

**DOMESTIC POLITICS AND NIGERIAN FOREIGN
POLICY.**

**A CASE STUDY OF OBASANJO'S CIVILIAN
ADMINISTRATION (1999 – 2003)**

BY

**ONOJA PATRICK
(M.SC/SOC-SCI./40031/04-05)**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE (M.SC) IN
POLITICAL SCIENCE**

**DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY
ZARIA**

March, 2008

CERTIFICATION

This thesis entitled “Domestic Politics and Nigeria’s Foreign Policy” a case study of Obasanjo’s civilian administration (1999 – 2003) by ONOJA PATRICK with registration number M.Sc/Soc.Sc/40030/04-05, has been read and approved by the undersigned as meeting the requirements/regulations for the award of the degree of Master of Science (M.Sc.) in Political Science, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria. This thesis is original and has not been produced in part or in full for the award of any certificate in this University or elsewhere.

Dr. Kayode A. Omojuwa
(Main Supervisor)

Date

Dr. Yusuf Yakubu
(Assistant Supervisor)

Date

External Examiner

Date

Dr. Umar Kao’je
Head, Department of Political Science

Date

Dr. Odofin A. P
(Post – Graduate Co-ordinator
Department of Political Science)

Date

Dean School of Post – Graduate Studies

Date

DEDICATION

In memory of my Late Sister, Miss Felicia Ajuma Onoja. May her gentle soul rest in perfect peace. (Amen).

DECLARATION

I hereby sincerely declare that this thesis is a product and record of my personal mental and intellectual efforts. I wish to submit that this thesis has not been submitted anywhere else for the award of a higher degree and the first of its kind to be submitted for the award of a Master Degree at the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

I also wish to state that all quotations made in this work are acknowledged by quotation marks and indentation as well as proper acknowledgement of all sources of information/data consulted by means of references. I therefore accept full responsibility for all errors of omission and commission.

Onoja Patrick

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Appreciation is one of the most difficult things to express because words rarely say exactly what one felt. I believe however that the simplicity of the thank you will resolve this difficulty.

First of all I remain greatly indebted and thankful to God almighty for all his blessing, guidance and mercy for giving me the opportunity to pass this experience.

I first wish to express my sincere appreciation to my supervisor, Dr. Kayode Omojuwa who read through my work, critized and gave valuable advice on the study.

I am equally grateful to my Assistant Supervisor, Dr. Yusuf Yakubu, Dr. Umar Kao'je, Dr. Odojin A. P., Dr. Ejembi Enefu Unobe, Prof. Ayo Dumoye, Dr. Abubakar Siddique Mohammed, Dr. Abdullahi Hudu and Prof. Paul Izah for their support and patience in guiding me.

To my immediate family, no amount of words can effectively convey my gratitude to my parents Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Onoja, I say thanks for being a

father and mother and for making this ambition a dream come true. My sincere greetings goes to my twin sister Patricia, my junior brother Peter and John and my sister Joy for standing by me from beginning to the end.

I would be doing a great disservice, if I do not acknowledge the concerns of Mohammed – Hashimu Yunusa, Bappah Habibu, Linda Adejo, and Chukuma Okoli, you took this degree programme as if it was your work and kept telling me “Patrick don’t be tired” may God reward you abundantly.

Others to be mentioned are: Ogu Negedu, Friday Odekina, Mark Acheneje, Raphael Adaji, Larai Ambi, Patricia Obaje, Alami Achimugu, Mrs Juliana Atadoga, Mr and Mrs Laori, Hassan Gayus, Atelhe George, Ilagha Chiefson, Anne Illah and my good friend Solomon Musa. God almighty will remember you people a million fold.

My computer man Mr. Adetunji (aka Chairman), you took your time against odds to work on this thesis. I cannot pay you, rather I will plead with God to bless you.

Finally, I want to thank all the lecturers in the department of Political Science. A. B. U. Zaria who have moulded me intellectually to attain this level of academic endeavor and to myself, I say well done and to God, I plead please do not give up on me now.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AU	-	African Union
ANC	-	African National Congress
BP	-	British Petroleum
BB	-	Barclays Bank
CIA	-	Central Intelligence Agency
ECOWAS	-	Economic Community of West African States
EEC	-	European Economic Community
EU	-	European Union
FNLA	-	National Front for the Liberation of Angola
FMG	-	Federal Military Government
FDI	-	Foreign Direct Investment
MPLA	-	Popular Front for the Liberation of Angola
NEPAD	-	New Partnership for African's Development
NCNC	-	National Council for Nigeria and Cameroon
NPC	-	Northern People Congress
NPN	-	National Party of Nigeria
OAU	-	Organisation of African Unity
OIC	-	Organization of Islamic Conference
SADR	-	Saharan Arab Democratic Republic

- RUF - Revolutionary United Front
- SAP - Structural Adjustment Programme
- TACS - Technical Aids Corps Scheme
- UNO - United Nations Organisations
- UNITA - National Union for Total Independence of Angola

TABLE OF CONTENT

Title	page
Cover page	i
Certification.	ii
Dedication	iii
Declaration	iv
Acknowledgement	v
List of Abbreviations	vii
Table of Contents	xi
Abstract	xv

CHAPTER ONE

1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Historical Background of Nigerian Foreign Policy	1
1.2 Statement of research problem	11
1.3 Aims and Objectives of research	11
1.4 Assumption	12
1.5 Theoretical framework	12
1.6 Research Methodology	13
1.7 Method of Data Analysis	14
1.8 Scope and Limitation	14

1.9	Chapter Outline	14
	Endnotes	16

CHAPTER TWO

2.0	Literature Review	17
2.1	Introduction	17
2.2	Foreign Policy	17
2.3	Foreign Policy and Domestic Policy	24
	Endnotes	35

CHAPTER THREE

3.0	The Impact of domestic Politics on Nigeria’s Foreign Policy under the military regimes administration (1976 – 1979)	39
3.1	Introduction	39
3.2	Impact of domestic politics on Nigeria’s Foreign Policy under Yakubu Gowon (1967 – 1975)	40
3.3	Impact of domestic politics on Nigeria’s Foreign Policy under Murtala / Obasanjo regime (1975 – 1979)	44

3.4	The impact of domestic politics under Buhari's regime	47
3.5	The impact of domestic politics on Nigeria's Foreign Policy under Babangida's Regime	48
3.6	The impact of domestic politics on Nigeria's Foreign Policy under Abacha Regime .	51
	Endnotes	58

CHAPTER FOUR

4.0	The impact of domestic politics on Nigeria's Foreign Policy (1999 – 2003).	60
4.1	Introduction	60
4.2	Consolidation of democracy in Nigeria	61
4.3	Foreign Investment	65
4.4	Debt Cancellation / Relief	67
4.5	Economic Development	69
4.6	Conflict prevention, management and resolution and Nigeria's Foreign Policy (1999 – 2003)	72

4.7	Globalization and Nigerian Foreign Policy	76
	Endnotes	78

CHAPTER FIVE

5.0	Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations	82
5.1	Summary	82
5.2	Conclusion	85
5.3	Recommendations	87
	Bibliography	88

ABSTRACT

Foreign and domestic policy issues are related products of the same political system and are designed to define and implement overall national purposes. Foreign and domestic policy must be mutually supporting if national policy aspirations are to be achieved in an atmosphere of political stability.

The research was carried out on the impacts of domestic politics in Nigeria's foreign policy using a case study method with a focus on President Olusegun Obasanjo's civilian administration (1999 – 2003).

The review of literature on foreign policy and other related material and the adoption of "Realist Theory" which is anchored on interest led us to the conclusion that Nigeria's seeming inaction during the period of study was an acknowledgement of the limits of its power. Against this background the study concludes that Nigeria's foreign policy has since independence been consistently guided by the same principles and objectives. Nigeria's Foreign Policy initiatives and actions have been defined by one firm and constant variable, i.e the protection of the country's national interest.

As a panacea, the study recommended, above all, that Nigeria must involve a "home grown" economic policy and honestly abide by its implementation.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF NIGERIAN FOREIGN POLICY

A study in Nigeria's foreign policy over time has quite often underscored the potency of its domestic contents. Notable scholars on Nigerian external relations such as Akinyemi, Aluko, Gambari, Birai etc demonstrated the influence of domestic conditions on the country's attitude and behaviour to other actors in the international system.¹ The influence of domestic politics on Nigeria's foreign policy was made obvious to the international community on 1st October, 1960, by the then first Prime Minister, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa himself in a moving address to the United Nations General Assembly in New York. He observed that:

Nigeria does not intend to ally itself as a member of routine with any of the ideological power blocs and Nigeria hopes to work with other states for the Progress of Africa and to assist in bringing all other African territories to a state of responsible independence².

Given the domestic nature and the country's size and at the same time natural resources, it was assumed that Nigeria would play a leading role in the continent of Africa. Some scholars even spoke of the country's "manifest destiny" to lead Africa surrounded by small and weak states.³

Abubakar, O.S reviewing Gambari said that; the first phase, one of uncertainty and timidity of Nigerian Foreign Policy coincided with the period of the First Republic (1960 – 65). The major issue at that time were the official foreign policy declaration itself; the Anglo Nigerian Defence pact, the Congo Crisis and African Unity; Negotiations for associate status with the European Economic Community (EEC): the Rhodesian Crisis and Common Wealth relations; and the Arab – Israeli antagonism and the search for a cohesive policy towards the middle east. Nigeria throughout this period operated a Pro- West foreign policy disposition. The conservative nature in her external relations was dictated by Nigerian Federalism which profess three strong regions with a weak centre. Prime Minister Balewa then had a constitutional authority which was not always matched by the political power needed to override these divergent groups encroachment upon Nigeria's foreign policy. The coming together of the two parties i.e

Northern Peoples Congress (NPC) and National Council for Nigerian and Cameroon (NCNC) which formed a coalition government then forced the Balewa government to make adjustment in order to keep the partnership viable.⁴

Consequently, Nigerian foreign policy during the 1960 – 65 period was less dynamic than it would have been if the NCNC had been solely responsible. By the same token, it was far more assertive, Pan Africanist and neutralist especially on the Middle – East than it would have been if the NPC had exclusive control. The need to adjust in order to accommodate the sometimes contrasting views of the governing parties and save the alliance, made Balewa's foreign policy liable to such criticism as lacking in consistent imagination and dynamism and characterized by Ad – hoc decision making which tended to be contradictory and self – defeating.

The second phase of Nigerian Foreign Policy was the period between 1966 – 1975 under which a lot of changes took place at the domestic political level. The Nigerian external relation was marked by active, positive and influential role especially in the continent. The fragile

nature of the Federalism was replaced by a stronger centre with 12 states constituting the Federating Unit. The assertion of the military rule under General Yakubu Gowon dramatically changed the dimension of authority Domestic politics and Nigerian Foreign Policy. The discovery of oil boom also assisted in great measure in allowing the country to play more decisive leadership role in World affairs, as it increased the revenue accruing to the Federal government. The previous low keyed, resistant and often apologetic approach to African affairs had to be changed. The aftermath of Biafra experience was also instructive as the country came up with a coherent policy to her fellow African countries. The integrative efforts of Gowon with the establishment of ECOWAS and the financial and moral assistance to neighbouring West African countries were remarkable. Nigeria's extension of hand of fellowship to the Eastern block countries such as China and Soviet Union was seen as a policy shift from the earlier position. The country played a frontline role in Southern Africa problems by increasing financial and other assistance to the Liberation Movement there. Gowon's active role in Africa later earned the country the chairmanship of OAU.

Similarly, Nigeria led other African countries in breaking diplomatic ties with Israel in the wake of the latter's hostility against Egypt. The nature of the regime and its domestic economic condition explained fundamentally the drastic change in Nigeria's diplomatic style under General Gowon. General Gowon was overthrown in a bloodless coup in July, 1975.

A momentous shift of Foreign policy position was however achieved under the General Murtala/Obasanjo regime. This is one administration whose foreign policy posture was characterized by dynamism as the regime strove to move the country's foreign policy to a more truly non – aligned position particularly within the six months of Murtala's rule. The regime's bold move to recognize MPLA in Angola and the memorable speech to the OAU extra – ordinary Summit Conference at Addis – Ababa in January, 1976 remains a remarkable turning point. Three main factors have been identified as being responsible for this dynamic posture. The first factor is that of increased revenue due to the oil wealth. The other two factors are the character of the leadership itself and the institutional

re-organization of the foreign policy making process that took place during this time.

The next phase in the development of Nigerian Foreign Policy came with the return to civilian rule (1979 – 1983). The external policy of the Shagari administration is comparable only to that of the Balewa Era. Some scholars and commentators consider the Second Republic as having “engendered retrogression” in the country’s foreign policy resulting from its Pro – Western policy. For sure, the period of retrogression began during the Obasanjo regime when the country experienced a “return to subservience” The major factor explaining the retrogressive nature of the country’s foreign policy during the period is found in the character of the leadership. The National Party of Nigeria (NPN) was made up of the most aristocratic, conservative businessmen and a sprinkle of academicians of the same mould. Most of them have economic and social links with the elite of the Western World even if at a peripheral level. This among others made it difficult for them to formulate an independent foreign policy which might necessitate occasional disagreement with the Western powers. Moreover, the nature of Nigeria’s mono – cultural economy with its

sole dependence on oil was such that by 1979, the country's level of integration into the World capitalist system by transitional interests was enhanced as represented by the oil companies. Between 1981 – 1982, the country total export had declined considerably by 34.5 percent and the monthly import bill reached the one billion mark just one year after Shagari took over. Invariably, the regime could not keep to its electoral promises to the people. On the foreign arena, the regime could not maintain the momentum of those progressive actions taken since Murtala Mohammed came to power that continued to enjoy the support of the informed elites.

Indeed, there was recourse to the old order of passive and reactionary posture in Nigerian Foreign Policy as manifested in the country's policy on the Chadian Crisis, OAU and ECOWAS. It was abysmal lack of focus and inability of the regime to respond to the various domestic demands that precipitated the collapse of the 2nd Republic with the overthrow of the government by the Buhari led military Junta in December, 1983. The coming to power of this administration was very much welcomed by the Nigerian public. This was largely due to the total disaster of the Shagari administration. The new government

was well received more so as it claimed to have been the offshoot of Murtala administration. The administration came with the purpose of restructuring and bringing the economy back to sound footing. It also vigorously sought to institutionalize a new ethic of National leadership based on discipline, public accountability and integrity. There was also more commitment to the polisaro and recognition of the Saharawi Arab Democratic Republic. Other policy issues, particularly the expulsion of aliens and the closure of Nigerian borders were received with mixed feelings by the neighbouring countries. However, Buhari's anti – West Posture was remarkable, as it demonstrated its autonomy and status in decision making. Nigeria's diplomatic relations with such powers as United States and United Kingdom became ruptured. In all these instances, Nigeria demonstrated to the rest of the World that she was not ready to take insults or directive from any country big or small, The regime at the end suffered "Support Erosion" with its human right abuses, a situation which made it easy for it to be overthrown.

The Babangida government that succeeded the Buhari regime was described as a Liberal/benevolent military regime especially at its

infancy. The administration like its predecessor was committed to economic restructuring which informed its choice of the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP). The programme had adverse effects on the life of Nigerians, and as expected had serious implications on the country's external relations. The regime's handling of the bombing of Libya by the USA was heavily criticized so also was the regime's OIC policy which almost precipitated serious internal upheaval. It was apparent that the government under the guise of economic diplomacy succeeded in playing into the hands of the Western powers as its economic programme could be said to be anything but humane. The failure of Babangida to respect the peoples mandate with the annulment of the June 12 Presidential election's result, after endless political transition led to the demise of the regime. Following the annulment of June 12 presidential election in 1993, the interim government which was put in place by General Babangida on 26th, August, 1993 did not enjoy the support of a wide range of Nigerians. General Sani Abacha's intervention on 17th November, 1993 was therefore very timely and inevitable given Nigeria's drift towards anarchy and disintegration.⁵

During the Abacha regime, development between China and Nigeria was one of the most prominent aspects of the shift in Nigeria's foreign policy. At this time Nigeria and China entered into different agreements, which allowed China to become involved in oil production, refurbishment of the long – neglected Nigeria Railway Corporation, the dredging of Seaports at Calabar and Warri and the development of Mass - housing projects.⁵ Abacha's foreign policy thrust shifted to Asia, failing to realize that in a globalized world, aligning Nigeria with Asia alone is inadequate. The political heat from both home and abroad continued until Abacha died on 8th June, 1998. Following the death of Abacha, General Abubakar Abdulsalam (rtd) took over as the Head of State of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. He succeeded in conducting a peaceful, free and fair election that finally brought Olusegun Obasanjo as the President and Commander-in-Chief of the Nigerian Armed Forces on May 29, 1999.

Obasanjo's foreign policy under democratic rule has been underlined by Nigeria's return to a place of prestige in the International Community. Particularly of interest in this research is the influence of

domestic politics on Nigeria's foreign policy under Obasanjo's Civilian administration (1999 – 2003)

1.2 STATEMENT OF RESEARCH PROBLEM

The research examined the impact of Domestic politics on Nigerian foreign policy under the Obasanjo civilian administration (1999 – 2003)

1.3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF RESEARCH

The research is aimed at achieving the following objectives:

1. To assess the internal factors that affect Nigeria's foreign policy.
2. To examine the influence of Domestic politics on Nigeria's foreign policy under Obasanjo's civilian administration (1999 – 2003)
3. To proffer solutions on how to improve on Nigeria's foreign policy.

1.4 SIGNIFICANCE / JUSTIFICATION OF STUDY

Following Nigeria's holding of election in 1999 and 2003, International Expectations about Nigeria's role as a regional power in Africa and beyond have increased.

It is therefore particularly important to re-examine the interface between domestic issues and foreign policy in assessing the possibilities and challenges that Nigeria faces in the 21st century.

1.5 ASSUMPTION

The research is based on the assumption below:

- a. There is a linkage between Nigeria's foreign policy pronouncement and domestic politics.

1.6 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The research is based on the theory of realism. The chief proponent of this theory is Hans Morgenthau. He postulated that, the test by which this theory must be judged is not "piori" and "abstract", but "empirical and "pragmatic"⁶ i.e. it must be judged not by some preconceived abstract principle or concept that does not relate to reality, but its purpose is to bring order and meaning to a mass

phenomena, which without it would remain disconnected and unintelligible. Political realism believes that politics, like society in general is governed by objective laws that have roots in human nature. The realist school sees international politics in the context defined in terms of power. Realism assumes that the idea of interest is indeed of the essence of politics and is unaffected by the circumstances of time. Charles A. Beard shows how national interest became the priority of diplomacy when he used it to explain and analyze the basis of American foreign policy.⁷ The arrival of the theory replaced parochial concept such as “National honour, reason of state or the will of prince, dynastic labour” etc.

In terms of its relevance, the theory could be used to explain Nigeria’s foreign policy and domestic politics under Olusegun Obasanjo Civilian administration (1999 – 2003) in terms of actualizing Nigeria’s socio – political and economic interests.

1.7 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research adopted the secondary source of data. These include textbooks, Journals, Magazines, Academic papers, internet and other scholarly materials on the problem of study. This information was

obtained from the University main library and other libraries outside the University.

1.8 METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS

The mode of data analysis was qualitative which is largely descriptive and analytical. Descriptive analysis is an interpretative analysis based on data collection. As regards data analysis, a combination of simple descriptive – analytical and deductive methods was mainly employed. Inferences were drawn from writings and commentaries of other scholars. The method however was premised on the realist theory. Data were largely sourced through secondary source including textbook, journals, magazines, academic papers, internet and other scholarly materials on the problem of study.

1.9 SCOPE AND LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The research covered Domestic Politics and Nigeria's Foreign Policy under Obasanjo's Civilian Administration 1999 – 2003. Principally, the study encountered two constraints, they include the paucity of literate and problems of data collection. The obvious dearth of

scholarly writings on the subject matter imposed certain limitations on the conduct of this study.

These impediments notwithstanding, we are able to make do with what were readily available and accessible, and we ensured optimal systematization of analysis for the interest of objectivity. Thus the work was accomplished within the best possible standards.

1.10 CHAPTER OUTLINE

Chapter one is the introduction, statement of research problem, aims and objectives of research, assumption, theoretical framework, research methodology, Scope/limitation of the study and Chapter outline. Chapter Two is the literature review. Chapter three is the impact of Domestic Politics on Nigerian Foreign Policy under the military regimes. Chapter four is on Domestic politics and Nigerian foreign policy under Obasanjo civilian administration (1999 – 2003). Chapter five which is the last chapter is the summary, conclusion and recommendations.

ENDNOTES

1. Abubakar, O.S “Domestic Conditions and Foreign Policy: Nigeria after the 3rd Republic” (Memmnat) Plaza, Abuja – November, 2004 pp 2.
2. Muhammed, B.G The impact of Domestic politics on Nigeria’s foreign policy (1993 – 2002) MIAD Project (unpublished) A.B.U. Zaria, 2002.
3. Gambari, I. A. Theory and Reality in Foreign Policy Making: Nigeria after the Second Republic (Atlantic Highland, Humanities Press International, 1989) pp. 139
4. Yunusa, M.H. A comparative study of Nigeria’s Foreign Policy under Obasanjo Military and civilian administration (1976 – 1979) and (1999 – 2003). M. Sc Thesis, Department of Political Science, A.B.U, Zaria (Unpublished) January, 2006.
5. Morgenthau, H Politics Among Nations: 5th edition, revised edition (USA) 1973.Pp2
6. Hammon, R(eds) 1978. Quantitative Technique Geography, (Oxford University Press) London.

CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Foreign policy is an important key to the explanation of international behaviours. It is not possible to understand inter-state relations without understanding foreign policies of the states involved. Similarly, a macro-analysis of any country's domestic conditions as a point of departure. The import of domestic conditions as it affects foreign policy attitude and behaviour in the international system can never be over-emphasized. This chapter therefore deals with thorough review of literature on foreign policy, domestic policy, the relationship between foreign policy and domestic politics.

2.2 FOREIGN POLICY

The concept of foreign policy like most concepts in social sciences has no universally accepted definition. It depends on the ideological inclination and background of the authors. As Aluko Olajide rightly observes, "nobody has really formulated a universally accepted definition of the concept of foreign policy and probably nobody will ever succeed in doing so"¹

According to Modelski George, foreign policy is a “system of activities evolved by communities for changing the behaviour of other states and for adjusting their own activities to the international environment”.² He further stressed that, it is a systematic and deliberately selected national interest. Anderson Roden viewed foreign policy as “involving the formulation and implementation of a group of principles which shape the behaviour pattern of other states while negotiating with other states to protect or further its vital interest”.³ However, we must ever have it at the back of our mind that, it is not all international contacts and relations that amount to foreign policy. Only those matters, which originated with or are overtly or tacitly sponsored by the government of states, may be considered as belonging to its foreign policy. That is, only ‘official’ or government directed dealing between nations are included in the concept of foreign policy. Northedge conceptualizes foreign policy as ‘an interplay between the outside and the inside’.⁴ He believes that foreign policy is the manifestation of domestic and external realities. Buttressing this view, Beard Charles said” foreign policy of a state usually refers to the general principles by which a state governs its reaction to their international environments”.⁵ To a large extent

therefore, both Northedge and Beared C. believe that foreign policy is determined by internal and external realities. In the views of Frankel, foreign policy is a dynamic process of interactions between the changing domestic demands and supports and the changing external circumstances. Similarly, Plano and Olton in R. Anderson, stressed that, foreign policy is the formulation and implementation of a group of principles which shape the behavioural pattern of state while negotiating with other states to protect or further its vital interest.⁶

Although there is no consensus on what constitutes foreign policy (definition), but essentially from the above definitions, it is the instrumentality by which nations influence the global environment and through which they realize their objectives. Therefore, any attempt at discussing foreign policy will be incomplete without linking it with national interest. According to Gambari Ibrahim, foreign policy is a projection of a country's national interest into the transnational arena and the consequent interaction of one with the other.⁷ Plano, J.C. and Olton, R. therefore said; foreign policy is the strategy or planned course of actions developed by the decision-

makers of a state vis-à-vis other states or international entities aimed at achieving specific goals defined in terms of the national interest.⁸

According to Morgenthau, H “National Interest is determined by the political tradition and the total cultural context within which a nation formulates its foreign policy”.⁹ He maintains that the main requirement of a nation state is to protect its physical, political and cultural identity against encroachment by other nation states. Buttressing the above are the views of Babangida Ibrahim who said “Nigeria’s National Interest can be seen as: Military, economic, political and social security. Anything that will enhance the capacity of Nigeria’s to defend their national security must be seen as being in their national interest. Anything that promotes Nigerian economic growth and development is in the national interest. Anything that will make Nigeria politically stable is also in the national interest”.¹⁰

In political discourse, national interest serves two primary purposes: as an analytical tool and as an instrument of political action. As an analytical tool, it serves as a conceptual guide by providing the objectives often by a state while weighing an intended foreign policy

option. An instrument of political action, it serves to justify or repudiate a state's foreign policy option and action in the international system.¹¹ This explains the interconnectedness of foreign policy and National Interest. Indeed, the concept that Morgenthau Hans said; "no nation can have true guide as to what it must do and what it needs to do in foreign policy without accepting national interest as that guide".¹²

Buttressing the views of Morgenthau is that is Padelford and Lincoln who said "no nation, or matter how lofty its deal and genuine its desire to abide by them can base its foreign policy on any other than its own national interest."¹³ These lofty statements and comments go to suggest that majority of political scientist and political leaders attach considerable significance to the concept.

To determine the best interest of a nation is a matter of objective reality and by describing this reality accurately, one is able to use the concept of national interest as a basis for evaluating the appropriateness of the policies, which a nation pursues. This prompts nations to do what they do in order to satisfy their best interest by

describing their needs and wants accurately. But as national interest is composed of, and rooted in the values, what people want, therefore, is to identify the values that shape and nourish national interest into a single complex of values as predicated on selective choices. And since some values are preferable to the other, say for example, it is better for Nigeria as a nation to survive than not to survive; it is therefore possible to discover, and articulate our objectives into a single national interest. This ability is to establish a hierarchy of values and to characterize every foreign policy as either for or opposing the national interest.¹⁴ Rosenaeau James expressed that; “the nature of national interest precludes the possibility of a full rational definition”. The core thrust of foreign policy is the protection of National interest of sovereign states of nations. All nations decisively and continuously search for national security, political independence and territorial integrity. Second to security comes the promotion of economic interest, which includes the terms of trade.¹⁵ According to Deutsch Kharl “the larger and more powerful a nation is, the more of its leader, elites and population increase their level of aspiration in international affairs”.¹⁶ This was evident in Nigeria’s involvement in Africa conflicts, especially in West Africa, right from independence. Nigeria

believes that once there is no peace in any of her neighbouring countries,¹⁷ it might directly or indirectly constitute security risk to Nigeria as a nation.¹⁸ From the above, it can be deduced that, foreign policy and national interest are inseparable concepts in international relations, and indeed, the foundation of a states foreign policy is her national interest which inturn directs the course of foreign policy. Hence, the concept of national interests has continued to play a significant role in the foreign policies of sovereign states. A state's foreign policy is not operated in a vacuum. The main instrument in the conduct of foreign policy is invariably the promotion and pursuit of national interest.

According to Ogwu Joy, the major determinant factor for establishing priority of interest should either be changes in external condition(s) or internal demands or both.¹⁹ It is against this background that the research reviewed further the views of scholars on domestic politics and foreign policy since it is believed that foreign policy pursuit is also anchored not only on the views of the leaders or decision makers but also that there are some factors within a particular country that also determine the conduct of foreign politics (domestic factors).

2.3 FOREIGN POLICY AND DOMESTIC POLICY

According to Graham Allison; we have portrayed the development of foreign policy as a relatively simple and orderly evolution from the definition of the national interest to the development of foreign policy goals and objectives, to the establishment of concrete programs and commitments. Were this process to occur in a vacuum, we would need proceed no further. Unfortunately, the real world of foreign policy-making exists within an environment that includes a host of pressures from both the domestic and international political systems. He said; the domestic environment includes political pressures that may emanate from within or without the government, and organizational influence stemming from the manner in which government agencies perform their functions.²⁰

Graham further stressed that; foreign and domestic policy issues are related products of the same political system and are designed to define and implement overall national purposes. Foreign and domestic policy must be mutually supporting if national policy aspirations are to be achieved in an atmosphere of political stability. The development of national economies requires the assembling of

resources from other states, and the expansion of markets across international borders. The ability of a nation to extent military strength in the pursuit of its foreign policy objectives in turn depends upon a diversified and sound domestic industrial structure or help from allies that possess such resources. Both sets of policies, foreign and domestic, are conditioned by the ideologies, popular attitudes, and balance of political power that exist within the national system at any given time.²¹

It was further stressed that: in the absence of a specific threat or opportunity to pursue its foreign interest, a nation's leaders are likely to turn their attention to domestic concerns and entrust the operational organizations with the responsibility for dealing with the routine activities involving other nations. The day-to-day activities of diplomats, foreign trade experts, and military planners tend to concern relatively mundane matters in normal times, and national leaders whose major problems and priorities may be domestic such as economic problems or social unrest-will not want to spend their time and energy on matters that are less pressing.²²

Nuamah Rosemary revealed that; in 43 years of Nigeria's independence three major factors were identified as being key determinants in Nigeria's foreign policy formulation: first the country's ravaged and weak economy; second, the personality and character of Nigeria's leaders and their perceptions of how to nurse and revive the economy; and third, the issue of ethno-religions diversity in a federal context, which more often than not makes consensus or rational issues difficult to achieve. While other domestic factors such as historical traditions, domestic environmental factors, organized vested interests and public opinion have impacted on Nigeria's foreign policy,²³ it can be said that, the three major factors identifies above are decisive in the Nigerian context.

She further said; while policy makers and executors of Nigeria's foreign policy appear to be committed to responding to demands, pressure and influences from the external environment, particularly in the context of the challenges posed by globalization, they also need to respond appropriately to domestic pressures and influences, especially those derived from popular public opinion.²⁴ Thus, the fundamental challenge that Nigeria's leaders face is to nurture a culture of openness, consultation and consensus- building in the country's

foreign policy making, while continuing to benefit from the views of experts.

From a conference in the University of Oxford, the extent to which personalities and characters have influenced foreign policy formulation was stressed. One view was that, Nigeria's leaders since independence have had a tendency to improvise in the conduct of foreign policy.²⁵ However, this view was challenged by other participants during the conference. They argued that Nigeria's foreign policy has been pursued consistently since 1960 within established parameters. The placing of Africa at the centre of Nigeria's foreign policy and the pursuit of policies such as "economic diplomacy" by successive regimes was said to demonstrate a level of continuity in the country's foreign policy that has been evident since the 1960's.²⁶

In a World Bank Operational policies; it was stressed that, while much attention has been paid to the formal aspects of Nigeria's foreign policy formulation – the world inhabited by diplomats, technocrats and national institutions two other distinct aspects or "faces" also feed into the outcomes of Nigeria's foreign policy process. One aspect is

the way in which Nigeria's "fracture" nationhood has impinged on the foreign policy process; and the second is the impact of Nigeria's global reputation for corruption on its foreign policy.²⁷ Both of these factors directly affect the cost of realizing Nigeria's foreign policy objectives.

While the formal institutions of Nigeria's foreign policy are not directly responsible for the limited legitimacy of the state or the widespread perception of Nigeria and Nigerians as corrupt, the task of articulating a national interest and representing this interest effectively to the outside world has been seriously affected by both problems.

In terms of Nigeria's fractured nationhood, the key policy recommendations that emerged from the Oxford Conference are: the need for Nigeria's foreign policy establishment to enhance its own sectoral legitimacy by consulting more widely in the country and by adopting a pro-active stance of explaining its fundamental objective to the wider Nigerian society. On the issue of corruption and criminal activities it was suggested that, active efforts must be made, in conjunction with Nigeria and foreign policy agencies, to apprehend, punish and deter criminal elements who persist in giving Nigeria a

bad reputation. While it may be possible to end such crime, changing the way in which Nigeria is perceived is possible and must be done if the efforts of its formal foreign policy are to achieve maximum results.

On the relationship between domestic politics and foreign policy with reference to Nigeria, Ake Claude stated that however disappointing Nigeria's foreign policy is, it is what should be expected, all things being equal. That, the salient features of Nigeria's foreign policy have been:

1. The marginality of foreign policy itself to political processes in the country.
2. The amorphousness of foreign policy: That, the declaration of principles by the various regimes since 1960 does not in itself denote foreign policy, as is generally assumed.
3. Nigeria's foreign policy since independence has been objectively pro-West and conservative.
4. Foreign policy or what appears to be foreign policy seems to be dissociated from national interest. He argued that, the concept of national interests in Nigeria's foreign policy has been problematic

because of the confusion of the interest of a few with that of the interest of the generality. That the shortcomings in Nigeria's foreign policy result from the nature of our national life.

Ake identified the objective bases of Nigeria's foreign policy as:

1. Nigeria's cultural and political fragmentation. He argued that during the first Republic, the regionalization of political power and the articulation of ethnic ideologies in Nigeria's politics led to the dissipation of energies and interest into different relatively autonomous pockets. He further pointed out that, the consistent failure of our African policy results from the tendency of always trying to seek a common denominator as a solution to all issues.
2. The character of political competition in Nigeria. The central issue here is the incredible intensity of political competition in the country, which results from the heavy premium placed on political power. This total policy involvement in politics, leads to the relegation of the process of government, of morality, and of foreign policy to the background.
3. Integration of Nigeria into the World-Capitalist system from the colonial era. This he argued, has given rise to a peculiar class structure with consequent implications for foreign policy. That, we cannot

objectively expect a comprador bourgeoisie to pursue a radical anti-imperialist foreign policy. He concluded on the note that the conduct of Nigeria's foreign policy since Balewa has made us nothing better than surrogates of imperialism. Although in discussing the relationship between domestic politics and foreign policy in Nigeria, Ake's analysis was half complete because, he simply made a diagnosis without prescribing a cure. The question therefore arose as to "where do we go from here?" "In this respect, it means that the institutional structures necessary for tackling the problems confronting Nigeria's foreign policy as outlined by Ake Claude were non-existent in the country's body politics.

According to Ogwu Joy; domestic influence is in most organized societies an in-built influence system which demands for or support government policies. It also provides bases for interactions between the ruler and the ruled as it justifies or condemns the rulers action.²⁸

Ogwu cited Coplins view when he recognized the needs of governments to generate support as he observed:

..... in both democratic and autocratic states, the leadership depend to a large

extent in the willingness of the members of society to provide support.... It is vital to the decision maker because it makes his stay in office more certain and provides him with the resources to carry out his policies.²⁹

The presence of domestic influence in policy issues are recognized by Gambari when he noted that:

There is a clean linkage between domestic and foreign policy in Nigeria. The way we do diplomatic business and the effectiveness of our positions abroad are related in part to the processes and objectives of our internal politics. Foreign policy provisions are in any case the external projections of interest, which are defined at home.³⁰

Gambari goes further, by noting that in a new state where unity is weak or absent, foreign policy issues are often deliberately used to pursue domestic political goals and ambitions, especially by the

opposition group as was revealed by Anglo-Nigeria defense pact issues. Thus contrary views expressed by public opinion and other domestic influences on foreign policy could be attributed to the large nature and diversities of ethnic groups, the absence of charismatic leader capable of insuring hegemony and the type of issues involved or being examined.³¹

Aluko Olajide recognized the vital role of public opinion in influencing the direction of Nigeria's foreign policy whether Nigeria is under military or civil rule. He notes that public opinion has become a significant factor in Nigerian politics, thus the Nigerian government like any other government must take note. He is also of the view that public interest in foreign policy has been on the increase as a result of the Civil War in Nigeria in which certain countries such as France, Portugal, U.S.S.R and South Africa played major roles which led to growing public awareness on foreign policy issues.³²

Thus, following Nigeria's holding of elections in 1999 and 2003, International expectations about Nigeria's role as a regional power in Africa and beyond have increased. It is therefore particularly important to re-examine the interface between domestic issue and

foreign policy in assessing the possibilities and challenges that Nigeria faces in the 21st century, which is the main concern of this research particularly from 1999 – 2003.

ENDNOTES

1. Aluko Olajide Essays in Nigeria's Foreign Policy University Press (Ibadan) 1983.pp.3 as reviewed by Yunusa M.H A Comparative Analysis of Nigeria's foreign policy under Obasanjo military and civilian administrations (1976 – 1979) and (1999 – 2003). M. Sc Thesis presented o the Department of Political Science, A.B.U., Zaria. 2005.pp. 18
2. Modelski George in Ibid pp. 18.
3. Anderson, R. Introduction to International Politics (McGraw –Hill) 1957.pp. 51
4. Northedge, F.S Introduction to International Politics (McMillan) New York. 1954.pp. 311.
5. See Aluko Olajide Essays in Nigeria's Foreign Policy (University Press) Ibadan. 1983. pp.81
6. Gambari, I. Domestic Politics and Nigerian Foreign Policy for the New Millennium. Pre-convocation Public Lecture, 1998
7. Olusanya, G.O. (1989). Forward in Olusanya, G.O. and Akindele, R.A. (1990). The Structure and processes of foreign policy making and implementation in Nigeria. 1960 – 1990 (Nigerian Institute of International

- Affairs (NIIA Lagos).
8. Yunusa, M. H. A Comparative Analysis of Nigeria's Foreign Policy under Obasanjo Military and Civilian Administration (1976 – 1979) (1999 – 2003). M.Sc Thesis Presented to the Department of Political, A.B.U Zaria. 2005.pp.21
 9. Opcit.
 10. Morgenthau, H. Politics Among Nations (California) 1956. pp.86
 11. Babangida, I. Nigeria's African and the World. Lecture delivered at the National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies, Kuru.
 12. See. Yunusa M.H Opcit No. 8 pp.23
 13. Opcit. No. 10.pp.87
 14. Padelford and Lincoln (eds): The Dynamics of International Politics Macmillan Press (New York) 1986.pp.2
 15. See Yunusa, M.H. opcits No.12. pp. 24
 16. Ogwu, U.J. Nigeria Foreign Policy; Alternative futures Macmillan Press (New York) 1986. pp.32
 17. Deutch, K. The Analysis of International Relations Hall (New York) 1969.pp.88
 18. Opcit
 19. Ibid

20. Ibid
21. Graham, T. A. *Essence of Decision* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971), pp.113 -117.
22. Ibid
23. Ibid
24. Nuamah R., Nigeria's Foreign after the cold war: domestic, Regional and External Influences. University of Oxford – July, 2003.
25. Ibid
26. Ibid
27. Ibid
28. World Bank Operational Polices: Countries Ranked by per capital Income, “The World Bank Operation Manual (Washington, D.C. the World Bank, July 2003) (Available from [http://www/.Worldbank.org/operations/WBOPS/preports/Report.annex .Di.Aspl](http://www/.Worldbank.org/operations/WBOPS/preports/Report.annex.Di.Aspl)).
29. Ibid
30. Claude, A The Relationship between domestic politics and Foreign Policy with reference to Nigeria in Tyoden, S.G. (eds): *Nigeria's Foreign Policy. Summary of the proceeding of a seminar. A national Institute publication*, 1992.pp.19.

31. Ibid pp. 32.
32. Ibid pp.33
33. Wallace, W. and Paterson, W.E (eds): Foreign Policy Making in Western Europe. New York, Praeger publishers (U.S.A) 1978. pp.6
34. Ogwu, J.U: Nigeria Foreign Policy. Alternative Futures (Lagos) Macmillan 1986 pp.45
35. Gambari (unpublished).
36. Aluko Olajide. Essays in Nigeria Foreign Policy (London) 1981. pp. 12
37. Joe, G: An Honour to Serve (Ibadan) spectrum
38. Ajibola, W.A: Public Opinon and Foreign Policy (Ibadan) 1978. pp. 4-5.
39. Ibid
40. Beared C. & Frankel J. quoted in Yunusa M. H. A Comparative Analysis of Nigeria's foreign Policy Under Obasanjo Military and civilian Administration (1976-1979) (1999 – 2003) M.Sc Thesis presented to the Department of Political Science, A.B.U Zaria. 2005 pp. 22

CHAPTER THREE

3.0 THE IMPACT OF DOMESTIC POLITICS ON NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY UNDER THE MILITARY REGIMES.

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Contradictions in domestic factors exist just as in any other actions which characterize the nature of human beings. Domestic influence is frequently used to refer to demand on, or support for government policies, this domestic influence can be viewed as a way of providing a basis for interaction between rulers and the ruled and the international communities. The political, economic, sociological and historical circumstances of a nation are some of the decisive factors that configure its foreign policy. Some of the decisive domestic factors that have influenced Nigeria's foreign policy are the constitutional nature of Nigeria's acquisition of independence, the Nigerian civil war and the general perception of Nigeria as a powerful black African nation. Fundamentally, Nigeria's foreign policy has been quite consistent both in its aspiration and implementation. Shifts in the foreign policy irrespective of regime types, always take into consideration the need for a deliberate and conscious re-appraisal of the domestic situation. The substance of Nigeria's foreign policy has

tended to revolve around certain principles while taking cognisance of the fact that the foreign policy of any nation is necessarily a reflection of its domestic reality. Thus, an indepth look at domestic influence on Nigeria's foreign policy particularly during the Military regimes is based on the following principles; legal equality of states, peaceful resolution of conflicts, non – alignment, multilateralism, non-interference in the internal affairs of other states and the African Centre piece.

3.2 THE IMPACT OF DOMESTIC POLITICS ON NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY UNDER YAKUBU GOWON'S REGIME (1967 – 1975)

The second phase of Nigeria's foreign policy was the period between 1966 – 1975 under which a lot of changes take place at the domestic political level. The Nigerian external relations was marked by active, positive and influential role in the continent.¹ To start with, the civil war left a tremendous impact on the manner of the conduct of Nigeria's domestic and foreign policy. Arising from what the government perceived as having been responsible for the war, and the

unexpectedly long resistance of the Biafrans, a number of lessons and conclusions were drawn.

One is that the country's survival as a sovereign independent state can no longer be taken for granted. Of particular consequence to the conduct of Nigerian foreign policy in Gowon's regime is the realization that it is dangerous to depend on one power block or group of countries or to rely on one source for the supply of arms required to maintain internal security.² Gowon's regime in 1967 facing the glaring situation of the Western power unwillingness to sell arms to Nigeria for the execution of the Civil War, decided urgently to review Nigeria's external relations with them, but for the tenuous link with the USSR which made it possible to arrange the arms deal quickly in August, 1967 the secession would have succeeded. Thus the way was open for relationship with the Eastern bloc which had been closed during Balewa's regime.

The above factor, ushered in a new era in which the principle of non-alignment meant more positively non-aligned foreign policy posture. The effect of the changed conditions and experiences as they affected the application of the principles of Nigeria foreign policy was marked

in the overall foreign policy posture. Africa was moved to the top priority of the nations foreign policy. Nigeria emerged as a militant champion of liberation movements in southern Africa and a vociferous opponent of apartheid in South Africa.⁴ Within this period, Gowon openly declared in the context of Mogadishu Declaration that there is no alternative to armed struggle and the use of force to liquidate colonialism in Africa.

To help extricate West Africa from new colonial stranglehold, Nigeria spearheaded the creation of the Economic Community of West African states (ECOWAS) in line with its principle of promotion of international peace and security and at the same time assured its smaller and weaker West African neighbours that it had no territorial ambition.⁵ The buoyancy of the post-civil war Nigerian economy, facilitated by the contribution of massive increase in petroleum production which brought equally massive increase in foreign exchange earnings, enabled Nigeria to assume a more independently assertive position in foreign relations. And while continuing the traditional economic relationships with Western bloc, supply of substantial technical and agricultural assistance by the Soviet Union,

and China by 1974 as well as cultural exchanges with the two states demonstrated Nigeria's essential non-aligned stand in World affairs.⁶

The experience of civil war made Nigeria assert her principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of member nations and was able to keep the UN and OAU from direct interference in the civil war. General Yakubu Gowon refused to commit the military to fight the Ian Smith regime. Instead, he insisted on negotiation and similar political solution neither did he give any material or military support to the frontline states (Tanzanian, Zambia and Botswana) which suffered the scourge of the southern African imbroglio on the pretext that both Tanzanian and Zambia were against the Federal Government during the civil war. Even in the Angolan debacle, Gowon could not come out openly to support any of the movements despite the fact that the MPLA drew the widest African support as against the CIA and South African sponsored FNLA and UNITA.

This indecision was solved when General Murtala took over power in July 1975.

However, apart from this genuine concern, and despite the bitter lesson of the civil war, Gowon's position was primarily motivated by his desire to avoid open confrontation with western European countries. While General Yakubu Gowon acknowledged Nigeria's dependency, he insisted that Nigeria's could attain economic development by remaining in the sphere of international capitalist system. Thus, until the overthrow of Yakubu Gowon by Murtala Mohammed Nigeria's roles in world politics were guided by the interests of Western and American Diplomacy.

3.3 THE IMPACT OF DOMESTIC POLITICS ON NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY UNDER MURTALA/OBASANJO REGIME (1975-1979)

A momentous shift of foreign policy position was however achieved under the Generals Murtala/Obasanjo regime. This is one administration whose foreign policy posture was characterized by dynamism as the regime strove to move the country's foreign policy to a more truly non – aligned position particularly within the six months of Murtala's rule.⁷ Three factors have been identified as being responsible for this dynamic posture. The first factor is that of

increased revenue due to the oil wealth. The other two factors are the character of the leadership itself and the institutional re- organization of the foreign policy making process that took place during this time.

Although, Murtala never lived long as such, General Obasanjo's policy of total commitment to the liberation of Africa and the eradication of apartheid led to his bold and timely decision to nationalize the British Petroleum (BP) in Nigeria in August 1979. The decision to nationalize BP's assets in Nigeria was not arbitrary or sudden. Indeed, David Williams formerly of West Africa Magazine, wrote that many British firms in Nigeria such as Dunlop and Barclays International had warned the foreign and Commonwealth office that the Nigerian government might take tough action against British economic and business interests if the Thatcher government were to go ahead and recognize the Muzorewa government. Much later, Lord Carrington was reported to have said in New Delhi, India, that the British government was prepared to recognize the Muzorewa government and lift sanctions.⁸ With this, it was believed that the Thatcher government was proceeding to honour the conservative

party election promises on Zimbabwe. General Obasanjo to counter this decided that, all BP's assets should be taken over in reprisal.

The nationalization of the British Company's assets in Nigeria at a time its 300,000 barrels a day could sell for 40 dollars a barrel on the spot market in Europe was considered very painful by the British government whose foreign secretary, Lord Carrington, lost his temper and declared that Nigeria would regret the decision.⁹ Of course, the consequence here was that, as the leading trading partner in Africa, Britain's relations with Nigeria was seriously strained. Britain described the nationalization of BP's assets by the Obasanjo regime as "crude Bullying" true it was because, apart from cutting off BP from access to Nigerian crude oil at a time when the company's alternative sources of oil were not bright, the nationalization led immediately to a fall of about 6.5% in sterling in the World Stock Markets. More to this was that, after the assassination of Murtala, the administration demanded the extradition of Gowon on the account that he knew about the coup. But he refused to come and Britain also refuse to expel him. This created a kind of strain on Anglo – Nigeria relation. The partial nationalization of Barclays Bank and the taking over of the

British Petroleum because of their links with apartheid South Africa were no doubt practical demonstrations of Nigeria's Afro centric and non – aligned policy.

With these, one will say, Nigerian foreign Policy under Obasanjo's regime witnessed greater consistency and coherence in formulation and implementation and it was the administrations' dynamic foreign policy and the emergence of Nigeria as a continental power that won Nigeria a seat in the security council of the United Nations.¹⁰

3.4 THE IMPACT OF DOMESTIC POLITICS UNDER BUHARI'S REGIME

The coming to power of this administration was very much welcomed by the Nigerian public. This was largely due to the total disaster of the Shagari administration. The new government was well received more so as it claimed to have been the offshoot of the Murtala administration. The administration came for the purpose of restructuring and bringing the economy back to sound footing. It also vigorously sought to institutionalize a new ethic of national leadership based on discipline, public accountability and integrity¹¹.

Although Buhari administration did not make much impact to achieve the traditional principles and goals of Nigeria's foreign policy, an important lesson can be learned from this period. It clearly demonstrated how strong country domestic factors are in determining focus of foreign policy behaviour. During the Buhari era, Nigeria was faced with many domestic problems. The attention of administration was preoccupied with rebuilding the country's battered economy, fighting against indiscipline, corruption, drug trafficking and managing external debt burden.

The regime at the end suffered 'support erosion' with its human rights abuses, a situation which made it easy for its overthrow by General Ibrahim Babangida who became the new Head of State of the Federal Republic of Nigeria¹².

3.5 THE IMPACT OF DOMESTIC POLITICS ON NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY UNDER BABANGIDA'S REGIME

The Babangida government that succeeded the Buhari regime was described as a liberal/benevolent military regime especially at its infancy. The administration like its predecessor was committed to

economic restructuring which informed its choice of the structural adjustment programme (SAP). The programme had adverse effect on the life of Nigerians and as expected had serious implication on the country's external relations. The regime's handling of the bombing of Libya by the USA was heavily criticized. So also was the regime's OIC policy which almost catapulted into serious internal upheaval.

The establishment of Technical Aid Corps Scheme (TACS) by the Babangida administration in January 1987 marked a new development in Nigeria's foreign policy, and represented an innovative trend in the country's drive towards the efficient institutionalization of aid/assistance to sister African Countries, as well as Africans in the diaspora.

The Technical Aid corps Scheme was therefore the outcome of domestic and external imperatives. At the domestic level, it responded partly to the need to cut down on monetary and material assistance to other countries when Nigeria itself was immersed in economic crisis. Also, it addressed to some extent, the problem of graduate unemployment in Nigeria by providing highly qualified Nigerian professionals with opportunities for gainful employment abroad. In a

fundamental sense, it signaled a shift in Nigeria's aid policy by making the recipient countries know that rather than expect "manna from Nigeria"; they had to initiate home grown solutions to their problem; to earn Nigeria's technical assistance. The Technical Aid Corps Scheme was therefore a concrete manifestation of the reality of Nigeria's past experience in aid allocation and the conviction that technical assistance was a more meaningful and enduring form of foreign aid.¹³

At the external level, the TACs did fit well within the context of South – South co-operation as a strategy for promoting African and third world development this was most urgent considering the economic crisis that was sweeping across Africa, and the need for these to design an African alternative to externally imposed programmes of economic reform. The TACs was directed at projecting a positive image for Nigeria. Apart from projecting Nigeria's human capital "Power" externally, it was a viable alternative and counter force to the attempt by certain sections of the Western media to tarnish Nigeria's image by labelling it a drug transit center.

The failure of Babangida to respect the people's mandate with the annulment of the June 12 presidential election's result, after endless political transition led to the demise of the regime. Following the annulment of June 12 presidential election in 1993, the interim government which was put in place by General Babangida on 26th August 1993, did not enjoy the support of a wide range of Nigerians. General Abacha's intervention on 17th November 1993 was therefore very timely and inevitable, given Nigeria's drift towards anarchy and disintegration.

3.6 THE IMPACT OF DOMESTIC POLITICS ON NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY UNDER ABACHA'S REGIME

Three major domestic issues in 1994 and 1995 helped to define the character of the Abacha foreign policy. These three domestic incidents, which might have ordinarily been perceived as purely within the day to day administration took on significance that were far beyond the shores of Nigeria and beyond the wildest imagination of the regime. They also became foreign policy headaches for the junta, largely because of their mishandling.¹⁴ All these events bothered on violation of human rights of Nigerians. The abuses however angered

not only Nigerians, but also, largely, the international community. These then became the defining parameters for the measurement of what is called the Abacha's foreign policy.

The arrest and detention of Chief Moshood Abiola in June, 1994; the coup hoax of March 1995 in which several military officers and prominent opponents of the junta including former head of state and his deputy Major – General Shehu Musa Ya'adua, were framed up and convicted; and the hanging of Ken Saro – Wiwa and eight Ogoni leaders after a flawed trial in November 1995, were the three events which attracted considerable international opprobrium for the junta.¹⁵

The above domestic politics and the impact on Nigerian foreign policy are discussed as below.

The annulment of the June 12 presidential elections generated political crises and upheavals, the gravity of which has not been experienced since the end of Nigerian civil war. The interesting dimension of the whole experience, however, was that in the eyes of some members of the international community, the annulment itself was perceived as a gross subversion of the democratization process on the part of the military. To this extent, targeted sanctions needed to be

imposed on the military administration as a kind of punitive measure against the annulment of the June 12 presidential election.¹⁶

It was this mode of thought that informed the reactions of the United States, Britain and other members of the European Union which felt that the most appropriate reaction to the political developments in Nigeria at that time was the imposition of sanctions. In the view of Mr. Douglas Hurd, the cancellation of the June 12 presidential election “was bound to have serious implications for Nigeria’s relation with the international community and the United Kingdom will have no option but to re-assess its own bilateral relation with that country Nigeria.”¹⁷

On the basis of its stated position, the British government proceeded to announce a number of sanctions which included the following.

- a. The suspension of new military training courses for members of the Nigerian Armed Forces in the UK, and the withdrawal of all offers of place on such courses:-
- b. The suspension of British assistance to the National War College, Abuja and the withdrawal of the British military advisory team.

- c. The suspension of the issuance of visas to enter the United Kingdom for members of the Nigerian Armed forces, the National Guard and the Nigerian state security and intelligence services and their dependants;
- d. The discontinuation of special treatment for visa application from official of the Federal Government, State Governments and parastatals;
- e. The review of all new aid to Nigeria on a case by case basis, and
- f. Consultation with other European Union partners and other allies, such as the U.S on further possible measures.¹⁸

On her part, the U.S. announced that she was suspending all forms of assistance to Nigeria except humanitarian assistance which was intended for the people of Nigeria and that which “furthers the democratization process”. The US also expelled the Nigerian military attaches and suspended the travel to Lagos of their newly appointed defence attaches. The U.S government also warned citizen to defer traveling to Nigeria until the situation within the country became clearer.¹⁹

The immediate effect of these sanctions by two key traditional allies of Nigeria was to herald the deterioration of relations between Nigeria and the West. This was because the U.S and U.K actively canvassed the imposition of sanctions by other Western nations particularly, European Union.²⁰

On the hanging of Mr. Ken Saro – Wiwa and eight others, Nigeria was expelled from the commonwealth. The organisation did eventually decide to suspend Nigeria for two years at the end of which time democracy should have been restored in Nigeria in keeping with Harare commonwealth declaration upholding human rights and democracy. In addition to these measures taken by the commonwealth, the United States and Britain recalled their ambassadors from Nigeria and imposed restrictions on arms sales to Nigeria. In apparent support of these actions, South Africa and all the member countries of the European Union also withdrew their ambassadors.²¹

However, the quest for new friends and allies in Asia was, without doubt, dictated largely by reasons of national prestige and economic

necessity. The gradual re-focusing of Nigeria's foreign policy towards the Asian continent by Nigeria state especially under the Abacha administration was a reaffirmation of Nigeria's external sovereignty and a rejection of perceived undue interference in the country's domestic affairs, both of which constitute reactions to political and economic pressures from her traditional Western allies. The pressure that was imposed on Nigeria resulted in a number of adverse effects. The predominantly western controlled media painted a negative picture of developments in Nigeria, thereby denting Nigeria's international image; Nigeria became increasingly diplomatically isolated among its traditional friends even in Africa; Nigeria political stability was exposed to threats which were, in some cases, attributed to foreign machinations, and economic well – being of the country was being threatened by the imposition of sanctions and calls for the extension of sanctions to include a petroleum embargo on Nigeria. This was the situation until Abacha's death in office which led to the emergence of General Abubakar Abdulsalam as the new Head of state of the federal Republic of Nigeria on 8th June 1998. The assessment of the impact of domestic politics on Nigerian

foreign policy under Obasanjo civilian administration (1999 – 2003) shall form the concern of the next chapter.

Abdulsalam Abubakar on assumption of office tried to revive the country's image which was battered by his predecessors. Hence, he took the task of embarking on political and economic reconciliation amongst the countries of the world, particularly the super powers. By returning the country to a democratically elected government in 1999 under the leadership of Chief Olusegun Obasanjo. The assessment of the impact of domestic politics on Nigeria's foreign policy under Obasanjo civilian administration (1999– 2003) shall form the concern of the next chapter.

ENDNOTES

1. Idang, G.J: Nigerian Internal politics and Foreign policy (1960 – 66)
Ibadan, 1973. pp. 5
2. Ibid.pp 24
3. Gambari I.: Theory and Reality in Foreign Policy Making: Nigeria
4. Alkali, R.A. Issues in International Relations and Nigeria's Foreign
Policy (North point Publishers) Baraka press, Kaduna 2003 pp. 195
5. Ibid pp. 195
6. Ibid pp. 196
7. Nigerian Journal of Political Science as presented in Ibid pp. 196
8. Nigeria in the United Nations, 1976 pp. 35
9. Nigeria in the United Nations, 1977 as revealed in Alkali, R. A.:
Issues in International Relations & Nigeria's Foreign Policy
(Northpoint Publishers) Baraka Press, Kaduna 2003 pp. 199
10. Ibid pp. 200 after second Republic (Humanities press) 1989.pp.39
11. Babatope, E: The Abacha Regime and the June12 crisis Nigeria
(Ebino Topsy) 1995 pp. 28
12. Tell Magazine (June 1998) pp. 14
13. Fawole, W. A: General Sani Abacha and the New Nigeria Foreign
Policy (OAU Press) Ibadan 1999. pp 9

14. Ibid. pp. 10
15. Saliu, H. A.: Selected Themes in Nigerian Foreign Policy & International Relations (Sally and Associates) Haytee Book, 1999 pp. 64
16. Ibid. pp 77
17. Ibid pp 78
18. Ibid pp125
19. Yunusa, M. Hashim: A Comparative Analysis of Nigerian's Foreign Policy under Obasanjo Military and Civilian Administration (1976 – 1979) and (1999 – 2003). M. Sc Thesis submitted to the Department of Political Science. A.B.U Zaria , 2006 pp 65
20. Ibid pp 66
21. West Africa, 5 – 11 July, 1993 pp. 1139
22. Ibid
23. Ibid
24. Ibid
25. Opcit No 15 pp. 65
26. Ibid pp. 66

CHAPTER FOUR

4.0. THE IMPACT OF DOMESTIC POLITICS ON NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY (1999 – 2003)

4.1. INTRODUCTION

Foreign policy is a product of complex human thought processes. Hence, it is susceptible to battering by unpredictable transients engineered by the same human beings. Sometimes, the effects of these transients are so marked that foreign policy simply becomes a series of responses to challenging factors rather than the product of proactive decision making.

But, the totality of the status of the country determines what the responses are. That is to say, the impact of the instantaneous domestic setting is constant and predictable. In most cases, the political, economic, sociological and historical circumstances of a nation are some of the decisive factors that configure its foreign policy. In Nigeria, some of the decisive domestic factors that have influenced Nigeria's foreign policy are the constitutional nature of Nigeria's acquisition of independence, the Nigerian civil war and the general perception of Nigeria as a powerful black African nation.¹ But the

advent of democracy in 1999 under the leadership of President Olusegun Obasanjo have changed the Nigeria's foreign policy posture. The new thrust of foreign policy sought to fine-tune the country's foreign policy postures to the realities of Nigeria's domestic circumstances, which were characterized by economic difficulties culminating in corrective reform measures. Also while Africa continued to remain the focal point of Nigeria's foreign policy within this period attention was being focused on issues of managing conflict and promoting African integration. There was a continued emphasis on African development, peace and security such that despite the global dimension of Nigeria's foreign policy much roles were played in the African continent.

President Olusegun Obasanjo's foreign policy during the period of study seems to have been appropriately and justifiably anchored on a number of domestic imperatives.

4.2. CONSOLIDATION OF DEMOCRACY IN NIGERIA

Consolidation of democracy in Nigeria has impacted on Nigeria's foreign policy during the period of study. Repositioning Nigeria as a

champion and defender of democratic values flow from the belief and conviction that desirable political stability in Nigeria as well as in any other country, can best be actualized and enhanced only under a regime of democratic governance and culture, demanded and venerated by the international community.²

The guidelines for the operation of the government are explicit. The legislature is charged with functions of making laws “for the peace, order and good government of the federation”³ the executive power are vested in the president, while the courts have the functions of interpreting the constitution.⁴ ordinarily, the government followed the constitutional guide lines in the performance of its function and the implementation of its policies at home and abroad.⁵

Arguably, to drive home the anachronism of dictatorial military rule in the new millennium and to underscore the close connection between peace and development on the one hand and democratic (good) governance on the other, president Obasanjo wasted no time in condemning the military coup in Pakistan and Cote d’Ivoire and in joining other to endorse and float the doctrine that governments that have come to power through the barrel of the gun must not only be

kept at a distance but must also be asked to show why they should be allowed to continue to participate as members of international organizations to which they belong, given the fact that democracy is the name of the governance- game that nation – states play today.

With renewed emphasis on human rights and fundamental freedom, good governance private sector – led economic development and periodic multi – party elections, it is not enough to merely transit to a democratic dispensation; it is more important to consolidate the gains of democracy and make democratic governance irreversible. The belief that foreign policy can be used to enhance and expedite democratic consolidation in Nigeria has informed president Obasanjo’s practical appreciation of the essential inter – dependent linkage between his foreign and domestic policies. The gains of democracy and good governance, correctly perceived by the Obasanjo’s administration during the period of study, constitute a necessary prerequisite for the conduct of an effective and result – oriented foreign policy.

Nigerians today, unlike before, define themselves firstly in terms of their ethnic identities and only secondarily as Nigerians. The implication is that confidence in the Nigerian project has declined precipitously, with consequences for foreign policy; after all, foreign policy is a reflection of domestic politics.⁶

Apart from the dictates and structures of the constitution which regulate the government, the country's foreign policy also has to be reconciled with the prevalent realities in the country among which is a depressed economy and large external debt of about 32 billion dollars. The ugly consequences of a depressed economy were there for all to see: collapsed infrastructure and social services, mass poverty with a significant percentage of population living below the poverty line, rampant corruption insecurity of life and property, and a nation in dire need of reconstruction. This perhaps may explain Obasanjo's long crusade on seeking debt forgiveness for heavily indebted developing countries, a position he had canvassed at every available international forum.⁸ To tackle the domestic problem, Obasanjo's promoted and attracted foreign investment, setting up of the poverty alleviation programme and was at the fore – front in the processes

that led to the formation of the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD).

4.3. FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Another domestic imperative to which president Obasanjo's foreign policy had in the period of study been anchored was the promotion and attraction of foreign investment, realizing that foreign investment is an instrument for expediting economic development and industrialization in the country.⁹

In seeking to attract foreign investments at this period, Nigeria was faced with an uphill task. In the first instance, being a debtor nation placed the country at the mercy of international lending agencies, which Obasanjo persuaded for debt forgiveness. The country also had the International Monetary Fund's prescriptions on economic restructuring to contend with.¹⁰ The administration was committed to the implementation of the IMF policies and conditionalities all for seeking debt relief as well as restoring investors confidence in the economy.

Nigeria however, in partnership with the Commonwealth Business Council, hosted the common wealth African investment conference in Abuja, April 22-24, 2002. The main aim of the conference was to increase foreign Direct Investment (FDI) flow in Africa and to provide a platform for the formation of new alliances and partnerships.¹¹ But did the transnational Corporations actually provides these foreign Direct Investment in the past years? The existence of communication companies like MTN, CELTEL (V-Mobile) and their likes are enough to prove that the Transnational Corporations actually provided these Foreign Direct Investment.¹² The campaign for foreign investment in the Nigerian economy during the period under study conducted along with other vigorously pursued strategies, has elevated economic diplomacy to arguably the most important priority in Nigeria's foreign policy agenda during the period under study.

Another domestic issues that impacted on Nigeria's foreign policy during the period was the issue of the huge debt Nigeria owed external creditors.

4.4. **DEBT CANCELLATION/ RELEIF**

In its determined efforts to return Nigeria to the path of global reckoning, Obasanjo's civilian administration within the period under study opted for the option of political diplomacy. In this regards, the president was reported to have made a total 113 trips between 1999 – 2003.¹³

President Obasanjo, perhaps more than any Nigerian leader, has in this period, elevated the issue of debt burden reduction, cancellation or forgiveness to the high pedestal in Nigeria's foreign economic policy agenda, maintaining that debt relief through forgiveness or reduction had become absolutely imperative in order to free a large chunk of Nigeria's foreign exchange earnings for use for social and economic development. The administration embarked upon a vigorous campaign to demonstrate that consolidation of democracy depends upon a successful Programme of Poverty Alleviation which is hardly possible under the present situation of oppressive and intimidating debt over – hang. While a few creditor countries and non governmental creditor agencies responded positively, many remained adamant, arguing that Nigeria did not deserve debt

forgiveness and cancellation because it was not just poor economic management, but more importantly many years of institutionalized corruption and systematic looting of public treasury that have been responsible for the predicament in which Nigeria found itself with a debt burden of over 30 billion dollars.¹⁴ President Obasanjo campaign for debt relief was also a strong domestic imperative to which his foreign policy has been anchored. And this was the campaign for repatriation of money stolen from the national treasury and lodged in foreign banks all over the world by corrupt leaders, government functionaries and their associates. This is an important component of the grand anti – corruption drive vigorously and religiously pursued by the Obasanjo administration.¹⁵

During the period of study, Obasanjo in April 2002 seemingly came to his wits end when he expressed his frustration to the financial times. Then he said; “in three years, I went round the world and I didn’t get anything. From April 1999, I went round the countries in Europe, twice over. I went to Japan, to America, to Canada and got good words But no action at all”.¹⁶ Kudos at last to the administration for the plea for debt relief was granted after the period under study.

Despite some limited successes and indications of cooperation by a few governments and banks that had already frozen huge sums of money in specific accounts of the major alleged culprits, there is still a long battle ahead of president Obasanjo in this area of foreign policy. It is on record that the Nigeria leader proposed the drawing up of an international convention which will facilitate the repatriation of money proven to have been stolen and illegally transferred abroad into private bank accounts. Some, of course, have linked the repatriation of money stolen from the national treasury and deposited in foreign banks to improved capacity for Nigeria and many other countries to meet the challenges and obligations of then huge debtburden.¹⁷

Emphasis was during this period given to Africa's economic development.

4.5. AFRICA'S ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The crisis of poverty and development which face the African continent and its people would no doubt continue to influence the actions of many Africa leaders. It is always erroneously believed that African countries lack definite ideology, which inform and guide

development. To overcome this obstacle, it was argued that African countries were required to consciously formulate a coherent ideology based on the African conditions, peculiarities and heritage.¹⁸ Hence, the birth of the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) dates back to 1999. Presidents, A. Bouteflika, Thabo Mbeki and Olusegun Obasanjo were at the time the chairmen of the OAU (AU), the Non – Aligned and the G77 respectively and they seized the opportunity of their unique positions to address the problems of poverty and underdevelopment, peace and security in Africa.¹⁹

The concept of NEPAD therefore has been defined as the collective vision of African leaders to resolve the crisis of governance and development in their region, in the 21st century. NEPAD is therefore, Africa's home grown economic rescue plan.²⁰ Unfortunately, at the domestic level viz – a viz the Nigerian foreign policy it was more of negative than positive impact. This is because at the national level, how has President Obasanjo fared in Nigeria? How democratic is Obasanjo himself? Above all, how has president Obasanjo put Nigeria in order by sincerely, addressing the fundamental problem of power abuse, corruption, weak infrastructure, crushing poverty and hunger,

illiteracy, diseases, unemployment and mental indolence? The president should have also known that he cannot alleviate poverty by deregulating fuel prices. The argument that deregulation will not necessarily lead to increase in prices is dishonest and deceitful, going by antecedents in this country. Deregulation will definitely lead to price increases not only that of petroleum products but also of other goods and services.²¹

While revitalization of the Nigerian economy has so far been the main concern of president Obasanjo's foreign policy, there has been a clear indication and investment of interest in conflict prevention, management and resolution, particularly in West Africa, presumably in the firm belief that peace and development are the two complementary sides of the security coin in any country or region in the international system.

4.6. CONFLICT PREVENTION, MANAGEMENT AND RESOLUTION AND NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY (1999 – 2003)

Nigeria's diplomacy has been an integral part of other African States particularly West African States.

The sub – region has always held a special significance for Nigeria because of its political economic and security implications.²² while relations with West African Countries remained cordial, there were few minor issues such as peace enforcement in the West African sub region, and the politics of the Francophone bloc, which from time to time dampened relations. Obasanjo was confronted by the festering crisis in Sierra – Leone.²³ i.e Obasanjo administration during the period under study inherited the Sierra – Leone question.

Before his election in 1999 he had sworn to pull Nigerian troops out of the country. This was a reflection of the popular sentiment of Nigerians who were skeptical of the country's wasteful involvement of about a million dollars per day on peace enforcement in Sierra – Leone.²⁴ This did not go down well with Nigerian whose own

national economy was suffering under the crushing weight of 32 billion dollar debt.²⁵

The need to resolve crises and relieve Nigeria of its burden was perhaps at the root of the Lome Peace Accord signed on July 7, 1999 between the government of Teejan Kabbah and the RUF Rebels led by Foday Sankoh. A deal facilitated by ECOWAS and witnessed by President Gnassingbe Eyadema of Togo, Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria, Blaise Compaore of Burkina Faso, Charles Taylor then the president of Liberia, and representative of the AU and the Commonwealth.²⁶

Perhaps in a hurry to cobble an agreement together and get out of the quagmire, the sub – regional leaders and Nigeria tried to buy peace by appeasing Sankoh. Firstly, they misjudged Sankoh’s capacity for insincerity by not insisting on and obtaining a firm commitment on disarmament and demobilization of the RUF rebel forces. Secondly, they handed him the economic wherewithal to continue to fund his operations, and in the process stripped the defacto government of economic power.²⁷

Having gotten Sankoh to sign the Lome Accord, the Nigerian government expected that the agreement would be implemented to the letter. The RUF had a different idea. Sankoh refused to give up his ultimate goal of taking power.

The ink was not dry on the agreement paper when the RUF began its systematic violation, by abducting and holding hostage about 34 people, among them members of the UN Monitoring Team, Nigerian Soldiers, British Military personnel and journalists.²⁸

However, Obasanjo's attempt to impose a solution in Sierra – Leone at this period was only a partial success. This was because, in their haste to have peace, the ECOWAS leaders forgot or failed to realize that a lasting peace could not be obtained by over looking the atrocities perpetuated by the rebels.

More to the above was Nigeria's role in curbing the crisis in Liberia. A significant achievement was recorded when Obasanjo granted asylum to Charles Taylor of Liberia in Nigeria.²⁹

At the domestic level, this action attracted criticisms because of the way and manner in which Charles Taylor maltreated some of the

Nigerians Soldiers and press men at the peak of the crisis. The idea of granting asylum to Charles Taylor in Nigeria was also criticized because of the unresolved religious and communal crises in Nigeria. But the asylum became necessary because of the governments desire to maintain peace and security in Africa.

Another issue that Nigeria seems to be preoccupied with at this time was the campaign for permanent membership in the UN Security Council. Nigerian's claim to a UN Security Council seat is linked to its contributions in the maintenance of international peace and security through numerous UN peacekeeping operations as well as AU operations in Chad and ECOMOG operations in Liberia and Sierra Leone,³⁰ while at home (Nigeria) the emergence of democracy also strengthened her prospects for a permanent seat at the UN Security Council.

According to Ibrahim Gambari, Nigeria does not and cannot exist or prosper in isolation from the rest of an increasingly interdependent world.³¹ This also brings in the idea of globalization and Nigeria under the period of study.

4.7 GLOBALIZATION AND NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

At the dawn of the 21st century, the World is in the midst of profound and fundamental changes in economies, technology, politics, culture and even in morals, social values and ethnics. The phenomenon of globalization is the driving force behind these changes. Globalization is a multi – dimensional process. It catalyses rapid and revolutionary growth on a global scale. Its defining feature is the extensive and intensive inter – connections and interactions that generate across national boundaries. It has optimized global integration in the trade, communication, technology, capital flow etc.³²

At the global level, Obasanjo exudes the confidence of a leader who is in control, and this has a positive impact on the way Nigeria was perceived outside during the period (1999 – 2003).

According to W. Alade Fawole, one of his first domestic action that reflected his sensitivity to the Nigerian and the international community was the mass retirement of “political military officers” from the armed forces in order to ensure the permanent sub – ordination of the military to civil authority”.³³ This action he said, laid the basis for a more stable and democratic military – civil relations as

the most viable guarantee for democratic consolidation and national development.

To conclude this chapter based on the analysis, it is generally accepted that a nation's foreign policy is a reflection of its domestic circumstances. To this extent, peace and stability are crucial prerequisites for development. A well formulated and executed, strong and virile domestic policy will not only address the domestic problems but also be a springboard for the forging and implementation of a robust foreign policy. Fortunately, the country is now a democratic is state, the implication of this for Nigeria's Foreign relations is important especially when juxtaposed with Foreign Policy style of previous military administrations. Nigeria's foreign policy has adapted its policy to that of the contending forces in the Global Environment and Afro-Centric nature of Nigeria's Foreign policy has been made more effective.

ENDNOTES

1. Jibril, A: The Impact of Domestic Environment on Foreign Policy in Foreign Policy in Nigeria's Democratic Transition. A publication of the Presidential Advisory Council on International Relations (PAC) (Print + Serve) Abuja 2005, pp. 54.
2. Rafiu, A: Domestic Imperatives of Obasanjo's Foreign Policy Punch Newspaper, 23rd Jue, 2000. pp. 25
3. Fawole W. A.: Obasanjo's Foreign Policy under Democratic Rule: Nigeria's Return to Global Reckoning?. Nigerian Journal of International Affairs vol. 26, No. 2, 2000. pp. 28
4. See section 5 and 6 of the 1999 Nigerian Constitution for details.
5. Opcit. Pp 28
6. Adamu, B: An Evaluation of Nigeria's Foreign Policy under the Obasanjo Administration. A MIAD Project submitted to the Department of Political Science, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, 2004. pp. 53.
7. Opcit No. 2. pp. 25
8. The winning confidence in the Nigerian Project has elicited calls for restructuring, sovereign national conference, confederation, and also

- spawned ethnic militias like the O’odua People Congress, Egbesu and others.
9. For a discussion on the OIC issue, see A. Oluko Nigeria’s Decision to Become a Full Member of the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC),” in G. O. Olusanya and R. A. Akindele (eds), the structure and process of Foreign Policy making and Implementation in Nigeria, 1960 – 1990, Lagos and Ibadan: NIIA and Vantage Publishers Ltd., 1990. pp. 488 – 504.
 10. Opcit No. 3 pp. 29
 11. Opcit No. 7 pp. 25
 12. Opcit No. 10 pp. 34
 13. Babalola, S: Nigeria’s Foreign Policy. Nigerian Tribune, July 9, 2002. pp. 12
 14. Yunusa M. Hashim: A Comparative Analysis of Nigerian’s Foreign Policy under Obasanjo Military and Civilian Administration (1976 – 1979) and (1999 – 2003). M.Sc Thesis submitted to the Department of Political Science, A. B. U. Zaria, 2006 pp. 79.
 15. Opcit. No 10 pp. 24
 16. Opcit No. 11 pp. 25
 17. Ibid pp. 25

18. Eniola, B: This Day. Vol. 8, No. 2662. pp. 15
19. Ibid
20. Oluko A.: Mobilizing Capital Flows for NEPAD. Nigerian Tribune, Thursday, October 16, 2003 pp. 26.
21. Ibid. pp. 27
22. Dunmoye Ayo: Lecture on International Economic Relations (Unpublised).
23. Yunusa M. Hashim: Accomparative Analysis f Nigeria’s Foreign Policy under Obasanjo Military and Civilian administrations (1976 – 1979) and (1999 – 2003). M.Sc Thesis presented to the Department of Political Science, A. B. U. Zaria, 2005. pp. 76
24. Opcit No. 3. pp. 31
25. Ibid pp. 32
26. Ibid pp. 32.
27. Ibid pp 23
28. Africa Today, August 1999 pp. 36
29. Ibid pp. 33
30. Ibid pp. 33
31. Opcit No. 23 pp. 75
32. Opcit No 2 pp. 34

33. Gambari, I: Domestic Politics and Nigerian Foreign Policy for the New Millennium. National Concord, January 18, 1999.
34. Saliu Hassan A: 100 Days of Obasanjo's Foreign Policy: Opportunities and Limitations. South African Journal of International Affairs, 2000.
35. This Day. July 30, 2002.

CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter as stated above, will concerns with summary of the findings of the entire research and make conclusions based on the findings.

5.1 SUMMARY

This research is aimed at finding out the influence of domestic politics on Nigeria's foreign Policy under Obasanjo's civilian administration (1999-2003). For proper understanding of the problem of study, Realist theory was adopted.

In treating this problem as assumption was made that there is a linkage between Nigeria's Foreign Policy pronouncement and Domestic Politics under President Olusegun Obasanjo's civilian administrations (1999-2003). To justify this assumption, relevant literature and other related documents were reviewed and analysed and the result shows that there are interfaces between foreign pronouncements and domestic politics.

Chapter three carryout an indepth analysis on the impact of domestic politics on Nigeria's foreign policy under the military regimes. The regime of General Yakubu Gowon, marked the switch of foreign policy focus in Africa. It was Gowon who first formalized Africa as "the centre piece of Nigeria's Foreign Policy". General Babangida made a radical shift in foreign affairs by initiating a policy of "Economic Diplomacy" anchored on the Structural Adjustment Programme. As a result of domestic problems, the international community treated Nigeria as a Parish state during General Abacha's regime. The regime swung to the East, Asia and Islamic nations.

The Olusegun Obasanjo administration began by redirecting the economic diplomacy initiative of the previous years to present a new image for Nigeria, with a view to attracting foreign investment and debt relief, but still an eye on core African issues.

- The findings revealed that Nigeria's foreign policy has since independence been consistently guided by the same principles and objectives.

- In the pursuit of these principles and objective, Nigeria's foreign policy initiatives and actions have been defined by one firm and constant variable, i.e the protection of the country's national interest.
- On consolidation of democracy, it was revealed that the gains of democracy and good governance has led to conduct of effective foreign policy.
- The impact of dominant personalities in history of Nigeria as the head of state or government has shaped Nigeria's foreign policy. In term of peace and security, the mistake of the past is still there, the private sector have not been mobilize to carryout rehabilitation and reconstruction needs of that region with Nigeria goods and products.

In sum, there is need to observe that a good foundation has been laid since 1999 for a new policy direction. The present democratic dispensation which was re-affirmed in 2003 and her integration into the International Community, has strengthened Nigeria's credentials to play a beneficial role in transformation the OAU into AU and into

effective instrument for maintaining peace and security on continent. She played, and continues to play a leading role in the creation and sustainability of NEPAD which is aimed at transformation Africa's socio-economic condition. Within the country, there are been a transformation of the political economy, the most important development being the launching of NEEDS to consolidate good governance and lay the basis for sustainable development.

5.2 CONCLUSION

From the foregoing, we have established the fact that the premise for taking about Nigeria's foreign policy of the future is the range of changes in the country's domestic and external circumstances.

Domestically, Nigeria has become a fledgling but determined democracy; she has become increasingly endowed with a resilient and vibrant civil society, which insists on being reckoned with in public affairs; and she has also embarked on economic restructuring that has paved way for emergence of the private sector as a critical player, in partnership with the state, in the economic affairs of Nigeria.

Externally, a lot of philosophical and ideological transformation have taken place. Decolonization and the problem of self – determination have become issues of the past. And the emergent foreign policy challenges for Africa, today, since the completion of decolonization and the fall of apartheid are the consummation of African solidarity / integration the achievement of a just world order, and the sustenance of the principle and practice of multi-lateralism in the global milieu, especially with regard to the maintenance of the supranational authority and the influence of United Nations Security Council is responding to global issues and problems.

These global issues and problems have since been enlarged by today's phenomenon of globalization; the seeming compressing of the world and the increasing trend in global consciousness.

This poses a great challenges for the future of Nigeria's foreign policy because the resilience of any country's foreign policy derives essentially from the strength of her domestic base.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

I hereby recommend that there is the need for adequate funding and implementation. Maintenance of peace and security at home should be given more attention against leadership view of maintaining peace abroad while the house (Nigeria) is on “fire”

Nigeria must evolve a “home – grown” economic policy and honestly abide by its implementation.

Finally, Nigeria should pursue the goals of democracy, good governance and respect for human rights at home to ensure the credibility of her leadership role abroad.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LIST OF PUBLISHED MATERIALS

BOOKS

Abubakar, O S: Domestic Conditions and foreign policy: Nigeria after the 3rd Republic (memmanet) Plaza Abuja 2004

Ajibola, W. A.: Public Opinion and foreign policy (Ibadan) 1978

Aluko Olajide: Essays in Nigeria's Foreign Policy. University Press Ibadan.

Alkali, R. A: Issues in International Relations and Nigeria's Foreign Policy (North Point Publishers) Baraka Press, Kaduna.

Anderson R.: Introduction to International Politics (MC Graw – Hill)

Claude, A: The Relationship between domestic politics and foreign policy with reference to Nigeria in Tyoden, S. G (eds): Nigerian's foreign policy. Summary of the proceeding of a seminar. A national Institute Publication. 1992.

Deutsch Karl: The analysis of International Relations (Prince – Hall) New Delhi, 1968.

Fawole W. A.: General Sani Abacha and the New Nigerian Foreign Policy (OAU Press) Ibadan. 1999.

Gambari, I. A: Theory and Reality in foreign policy making: Nigeria after the second republic (Atlantia Highland, Humanities Press International).

Garba J.: An honour to serve (Ibadan) spectrum)

Graham, T. A: Essence of Decision (Boston: Little, Brown 1971).

Hammon E(eds): Quantitative Technique Geography (Oxford University Press) London 1978.

Idang, G. J: Nigerian Internal Politics and Foreign Policy (1960-66) Ibadan

Morgenthau H.: Politics among Nations (California) U. S. A. 1973

Northedge, F. S: Introduction to International Politics (Mc-Millan) New York 1954.

Ogwu U. Joy (eds): New Horizons for Nigeria in World Affairs (NIIA) 2005.

Ogwu U. Joy: Nigerian Foreign Policy: Alternative Features (Macmillan Nigeria Publishers) Ibadan, 1986.

Olusanya, G. O. (eds): Nigerian's External Relations: The first twenty five years. (University Press) Ibadan.

Padelford and Lincon (eds): The Dynamic of International Politics (Macmillan Press) New York, 1986.

Saliu Hassan, (eds): Selected Themes in Nigerian Foreign Policy and International Relations (haytee Books) Illorin. 1999

Wallace William: The Foreign Policy Press in Britain (George Allen) London, 1977

Nuamah R.: Nigerian's Foreign Policy after the cold war: domestic, regional and external influences. University of Oxford 2003

MAGAZINES:

Africa today, August 1999

Tell Magazine, June 1998

West Africa, 5 – 11 July, 1993

JOURNALS

Babatope, E.: The Abacha Regime and the June 12 Crisis Nigeria (Ebino Topsy) 1995.

Oluko A. “For a discussion on the issue, Nigeria decision to become a full member of the organization of Islamic conference (OIC)” in G. O. Olusanya

and R. A. Akindele (eds) the structure and the process of foreign policy making and implementation in Nigeria, 1960 – 1990 Lagos and Ibadan NIIA and Vintage Publishers Ltd., 1990.

Alkali, R. A.: Nigeria in the United Nations, 1977 as revealed in issues in International Relations and Nigeria's Foreign Policy (North Point Publishers) Baraka Press, Kaduna 2003.

Fawole W. A.: Obasanjo's Foreign Policy under Democratic Rule: Nigeria's return to Global Reckoning? Nigeria Journal of International Affairs. 2000

Saliu Hassan A: 100 days of Obasanjo's Foreign Policy; opportunities and limitations "South African Journal of International Affairs", 2000.

NEWSPAPERS

Oluko A.: "Mobilizing Flows for NEPAD Nigerian Tribune". October 16, 2003.

Babalola, S. "Nigeria's Foreign Policy". Nigeria Tribune July 9 2002.

Eniola, B: This Day March 6, 2003.

Rafiu, A: "Domestic Imperatives of Obasanjo's Foreign Policy": Punch Newspaper June 2003.

This Day June 2002

LIST OF UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Adamu, B. "An Evaluation of Nigeria's Foreign Policy under the Obasanjo Administration". A MAID Project submitted to the Department of Political Science, A. B. U. Zaria 2004.

Babangida Ibrahim "Nigeria's – African and the World" lecture delivered at NIPSS – Kuru 1986"

Beared C. & Frankel J. quoted in Yunusa M. H. A Comparative Analysis of Nigeria's foreign Policy Under Obasanjo Military and civilian Administration (1976-1979) (1999 – 2003) M.Sc Thesis presented to the Department of Political Science, A.B.U Zaria. 2005

Dunmoye Ayo “lecture on International Economic Relations” A. B. U. Zaria.

Gambari Ibrahim “Domestic Politics and Nigeria’s Foreign Policy in New Millennium”: Pre – convocation Public lecture at Arewa House, Kaduna. 1998.

Jibrin A “The Impact of Domestic Environment on Foreign Policy in Nigeria’s Democratic Transition”. A publication of the presidential Advisory Council on International Relations (PAC) (print + serve) Abuja 2005.

Muhammed, B. G. “The Impact of Domestic Politics on Nigeria’s Foreign Policy” (1993-2002) MIAD Project (Unpublished) A. B. U. Zaria 2002.

Yunusa, M. H. “A Comparative study of Nigeria’s Foreign Policy under Obasanjo military and civilian administration” (1976-1979) and (1999 – 2003) M.Sc Thesis, Department of Political Science, A. B. U. zaria (Unpublished) January 2006.

World Bank operation Policies: Country ranked by per capital Income, “The World Bank operational manual”. (Washington, D. C. The World Bank) 2003.