention if not radical government intervention.

In spite of these obvious challenges, the commitment of the President to sustaining the policy objectives of the Vision is not in doubt. However, this sustaining and attainment of the Vision even outside the scheduled timeframe requires addressing the challenges in a more positive way. As is well known, for instance, education of the young ones is the bedrock of any nation. As the heartbeat of any nation these youths are the hopes for the realization and sustenance of the vision. Yet they constitute today the bulk of the neglected. The need, therefore, for Government to comprehensively place this above all others (Itua, 2011) by addressing the issues of their empowerment and job creation. This will stem the tide of their illegal emigration to countries where they engage in activities that impinge on the nation's image. Without doubt, this youth related problematic lies even at the foundation of the nation's security challenges and which, currently, is sending wrong signals to major prospective foreign investors.

It is also a fact that because of the security challenges in addition to the general harsh operating business environment even local investors are relocating to other countries like Ghana. Parts of this general harsh business environment are mismanagement and corruption. Diversifying the economy which currently is driven by oil – a depleting resource – is critical to sustaining the Vision. In this regard, there has been more words than action as, comparatively, there has been not much investment in the non-oil sector.

Yet Nigeria is richly endowed with abundant raw materials that could support various areas of manufacturing begging for exploitation (Okere, 2012). To address the issue the current trend in the establishment of industrial parks need to be stepped up and properly harnessed to attract foreign manufacturing firms to advantage the manufacturing base of the country. But this assumes the availability of power which currently, in spite some progress, still stands far below acceptable level. Official declaration of a State of emergency on the power sector is not out of place as this will ginger adequate resource mobilization for improvement.

All the above are not only issues that directly affect the economy and the lives of the people, they are also fundamental to constructing a nation that can command attention of the global community and attaining the vision of great power status. Though mainly within the confines of domestic policy action, the intermistic character of contemporary issues makes it near to impossible for any nation to go it alone even in such domestic matters. This importance of the external environment to the internal challenges must be comprehended and appreciated by all policy actors. It is this comprehension that will enable the generation of compatible policy and effective diplomacy that serve national interest. Consequent upon this nexus, key to continued progress in the direction of that Vision is a continued focusing on foreign policy as the externalization of domestic priorities and the aspirations of citizens.

As much as diplomacy cannot be effective under the current context of security challenges, decay in the educational sector as well as weak economic base, yet Nigeria requires diplomacy and official ingenuity to address these challenges. Such diplomacy requires formidable specialized knowledge in many fields of intellectual endeavors with an overlay of generalized training in the diplomacy of the respective issues for any diplomat to make meaningful impact and sell the agenda of this country. In other words, Nigeria's diplomacy requires high caliber professionals to drive her contemporary diplomacy. Accordingly, capacity building for Nigerian diplomats should be placed on the front burner. The above requirement is however negated by the present practice of settling political friends with diplomatic appointment by the President. To remain relevant in the world of today Nigeria must jettison the politicization of Foreign Service and the Ministry of foreign affairs in general in its recruitment and appointment exercises. This was clearly brought out by the 2010 Round Table on Nigeria's Foreign Policy. The Round Table called on the Nigerian foreign policy establishment to stem the tide of eroding professionalism and decline in foreign service, to take advantage of the prospects and opportunities presented by a changing domestic and external environment, and to seek to confront and address the litany of known challenges in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) (*This Day*, October 9, 2010).

Added to the above is the need to re-orientate Foreign Service Officers in the direction of moral rectitude, of integrity, loyalty, good conduct and hard work. This is critical in managing the nation's foreign policies as a tool of development. This need arises from the current perception of Nigeria's diplomatic posts especially by Nigerians in the Diaspora as "centres of officialdom managed by indolent officials who are generally too selfabsorbed,

haughty, uncaring and irresponsible". As noted by Obijiofor, (2012)

Nigerian diplomats serving in overseas countries have been chastised publicly for their selfish behaviour and for their contemptuous treatment of, or disregard for, citizens in need of consular services. The Foreign Affairs Ministry must take responsibility for the scandalous conduct of diplomatic staff that has sullied the image of the country at home and abroad.

This poor impression and lack of confidence by many Nigerians in the Diaspora in Nigeria's Foreign Service as a result of mediocre work ethic, and poor relationship with the public, is a major challenge which the Ministry of Foreign Affairs must take responsibility and squarely address. Even the MFA as the coordinating Ministry requires re-positioning. In fact any effective repositioning of Nigeria's diplomatic missions cannot be achieved without a thorough overhaul of the Foreign Affairs Ministry. According to Obijiofor (2012), "it is this supervising ministry that has contributed most appallingly – indirectly and directly – to the ghastly image of Nigerian diplomatic posts". A major problem that has undermined the capacity of Nigerian diplomatic

missions to function effectively is adequate funding. The nation cannot maintain poorly funded diplomatic missions and expect the diplomats to perform effectively.

Besides the issue of finance, managing the multi-varied players in today's diplomacy is a major challenge. A key feature of today's diplomacy is the involvement of myriads of actors and the growth of multilateral diplomacy. Nonstate actors have proliferated in number and types, ranging from traditional economic interest groups, through to resource, environmental, humanitarian, criminal and global governance interests. In some instances, non-governmental organizations are closely linked to official administrations, while others are transnationally linked. If one juxtaposes this fact with the original conception of Vision 20:2020 which is designed as bottom-top in approach to allow the real stakeholders, (which are basically private entities and individuals) to be its driving force, then effort must be intensified to maintain collaborative link between public and private sector in the process of articulating and implementing the foreign policies related to the Vision. In consequence of the above and because of the vital role of the economy in the whole agenda, regular dialogue with private sector operators playing active roles in economic planning, based on market principles need be intensified. This is in addition to the formation of business partnerships/linkages that engender learning and transfer of technology. While forming the said partnership Nigeria must at the same time re-examine all existing

partnerships, especially those with the West to ensure that they can enable self-reliance not just for Nigeria but also for Africa in general.

In addition there has been a geometric growth in the involvement of a wider range of ministries/departments in the nation's external relations. Such ministries/departments as industry, aviation, environment, shipping, customs, health, education and sports, which get involved in Nigeria's external relations, require coordination just as the non-state actors. This is particularly necessary in matters relating to both formulation and implementation of international agreements. Coordinating these varied actors to ensure the nation acts in unison has become an important distinguishing feature in modern diplomacy. Finally, it is important to note that several well orchestrated projects have "waxed and crashed" in Nigeria. The very reasons for such waxing and crashing are still with Nigeria today: indiscipline and policy inconsistencies.

As in the past, Nigeria fancies herself as an actor on the world stage but refuses to muster the discipline, stamina and industry that can translate the potential conferred on her by material endowments into achieved status (Olukotun, 2013). According to Onyenekenwa (2011), Nigerian governments are plagued with institutional/structural inconsistencies and discontinuity. The officials are not committed to the development of policies of their predecessors hence the national landscape is littered with uncompleted

projects (Okigbo, 1989; Oladapo, 2004). Counting indiscipline and lack of political will in the formulation and implementation of policies as constituting “the most serious defects in Nigeria”, Onyenekenwa opined that “a policy is only as effective as the discipline and will that sustain it”. According to him,

lack of discipline manifests in the infusion of partisan and ethnic politics into the technology of data collection, in the location of government projects and in the application of policies, while poor policy performance is largely attributed to lack of commitment and political will on the part of the leadership.

Managing the Nigerian Vision to avoid crash requires, 220 Okechukwu B. C. Nwankwo: Shifting the Paradigm in Nigeria’s Foreign Policy: Goodluck Jonathan and Nigeria’s Vision 20:2020 therefore, that the leadership commit to sufficient discipline and political will to enforce policies. How well the leadership does just that as to respond to the changes and challenges facing the Vision, will definitely determine its effectiveness, relevance, and future.

CHAPTER FIVE

GENERAL CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary

Foreign policy not only shapes the country's identity at large, but also determines its place and its future in the world. It is within this framework that this study examined Nigeria's foreign policy under the current administration of Jonathan vis-à-vis Nigeria's aspiration of becoming an important global player. Fully aware of the raging controversy over the attainability of the Vision especially from the standpoint of timeframe which we played down, evidence abound that the regime of Jonathan is making positive effort in the direction of the vision with the instrumentality of foreign policy. The administration is presently taking advantage of the international environment, as is the case with other nations, in enhancing domestic development. Today, more than ever before, Nigeria's foreign policy is giving greater attention to her domestic priorities and herein lies the paradigm shift. The articulations in the foreign policy component of the Vision call for Nigeria's foreign policy to be great in focus, reciprocal in tactics, and beneficial to Nigerian citizens in outcome (*This day*, 2010). They can take care of today's domestic needs identified as the economic well-being of citizens, enhanced security and massive foreign investment inflow and are related to Nigeria's leadership role in the sub-region, in the continent as well as her global dream of great power. With the involvement of the people and

various sectors in driving development process in a very sustainable manner, the paradigm shift gives hope that “the promised land” that the Vision 20:2020 is pointing at may one day be attained subject, above all, to discipline and policy consistency especially in the leadership.

The Jonathan administration has never lacked in good policies. In fact the various declaratory statements of the president bear testimony to this fact. For instance, in line with the shift in paradigm the Foreign affairs Minister was credited with declaring that Nigeria’s foreign policy under the regime would be investment-driven and different from the previous focus on Africa. According to him “Our foreign policy must now reflect the aspirations of Nigerians, our collective dreams, the yearnings of our children, and the fulfilment of the potential of our youths as well as the realization of the manifest destiny of this great country” (as in Anyanwu and Uzoatu 2011). The problem which has been the bane is the implementation. The challenge is that of managing official pronouncements to ensure consistency between declaratory and operational policies.

5.2 Conclusion

The fact that Nigeria’s foreign policy has maintained the same basic elements since 1960, is not questionable since it has its national interest that it seeks to achieve but the changes now derives from fact that some these national interest are taken more critical in some regimes while other regimes

don't see them as core or vital. During the early 1950's and 1960's Nigeria's foreign policy aimed at proper behavior in the international system and it stressed world peace, respected sovereign equality, and the likes. More attention was based on Africa in the later times, basically during the late 1960's and 1992, afterwards, attention was now drifted to gaining the country's image back after Abacha's dictatorship. Not like each regimes didn't encompass all the stated above, but at different times, different things were critical in Nigeria's foreign policy.

This study is a critical review of Nigeria's foreign policy under the Jonathan Administration but also assessed and reviewed Nigeria's foreign policy since independence in 1960. It is noted that although the country within the period under review witnessed varied forms of government – from parliamentary to military to full-blown civilian democratic governments intermittently – there has been a relatively consistent foreign policy thrust that has characteristically been pro-Africa. In that regard, there has been a semblance of continuity in her foreign policy focus. Inherent in that doctrine has been the supposition that Nigeria would always have a leadership role to play in Africa and that whatever was in Africa's interest was invariably in Nigeria's interest too. Under the various administrations, efforts were made to follow the guidelines and policy constructs, sometimes more faithfully, though erratically.

Africa had continuously been the centerpiece of Nigeria's foreign policy basically as also in the Jonathan's administration. But that is where it ends. There has however been consistency in veering off from the avowed principles and objectives over the decades as clearly observed in the nebulous "Citizens Diplomacy" thrust of the Yar'Adua administration. Foreign policy must be defined in terms of the goals a nation needs to officially seek to attain abroad, the culture and values that bring about those objectives and the instruments necessary to pursue the goals while taking into account other nation's prevailing foreign policies that may be established against our national interest. Nigeria in the present regime is not following this global tenet and it is hurting Nigeria badly among the comity of nations shown by the lack of interest in Nigeria despite our huge human and material resources; lack of development; dwindling economic fortunes as businesses are moving away from Nigeria to a more stable Ghana and Togo and other neighbouring nations that are supposed to be kowtowing to us. Foreign policies are not forged in a vacuum; it is virtually impossible to influence the outside world when the foundation upon which to do that is faulty. As long as government continues to take faulty steps, there is bound to be a backlash in the foreign policy angle as Nigeria would continue to suffer undue insults and embarrassments and inability to forge great alliances or gain from other nations.

The weakness or outright dysfunctionality in Nigeria's foreign policy has proven distinctly unremarkable, and it is evidently detrimental to the interest and survivability of the nation. There is therefore the need for a paradigm shift and proactive transformational plans to reverse the degeneration that characterized the nation's diplomatic practice. For us to stand tall within the contemporary global community, there is the need to fashion out a new progressive diplomatic agenda that will boost the profile of the country and fundamentally conform to current global realities.

5.3 Recommendations

1. Nigeria's foreign policy in contemporary global context should necessarily involve the country's best minds. Hence, there is need for a major re-organisation of the nation's Foreign Service. Ambassadorial positions should no longer be politicized. Only career diplomats and practitioners who understudy and understand the nuances of international relations and global politics should be appointed as Ambassadors and High Commissioners. The era of arm-chair diplomacy is gone and appointment of kleptomaniac politicians to represent the country in ambassadorial position should be discountenanced.
2. Recruitment into the Ministry of Foreign Affairs should be based purely on merit, and not sacrificed on the altar of political expediency or parochial exigencies. Diplomacy is a game of elaborate rules requiring a thorough professional acumen. Hence, considerable emphasis should be

laid on professionalism through the instrumentality of training. In this regard, the certificate programme designed for the newly recruited officers at the Foreign Service Academy should be restructured to be in tune with contemporary global realities. Similarly, the Masters degree in International Relations and Strategic Studies being run for the Ministry's officials by the Department of Political Science of this University should be further strengthened. The University should provide more congenial serenity for effective and efficient running of the programme.

3. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs should be re-organized to ensure adequate synergy between it and other Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDA). It should be sufficiently funded to enable it discharge its statutory obligations. The number of Foreign Missions should be streamlined to manageable proportion. The Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA) should not just be an appendage of the Ministry; it should be recognized as its powerful research arm and policy think tank.
4. Since the economy constitutes the bedrock of a vibrant foreign policy, government should holistically address the economic challenges confronting the nation. The economy should be diversified and be attuned to the realities of contemporary globalization. The economic diplomacy framework of the Jonathan Administration should be radically retooled to meet contemporary challenges.

5. Nigerians in Diaspora should be properly recognized in the scheme of foreign policy articulation and implementation. They have a prominent role in advancing the foreign policy of the country and hence should be given sufficient diplomatic attention. Their input and intellect should be sought and tapped for the benefit of the country.
6. There is the need for a strong strategic plan and long term projection of the nation's foreign policy posture with a view to fashioning out a roadmap for Nigeria's diplomacy. A realistic and rational analysis of our foreign policy scenarios will give room for strategic calculations of the costs and benefits of the nation's diplomatic practice.
7. There is the necessity for an urgent remedy to the current abysmal security challenges in order to spruce up the battered image of the country. Government should robustly unravel the root causes of the insurgency. The nation's security intelligence should be reappraised while the security operatives including the Police, State Security Service and the National Intelligence Agency should be adequately equipped to fight terrorism. The Boko Haram insurgency must be fundamentally contained and nipped in the bud. Government should not under any illusion or pretext grant amnesty to the Boko Haram terrorists who have been persistently involved in serious human rights perversion. Instead, members of the sect and their sponsors should be fished out and brought to justice.

8. While the internal logic of reforms of the Jonathan Administration seems to be coherent and predicated on the perception of Nigeria's social reality, it failed to address the fundamental problem of corruption which has become a cankerworm that has eaten deep into the fabric of the nation. There is therefore the imperative need to frontally confront the pervasive, corrosive, systemic and episodic character of corruption in the nation.

References

- Aneek, C. (2010). *International Relations Today: Concepts and Applications* pp. 71-83 .
- Abati, R. (2012). The Gains of Jonathan's Diplomacy. Retrieved December 2012 from <http://africanspotlight.com/2012/09/the-gains-of-jonathansdiplomacy- by-reuben-abati/>
- Abba, M. (2009). What Manner of Citizen Diplomacy? (16 July) <http://www.leadershipnigeria.com/index.php/columns/daily> (Retrieved 28/01/15)
- Adeniran, T. (2008). "Foreign Policy, External Image and International Relations" In: Sam Oyovbaire (ed.) *Governance and Politics in Nigeria: The IBB and OBJ Years*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- Agba E (2015). 'Terrorism in the 21st Century: An Analysis of the Threat to Human Existence', *African Journal of Politics and Diplomacy (AJPD)*, Vol. 1, No. 1.
- Agbu, O. (2001). "Nigeria's Foreign Policy in a Democracy: Challenges for the Future". *Nigerian Journal of International Affairs*, 27(1&2).
- Agbu, O. (2009). "Nigerian Foreign Policy under President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua: Challenges and Prospects" in Osita C. Eze (ed), *Citizen Diplomacy*, Lagos, NIIA.
- Ake, C. (1976). Explanatory Notes on the Political Economy of Africa. *Journals of Modern African Studies* 14 (1).
- Ake, C. (2001). *Democracy and Development in Africa*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books.
- Akinbobola, A. and Adebawale, T. (2008). "Nigeria's Africa Policy in the 21st Century: An Appraisal of Contending Issues". *Nigerian Journal of International Affairs*, 34(2).
- Akinboye, S.O. (1999). "Nigeria's Foreign Policy" in Remi Anifowose and Francis Enemuoh (eds), *Elements of Politics*, Lagos, Malthouse Publishers.
- Akindele, R.A. and Ate, B. (eds.) (2000). *Selected Readings on Nigeria's Foreign Policy and International Relations*. Ibadan: NIIA and Vantage Publishers.

- Akintola, B. (2007). "Nigeria and the World: A Review of Nigeria's Foreign Policy (1960- 2007)". *The Nigerian Army Quarterly Journal* **3**(4).
- Alao, A. (2011). "Nigeria and the Global Powers: Continuity and Change in Foreign Policy and Perceptions", Occasional Paper No. 96, SAIIA.
- Alavi, H. (1972). The Post-Colonial State. *New Left Review*, 74.
- Aluko, O. (1981). *Essays in Nigerian foreign policy*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Aniche, E.T. (2009). *A Modern Introduction to Political Science*, Onitsha: Desvic Publishers.
- Aniche, E.T. (2010). World Bank and Reforms in Nigeria (1999-2007): An Appraisal. *J. Lib. St.* **13** (1): 143-165.
- Anyaoku, E. (2013). Remarks at the presentation of two books published by the Presidential Advisory Council on Foreign Affairs, Abuja.
- Badmus, I. and Ogunmola, D. (2003). "Nigeria's Foreign Policy under General Abdulsalami Abubakar". *Nigerian Journal of International Affairs* **29**(1&2).
- Dudley, B. (1982). *an introduction to Nigerian government and politics*. London: Macmillian.
- Egbo, S. (2003). *Nigeria and the World: A Treatise on Foreign Policy*. Enugu: John Jacobs Classic Publishers Ltd.
- Frankel, J. (1978). *International Relations* (2nd Ed.) London: Oxford University Press.
- Gambari, I. (1989) *Theory and Reality in Foreign Policy Making: Nigeria after the First Republic*. New Jersey: Humanities Press Inc.
- Idang, G. (1971) *Nigeria International Politics and Foreign Policy(1960-1966)*, Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- Ikuomola, V. (2011). France to back Nigeria for UN Security Council seat', *The Nation*, Lagos, 22 May.
- Institute of Army Education (1977). "Nigeria's Foreign Policy, 1960-1976". *Nigerian Army Information Briefs*, **4**(1), January.
- Itua, F. (2011). Nigeria's Vision 20: 2020: Myth or Reality? Downloaded August 2013 from <http://thepolitico.com/economy/nigeria%E2%80%99s-vision-20-2020-myth-or-reality/>

- Jonathan, G. E. (2011). Address by His Excellency, Goodluck Ebele Jonathan at President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria at the Retreat on the Review of Nigeria's Foreign Monday, 1st August. Retrieved 20/03 from <http://www.nigeriavillagesquare.com/forum/mainsquare/64643-president-jonathan-review-nigerias-foreignpolicy.html>
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1977). *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Nnoma-Addison, F. (2010). *The United States and Nigeria: Celebrating 50 Years of Friendship & Progress In Pictures*. Africa Media-Image Project
- Obijiofor, L. (2012). Insights. Retrieved from [http://sunnewsonline.com/new/columns/to-serve-and-tosuffer/](http://sunnewsonline.com/new/columns/to-serve-and-tosuffer/SocialSciences) *Social Sciences* 2013 **2(6)**: 212-221
- Ofoegbu, R. (1990). "The Structure and Processes of Foreign Policy Formulation and Implementation: A Study of the Ministry of External Affairs" In: G.O. Olusanya and R.A. Akindele (eds.) *The Structure and Processes of Foreign Policy Making and Implementation in Nigeria, 1960-1990*, Lagos: NIIA.
- Ogunsanwo, A. (2012). "Challenges and Prospects of Nigeria's Foreign Policy in the 21st Century" in T.A. Imobighe and W.A. Alli (eds.) *Perspectives on Nigeria's national politics and external relations: Essays in honour of Professor A. Bolajo Akinyemi*, Ibadan: Univeristy Press Plc.
- Okafor, J.C., Okeke, V.O.S. and Aniche, E.T. (2012). Power Struggle, Political Contest and Ethno-Religious Violence in Nigeria. *Nnamdi Azikiwe J. Pol. Sci* **3** (1): 74-87.
- Okeke, V.O.S. and Aniche, E.T. (2012a). World Bank and Public Sector Reforms in Nigeria (1999- 2007). *Intl. J. Dev. St.* **IV** (II).
- Okeke, V.O.S. and Aniche, E.T. (2012b). An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Administration. *Sacha J. Pol.* the Cabotage Act 2003 on Nigerian Maritime Strat. **St. 2** (1): 12-28.
- Okere, R. (2012). Vision 20:2020 A vision on the death row in the face of dying industries Downloaded August 2013 from <http://www.ngrguardiannews.com/focus>
- Okulaja, A. (2009). Yar'Adua Declines to Recognize Kosovo (July 27) <http://234next.com/csp/cms/sites/Next/News/World/5438548->

147/Yar'Adua_declines_to_recognise_Kosovo_.csp (Retrieved 14/01/15)

- Olukotun, A. (2013). 2020: Failed vision and big power illusions. Downloaded August 2013 from <http://www.punchng.com/politics/2020-failed-vision-andbig- power-illusions/>
- Olusanya, G.O. and Akindele, R.A. (1986). *Nigeria's External Relations: The First Twenty Five Years*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- Onyenekenwa, C. E. (2011). Nigeria's Vision 20:2020-Issues, Challenges and Implications for Development Management. *Asian Journal of Rural Development*, **1**: 21-40
- Pham, P. J. (2007). Nigeria's Foreign Policy: An Enquiry into Sources and Prospects. http://www.ipri.pt/eventos/pdf/JPeterPham_paper.pdf (Retrieved 22/01/15).
- Shagaya, J. N. (2003) *Governance in Nigeria-The IBB Era: An Insider's View*. Jos: Viewpoint Communications Ltd.
- Tafawa Balewa, Quoted in Gambari. I (2008), "From Balewa to Obasanjo: The Theory and Practice of Nigeria's Foreign Policy" In: Adekeye Adebajo and Abdul Mustapha(eds) *Gulliver's Troubles: Nigeria's Foreign Policy after the Cold War*, Scottsville, South Africa, University of Kwazulu-Natal Press, p.62