

**AN ASSESSMENT OF PRESIDENT MUHAMMADU BUHARIS MID-
TERM FOREIGN POLICY OBJECTIVES [2015/2017]
A CASE STUDY OF THE ANTI-CORRUPTION.**

BY

**BELLO AHMAD ADAMU
13/015488/ASS**

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

MAY, 2017

**AN ASSESSMENT OF PRESIDENT MUHAMMADU BUHARIS MID-
TERM FOREIGN POLICY OBJECTIVES [2015/2017]
A CASE STUDY OF THE ANTI-CORRUPTION.**

BY

**BELLO AHMAD ADAMU
13/015488/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 OFSCIENCE (B. Sc.) DEGREE IN
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND STRATEGIC STUDIES
MAY, 2017**

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that **BELLO AHMAD ADAMU**, with matriculation number **13/015488/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.

.....
BELLO AHMAD ADAMU
Student

.....
DATE

.....
DR. AGBA EMEKA
(PROJECT SUPERVISOR)

.....
DATE

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

.....
DATE

.....
(EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR)

.....
DATE

DEDICATION

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

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I want to appreciate Almighty ALLAH for giving me the grace to complete this work successfully and I also want to say a big thank you to my head my lecturer, Dr Agba Emeka who is also my project supervisor for his unrelenting efforts throughout this research work, and also I want to say a big thank you to my head of department a lecturer, Dr Femi Olufumilade I appreciate you.

My sincere gratitude goes to my Mother Hija. Asma'u Adamu Bello for her prayers and monetary support and also your encouragement. May almighty ALLAH bless you mum. And to my family for their support during the whole process, my big Brother Abdullahi Adamu Bello, My late brother Musa Bello, and sisters for their prayers and reassuring words.

My friends, friends turned brothers for their support in gathering materials in editing Mas'ud, Abdulrahman, Usama, Muhammad, and other thanks and may Almighty ALLAH bless you all.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background of 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 center-piece of Nigerian foreign policy; non-intervention in the internal affairs of other states; policy of good neighbor lines; 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, leading to the demise of economic diplomacy by 1990 as the two international finance institutions (IFIs) disengaged from Nigeria (Aniche, 2009) and (Agba E, 2015).

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) re-engaged 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. Muhammadu Buhari GCFR (born 17 December 1942) is the President of Nigeria, in office since 2015. He is a retired Major General in the Nigerian Army and previously served as the nation's Head of State from 31 December 1983 to 27 August 1985, after taking power in a military coup d'état. The term Buharism is ascribed to the Buhari military government. He unsuccessfully ran for the office of President in the 2003, 2007 and 2011 general elections. In December 2014, he emerged as the presidential candidate of the All Progressives Congress for the March 2015 general elections. Buhari won the election, defeating the incumbent President Goodluck Jonathan. This marked the first time in the history of Nigeria that an incumbent president lost to an opposition candidate in a general election. He was sworn in on 29 May 2015. Buhari has stated that he takes responsibility for anything over which he presided during his military rule, and that he cannot change the past. He has described himself as a "converted democrat".

1.2 STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Foreign Policy is basically about a nation's relations with the external environment. And a nation in dealing with the external environment, often considers its national interest first. Hence, foreign policy is aimed at fulfilling the national interest of a nation. In this regards, a nation's domestic needs is

often what spurs its foreign policy objectives. Hence, we cannot divorce a nation's foreign policy from its domestic environment. For instance, America's need to sustain industrial operations which is the life-line of its economy is the cause of its foreign policy in the Middle East. Nigeria, like America, has had its own domestic needs overtime. However, over the years the Nigerian foreign policy had been a subject of debate and questions had always arisen if the country's foreign policy correlated with the Nigerian domestic needs. This was in view of the consistent commitment by previous Nigerian governments to solve Africa's problems to the neglect of the Nigerian problem.

However, from the Shehu Yar'Adua and Goodluck Jonathan era in the present fourth republic, scholars have argued that the Nigerian foreign policy delved more into citizen diplomacy, as a major shift from the traditional Nigerian foreign policy that was highly afro-centric. But when Muhammadu Buhari assumed office from Goodluck Jonathan as Nigeria's president on May 29, 2015 he prioritized the Nigerian foreign policy to be based on Nigeria's most basic needs at the time. These needs were security, eliminating corruption, and economic revamp.

The issue of security was timely because Buhari assumed office at a time the insurgency in the north-east was presenting a dangerous challenge to the country. During this time, Boko Haram were defeating the Nigerian army in the battlefield and taking territories, and there was a risk that the country could

become a failed state like Somalia, Libya etc. Also, before he assumed office, there was a high sense of abuse of public funds by political office holders under the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) led administration. With huge assets acquired by public officers, money laundering, numerous uncompleted projects, it was quite clear that government of the day was not doing enough to stamp out corruption. On the other hand, the government was viewed as corrupt itself. In his numerous campaigns prior to his election, Buhari had asserted that stamping out corruption would be one of the cardinal points of his administration. In some of his electioneering campaign, he was famously noted for saying, “if we do not destroy corruption, corruption would destroy us”. And his believe was that a major strategy in defeating corruption would involve the cooperation of many western countries where Nigeria’s stolen funds have been stalked. His believe then, was that if corruption were defeated, Nigeria’s economy would naturally revamp besides other government policies that would attract investors to further boost the economy.

The government of Muhammadu Buhari is two years old since May 29, 2017. This research therefore, is basically an assessment of the mid-term foreign policy objectives of the Buhari administration. The research investigates the extent Buhari’s foreign policy objectives have been achieved in the mid-term of his present tenure. The research would focus more on how much he has succeeded in gaining western support in the fight against insurgency and in the

fight to recover looted funds stalked in foreign banks. Also, the research would also investigate the extent the president has convinced his western allies to assist in boosting the Nigerian economy.

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS.

What are the major foreign policy objectives of President Muhammadu Buhari's administration?

To what extent in President Muhammadu Buhari's foreign policy successful in midterm?

What the challenges faced by Buhari administration in carrying out his foreign policy objectives?

How can the foreign policy objectives of the Buhari administration be better executed?

Objectives of the Study

1. To identify the major foreign policy objective of the Buhari administration.
2. To identify the domestic determinant of the foreign policy of the Buhari administration.
3. Assess President Buhari's foreign policies in his years of office.

Scope of the Study

The scope of this work is a an assessment of the foreign policy of the Muhammadu Buhari's administration between **2015/2017**

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.

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.

Significance of the Study

The major challenge to this is the time frame. The bound of the study is limit a researcher to little suitable materials to assess the foreign policy of President Muhammadu Buhari indicate that Nigerians foreign policy has change Africa to more global affair.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

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. What are the inputs which flow into it and 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.

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 short-term 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.

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 on lookers in a fast moving world.

President Buhari's war against corruption unstoppable – Presidency ON APRIL 2, 2017

A presidential spokesman, Malam Garba Shehu, said that President Muhammadu Buhari's led administration has vowed to fight corruption to standstill in spite of strong resistance by some individuals and groups to thwart these efforts. Shehu, who is the Senior Special Assistant on Media and Publicity to the President, made this known in a statement issued in Abuja on Sunday. He stressed that the war against perfidy and corruption by the Buhari administration would not stop despite the opposition against it in some quarters. The Presidential aide, who featured on a radio programme tagged, 'Hannu Da Yawa' at the Federal Radio Corporation of Nigeria, Kaduna zonal station, on Saturday, maintained that the Presid

ent declared rooting out corruption as one of the cardinal policies of his election campaign.

“Let me say one thing. Those whose illicit ways of accumulating money have been stopped will criticize this government but all that will not derail the unfaltering commitment of the President Muhammadu Buhari’s administration to the war against corruption. He is aware that this was one of the main reasons why Nigerians in their millions put their trust in him; the main reason they voted him into power in 2015. To keep that trust of ordinary Nigerians who voted him into the office, he has vowed to give corruption a good fight. He will not let them down,” he said. Shehu admitted that so far, the battle to uproot corruption from Nigeria has not been easy. According to him, corruption has been fighting back vehemently, finding accomplices in various forms and guises but reassured that the Buhari administration will not relent. “Nothing will return our country to those sad, old days of wanton thievery that have plunged us into the economic mess from which Nigeria is currently recovering.

“The war against corruption in Nigeria is one of those clashes between good and evil, where good is determined to triumph.” He dismissed the insinuation that some members of the governing party, the All Progressives Congress (APC) were being spared in the ongoing campaign against corruption, saying “all are equal before the law”.

Shehu disclosed that upon directives by the President, the National Hajj Commission had carried out an audit of accommodation agents in both Makkah and Madina in Saudi Arabia, as parts of measures to promote transparency. He revealed that a saving of more than 16.7 million dollars was realized from the exercise. “Each Hajj pilgrim is being saved between 600 to 1,000 Saudi Riyals, which is about N60,000 – N100,000 from accommodation, money that had lined the pockets of agents in the past. “This year, houses are being rented directly from owners.”

Shehu also lauded those fearless ordinary citizens for embracing the whistleblower policy by “taking extraordinary risks” to expose corruption in the society.

On the ongoing relocation of international flight services to Kaduna Airport, the Presidential aide challenged the government and people of Kaduna state to devise ways by which the social and economic benefits brought to the state did not depart the city after the rehabilitation of the Abuja airport. “The government of Nigeria has done a big thing for Kaduna. You must show appreciation to this by supporting the administration,” he said.

While referring to the “massive cash releases for capital projects in excess of a record of one trillion Naira under the 2016 budget”, Shehu reiterated the determination of the Buhari administration to complete some developmental projects.

He said this is meant to uplift the quality of life of all Nigerians irrespective of their geo-political backgrounds. He acknowledged the Minister of Power, Works and Housing, Babatunde Fashola with the record of being the first ever Minister to ride on all the federal roads across the nation.

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, 2012).

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,CHANGE IN NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY AND ANTI-CORRUPTION

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 these 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 advice 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 it 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 state hood 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 pay 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 Bakassi 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 had 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 Bakassi 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.

REFERENCES

- Adebayo, A. A. (1975). *Nigeria's foreign policy and the African continent*. Lagos: Nigerian Institute of International Affairs.
- Ademoyega, A. (1981). *Why we struck: The story of the first Nigerian coup*. Ibadan: Evans Brothers.
- Agba E (2015). 'Nigeria's Rising External Debt in the Post Debt Relief Era: Dangers of a New External Debt Burden', *Journal of Arts and Social Sciences (CASS)*. Ibadan: Baba Ventures. ISSN: 2408-5316
- Ake, C. (1976). *The political economy of Africa*. London: Longman.
- Ake, C. (1981). *A political economy of Africa*. London: Longman.
- Ake, C. (1985). *Political economy of Nigeria*. London: Longman.
- Ake, C. (2001). *Democracy and development in Africa*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Alavi, H. (1972). *The state in post-colonial societies: Pakistan and Bangladesh*. *New Left Review*, 74, 59–81.
- Aluko, O. (1981). *Essays in Nigerian foreign policy*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Aneek, C. (2010). *Foreign policy analysis*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Aniche, E. T. (2009). *Nigerian foreign policy and economic diplomacy: An assessment*. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 3(2), 52–60.
- Aniche, E. T. (2010). *Economic diplomacy and Nigeria's national development*. *Journal of International Politics and Development*, 8(1), 113–129.
- Dudley, B. J. (1982). *An introduction to Nigerian government and politics*. London: Macmillan.

- Frankel, J. (1978). *International relations in a changing world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1977). *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Modelski, G. (1962). *A theory of foreign policy*. London: Pall Mall Press.
- Nwokedi, E. (1986). Nigerian foreign policy and African affairs. In O. Aluko (Ed.), *Nigeria's foreign relations* (pp. 45–67). Ibadan: University Press.
- Okafor, E. E., Aniche, E. T., & Okeke, V. O. S. (2012). State, governance and human rights in Nigeria. *African Journal of Governance and Development*, 1(1), 23–40.
- Okeke, V. O. S., & Aniche, E. T. (2012a). Nigerian foreign policy and global economic institutions. *Journal of International Relations*, 6(1), 88–104.
- Okeke, V. O. S., & Aniche, E. T. (2012b). State autonomy and class struggle in Nigeria. *African Journal of Political Economy*, 4(2), 61–79.
- Olusanya, G. O., & Akindele, R. A. (1986). *Nigeria's external relations: The first twenty-five years*. Ibadan: University Press.
- Pham, J. P. (2007). *Nigeria: Assessing risks to stability*. Washington DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies.