FOREIGN POLICY AND NIGERIA'S NATIONAL INTEREST: AN ASSESSMENT OF YAR'ADUA AND JONATHAN'S ADMINISTRATIONS (2007 – 2015)

BY

MUSTAPHA HANAFI- IDIARO

(MSc/Soc-Sci/10751/2008/09)

New Reg. No: P16SSPS8389

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER OF SCIENCE (MSc) DEGREE IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES,
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES,
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,
ZARIA

JUNE, 2018

DECLARATION

I declare that this dissertation entitled **Foreign Policy and Nigeria's National Interest: An Assessment of Yar'Adua and Jonathan's Administration (2007 – 2015)** was undertaken by me in the Department of Political Science and International Studies of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. The information derived from the literature has been duly acknowledged in the text and a list of references provided. No part of this dissertation was previously presented for another degree at this or any other institution. I however take full responsibility of any error found therein as perfection is attributable only to God Almighty.

Mustapha Hanafi- Idiaro …….. June, 2018.

CERTIFICATION

This dissertation entitled**" Foreign Policy and Nigeria's National Interest: An Assessment of Yar'Adua and Jonathan's Administrations (2007–2015)** by Mustapha Hanafi-Idiaro has met the regulations governing the award of Master of Science degree in Political Science of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

PROF. UMAR M. KA'OJE	**……..**	**……**
Chairman, Supervisory Committee	**Signature**	**Date**
PROF. YUSUFU A. YAKUBU	**……**	**…….**
Member, Supervisory Committee	**Signature**	**Date**
DR. ALIYU YAHAYA	**…….**	**……..**
Head of Department	**Signature**	**Date**
PROF. S. Z. ABUBAKAR	**……..**	**……**
Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies	**Signature**	**Date**

DEDICATION

This research work is dedicated to the following people:

My late father, Alhaji Hanafi Idiaro for bequeathing the legacy of integrity, discipline and humility;

My beloved mum, Alhaja Ummuhani Hanafi- Idiaro for labouring so hard for us (her children) to be successful in life;

My darling wife, Hussainat Taiwo Idiaro for her wonderful love, care and support.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All praise and adoration are due to Almighty Allah-the Beginning and the End; the Beneficent, the Merciful- who has made the beginning, the rigours and the conclusion of this work possible. My immense gratitude goes to my Supervisors- Prof. Umar Mohammed Ka'oje and Prof. Yusufu A. Yakubu, both of whom thoroughly guided me from their unique intellectual endowments and scholarly experiences, in the course of carrying out this research. Out of their very tight schedules, they patiently read through and listen to my submissions and offered very useful advice that culminated in the completion of this work.

As could be seen from my extensive references, I have benefitted immensely from the works of other scholars and I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to them.

My hearty regards and gratitude to all my Lecturers in the department for imparting the general knowledge of Politics and International Relations in us with every sense of dedication, commitment and hard work which have given us the opportunity to proudly say (anywhere) that we were taught by them. They include Professors Ayo R. Dunmoye, Paul. P. Izah and Ejembi A. Unobe, Kayode Omojuwa, Hudu A. Ayuba, Dr Saddique Mohammed, Dr Isah M. Abbas, Dr Edgar Agubamah, Dr Samaila Shehu, Mal. Aminu Garba, Late Doctors Sabo Bako and Peter Odofin, Late Mal. Saidu Adamu, and late Mr Paul Mutfwang. And my very good friends- Dr. Genyi George, Mal. Umaru Tanko Abdullahi and Dr. Jacob Audu, for their encouragement and useful advice. I am also indebted to Mal. Kamar Hamza and Mal. Aminu Kwasau of Kaduna State University (Ph.D students in the department) . I pray God Almighty to bless them all.

I am greatly indebted to my lovely wife - Mrs Hussainat Taiwo Idiaro and expressing my heartfelt appreciation to her for her love, care and support from the beginning of our conjugal lives till this moment. She contributed her all to the success of this work. My beloved children are also appreciated for always encouraging me by reminding their Daddy on the writing of his Thesis. They are Fatima Nyass, Hafsat, Ummi and Sheikh Ibrahim. Also my siblings for their love and prayers. May God bless them too.

For believing in my ability to succeed, despite the odds, I will continue to be grateful to the following people who have contributed immensely and positively to my life. They are Fadheelat Sheikh Muhammad Nurul Faydah Cisse Ilorin, Professor Sulayman A. Shittu of U.I. Ibadan, Professor and Hajiya K. A. Bello of A.B.U.Zaria, Mrs Mairo M. Umar (Principal, Kaduna Polytechnic Demonstration Secondary School, Kaduna),Mal. AbdulKadir B. Abba (Deputy Registrar Academic Affairs, Kaduna Polytechnic), my bossom friends - Issa Hanafi Agaka, AbdulWahab Jamiu, Muhammad Awwal Abdullahi, Ma'aruf Adebayo Hussein, Muftau O. Moronfoye, Alhaji Usman Yusuf, Dr. Saeed Ahmed, Ustaz Isma'il Mabruk Adebanwa,Mr Charles Ikpeme,Ezekiel Egbo Afubu, and AbdulAzeez Olawale Shittu.

My wonderful MSc classmates can never be forgotten. Notable among them are: Adamu Mu'azu AbdulKareem, Zachariah 'Zacks' Haruna, Awatt Asukwo, Mal. AbdulRazaq, Ghani Dass, Athletico Ibrahim Adamu Gombe, Umar Mohammed Jada, Sylvester Egwurube, Bello Harris, Munirudeen Ibrahim, John Mataimaki, Haruna Ja'e, Bem Tativ Elijah and Mrs. Khadijah Gumbi.

And to all who have contributed in one way or the other to this achievement, I say thank you and God bless!

ABSTRACT

This work is undertaken to give a lucid assessment of Nigeria's foreign policy and national interest with particular focus on the policy thrusts adopted by both the Yar'Adua and Jonathan's administration from 2007 to 2015. The work examines the trends in Nigeria's foreign policy since independence to 2015. Although, many scholarly works have been done on Nigeria's foreign policy trends since independence, but very little of specific attempts have been made to articulate the need for re-direction of Nigeria's foreign policy. The work is a deliberate effort aimed at directing intellectual attention to the reasons why Nigeria's foreign policy vis a vis her national interest should be re-directed from ***Africa-centered.*** *In order to give credence to the research and obtain adequate and reliable information for the study, primary and secondary data were utilized. Interviews were conducted, structured questionnaires were administered. Some members of staff of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, foreign policy scholars/analysts and some serving and retired Diplomats provided the primary data while the secondary data were obtained from related books, seminar/conference papers, journals, newspapers/magazines, internet and government publications. The study uses survey method as its research design. The choice of this research technique was informed by the descriptive nature of the research problem and also to give credence to the research findings. Structured observations were also used in the course of the research..The work has been able to come up with some findings in closing the long-standing gap which referred Nigeria as 'Big Brother' to other African countries in need of assistance to the detriment of her growth and development. The work has also brought out the fact that* ***Citizen Diplomacy****(foreign policy thrust adopted by the Yar'Adua's administration) amongst other foreign policy thrusts of successive governments (including that of Jonathan's), is more desirable as it has promoted the prosperity and survival of Nigerian citizens both at home and in the diaspora. The thrust has further connected diplomacy to governance by emphasizing the ideals of citizenship and the need for citizens' participation in decision-making process, particularly in Nigeria, amongst others. In order to have a comprehensive analysis and understanding of the focus of this study, two theories were considered as a framework of analysis (Critical Theory and Social Constructivist Theory), but Social Constructivism was adopted.*

Keywords: *Foreign Policy, National Interest, Diplomacy, Social Constructivism*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page …… …….i

Declaration ……. …….ii

Certification …….. …….iii

Dedication ……iv

Acknowledgement ……. …….v

Abstract …… …….vii

Table of Content …….. ……...viii

CHAPTER ONE: GENERAL BACKGROUND

Introduction…….....1

1.1 Statement of the Problem ……..2

1.2 Research Questions/Objectives of the Study ……..……3

1.3 Objectives of the Study……4

1.4 Research Assumptions……4

1.5 Significance of the Study ……5

1.6 Scope and Limitations ……5

1.7 Organization of the Study……..……..6

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction ……..8

2.1 National Interest…… 8

2.2 Nigeria's Foreign Policy Objectives…… ……..10

2.3 Principles of Nigeria's Foreign Policy ……12

2.4 Determinants of Nigeria's Foreign Policy ……..14

2.5 Instruments for Conducting Nigeria's Foreign Policy ……15

2.6 Conceptual Clarifications and Definitions ……..17

2.6.1 Diplomacy ……17

2.6.2 Foreign Policy ……19

2.6.3 Foreign Policy Making and Its Conditioning Factors ……..20

2.6.4 Foreign Policy Process ……..25

2.6.5 Making of Nigeria's Foreign Policy ……33

2.7 Overview of Nigeria's Foreign Policy Since Independence ……34

2.7.1 Balewa's Foreign Policy ……34

2.7.2 Ironsi's Foreign Policy ……37

2.7.3 Gowon's Foreign Policy ……37

2.7.4 Murtala/Obasanjo's Foreign Policy ……38

2.7.5 Shehu Shagari's Foreign Policy ……..40

2.7.6 Buhari's Foreign Policy ……...41

2.7.7 Babangida's Foreign Policy ……42

2.7.8 Abacha's Foreign Policy …… 44

2.7.9 Abdulsalami Abubakar's Foreign Policy ……46

2.7.10 Obasanjo's Foreign Policy……46

2.7.11 Yar'Adua's Foreign Policy ……49

2.8 Citizen Diplomacy As a Concept ……..51

2.9 Assessment of Yar'Adua's Citizen Diplomacy ……53

2.9.1 Critique of Citizen Diplomacy ……56

2.10 Goodluck Jonathan's Foreign Policy ……58

2.10.1 Assessment of Jonathan's Economic Diplomacy ……60

2.10.2 Critique of Jonathan's Economic Diplomacy ……..63

2.11 Theoretical Framework ……65

2.11.1 Relevance of Social Constructivist Theory ……67

2.12 Summary ……67

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design……69

3.2 Method of Data Collection ……..69

3.3 Primary Source of Data……69

3.4 Secondary Source of Data……70

3.5 Research Instrument and Administration ……70

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1.0 Data Presentation……..72

4.1.1 Data Analysis……73

4.2.0 Respondents' Profile……73

4.2.1 Test of Hypothesis One……73

4.3.0 Test of Hypothesis Two……74

4.4.0 Test of Hypothesis Three……75

4.5.0 Discussion of Findings……78

4.5.1 Data Source Triangulation……79

4.5.2 Methodology Triangulation……..79

4.5.3 Theory Triangulation……79

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary……81

5.2 Conclusion ……81

5.3 Recommendations …….....83

References …….87

Appendix I (Questionnaire for Staff of the Foreign Affairs Ministry)…….....94

Appendix II (Questionnaire for Foreign Policy Scholars/Analysts and Diplomats)….....96

Appendix III (List of Interviewees)……..……..97

LIST OF TABLES

Test of Hypothesis One ……..73
Test of Hypothesis Two ……..74
Test of Hypothesis Three ……76

CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL BACKGROUND

1.0 Introduction

After the Second World War in 1945, the foreign policy direction of most developing nations was to liberate themselves from the shackles of colonialism and adjusting themselves to the politics of bi-polarism. Fifty years after, most African countries have been liberated. The cold war between the western capitalist bloc and the eastern socialist bloc no longer exists. From the fall of the Berlin wall, there was an emergence of a new world order. Foreign policy in the contemporary world has taken a completely new shape. The dynamics that now shape relations between states are informed by more complex issues than was traditionally the case.

The world was faced with such new realities as bad governance, poverty, civil war, terrorism, environmental degradation, threat to nuclear war, piracy, illegal oil bunkering, proliferation of small arms and light weapons and trans-national crimes among others. Nigerians and their successive leaders were clamouring for change of Nigeria's foreign policy direction to meet the emerging trends in the international system. The foreign policy of Nigeria, among other things, had placed emphasis on Africa and the enhancement of international cooperation for the consolidation of world peace. Nigeria's foreign policy has for much of the period of her independence been a definitive declaration of Africa as the centre-piece of her foreign policy thrust. Issues like decolonization, anti-apartheid, and the pursuit of peace in Africa and the world at large constituted the central focus for so long in the country's foreign policy pursuit to the detriment of the Nigerian nation and its people.

The changing realities of the global situation in terms of the complete decolonization of the African continent, the collapse of apartheid policies and regime, and the new concern about

globalization coupled with the negative residual effects of the **'African-centered'** policy on the Nigerian domestic situations such as economic backwardness, ethno-regional/religious crises and political instability have made change in Nigeria's foreign policy thrust inevitable.

However, the African centeredness of Nigeria's foreign policy has been criticized by scholars in that it became very glaring that such conventional orientation of thrusting Nigeria's external behavior upon frivolous magnanimity, or unrewarding love for her African neighbours. Over the years, Nigeria's Africa-centered policy had not given Nigeria and her citizens the required respect and dividends. We are giving and we are not getting. Therefore, Nigeria's foreign policy should seek to improve the welfare and living conditions of Nigerians. Nigeria's national interest must be re-assessed to aid our developmental aspirations. Thus the assessment of foreign policies and national interest pursued by both Yar'Adua and Jonathan's administrations.

In consideration of the problems engendered by the 'Africa-centered' policy on Nigeria and Nigerians, this chapter will explain salient problems that prompted this research work, the significance of the study, research assumptions, data and methodology, objectives of the study, scope and limitations as well as the organization of the work.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

This study, while corroborating Robinson, in Roseau (1969) that the primary interest of all nations is security of national territory and in safeguarding the lives and values of the citizens (wherever they may choose to live), observed that African-centered foreign policy of Nigeria had not adequately safeguarded her citizens' lives and values. While Okolie

(2007) also refers to foreign policy as protecting, maximizing and promoting the prescribed national interest of a given state, the work equally observed that the Afrocentric foreign policy of Nigeria had not adequately protected, maximized and promoted our national interest in favour of her citizens. Furthermore, it is observed that, despite the conservative African-centered foreign policy adopted since independence, progress, prosperity and survival of Nigerians at home and in the Diaspora had not been well promoted. More so, as Eke (2009) noted that every state's interest is dictated by the interests and core values of its citizens. It is based on the above that this work considers non-realization of Nigeria's foreign policy objectives problematic, and therefore seeks to assess the foreign policy thrusts of Yar'Adua (Citizen Diplomacy)and that of Jonathan's (Economic Diplomacy) vis-à-vis Nigeria's national interest, as well as the trends in Nigeria's foreign policy since independence with a view to addressing the stated problems and providing information and insights to stakeholders of Nigeria's foreign policy and advocating for a paradigm shift from **Africa-centered,** considering the negative effects the former has had on Nigeria and Nigerians since independence to date.

In the process of examining this, the following questions are asked:

1.2 Research Questions

a) Have the Nigeria's foreign policy objectives and national interest been able to safeguard the lives and values of Nigerian citizens?

b) Has the adoption of Citizen-Diplomacy by Yar'Adua and Economic Diplomacy by Jonathan's administration being able to promote the prosperity and survival of Nigerian citizens both at home and in the diaspora?

c) Has the Nigeria's national interest being dictated by the core values and interest of her citizens?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The broad objectives of the study are to assess foreign policies adopted by the Yar'Adua administration and the Jonathan's administrations vis a vis Nigeria's national interest;

the specific objectives include the following:

a) To articulate what prompted the adoption of Citizen-Diplomacy as Nigeria's foreign policy thrust by the Yar'Adua's administration;

b) To examine the need for the adoption of Economic Diplomacy as Nigeria's foreign policy thrust by the Jonathan's administration;

c) To come up with verifiable findings of what foreign policy thrust could be best adopted by Nigeria.

1.4 Research Assumptions

In line with the stated problems of the study and the outlined objectives, the following assumptions were tested in the study:

a) Views, opinions and aspirations of the national elite determine what constitutes Nigeria's national interest and Nigeria's foreign policy focus.

b) The definitive declaration of Africa as the centre-piece of Nigeria's foreign policy serves Nigeria's national interest, and therefore be continually pursued.

c) Changing realities of global circumstance affect Nigeria's foreign policy focus, thereby making a paradigm shift to a more rewarding policymuch more desirable.

1.5 Significance of the Study

Although, many scholarly works have been done on Nigeria's foreign policy trends since independence as it focuses on Africa as her centre-piece, but very little (if there is any at all) of specific attempts have been made to highlight the urgent need to re-direct Nigeria's foreign policy thrust that will benefit Nigeria and Nigerians above any other consideration considering the socio-economic and political retrogression the 'Africa-centered' has brought to Nigerians.

The significance of this study therefore lies firstly in its deliberate attempt at filling this gap by directing intellectual attention to the reason why Nigeria's foreign policy should be re-directed.

Secondly, its significance lies in an attempt to enrich political discourse and stimulate better understanding on how Nigeria's foreign policy has no bearing with the plight of Nigerian masses, and how citizen-centered approach will enhance the country's needed socio-economic and political growth and development if adopted and sustained. Furthermore, its significance lies in its attempt to see to the appropriateness or otherwise of the theory adopted to analyse the subject matter of this study.

1.6 Scope and Limitations

Space, time and extent readily come to mind when scope and limitations are mentioned in the study of this nature. The study covers the foreign policy thrust of President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua's administration and that of President Goodluck Jonathan (i.e. 2007 to 2015). It is important to note that in analyzing the foreign policy thrusts of both governments, there is the need to examine, critically, the trends in Nigeria's foreign policy since independence for us to understand the need for a re-direction. Hence the study covers the trends since

independence to and after the demise of President Yar'Adua in 2010, and to the end of President Jonathan's administration in 2015.

Our limitations in the conduct of this research included, but not limited to: Frustrations encountered during administration of questionnaires at the Foreign Affairs Ministry in Abuja (as gaining access and retrieving the administered questionnaires were cumbersome); getting people of high caliber to interview was also tasking, as the researcher had to travel several long kilometres to get them interviewed at their convenient times; financial challenges equally slowed down data collection and final production of the entire work. All these were however surmounted by the doggedness and perseverance of the researcher, and encouragements he received in the course of carrying out the research.

1.7 Organization of the Study

This work has been divided into five Chapters. Chapter One gives the general background of the study as to how Nigeria's foreign policy had, since independence, placed emphasis on Africa and the enhancement of international cooperation and global peace. The chapter states the problem which the adopted foreign policy had engendered, the research questions, objectives, assumptions, significance of the study, scope and limitations and its organization. Chapter Two being the Literature Review, explains the meaning of national interest and foreign policy objectives, principles of Nigeria's foreign policy, determinants of Nigeria's foreign policy as well asinstruments for conducting Nigeria's foreign policy. Conceptual clarifications and definitions were also explained in chapter two of the work. These include: Diplomacy; Foreign Policy; Foreign policy making and conditioning factors, foreign policy process and the making of Nigeria's foreign policy. While providing a historical overview on Nigeria's foreign policy since independence, the chapter discusses Citizen Diplomacy as a Concept. It further assesses both the Yar'Adua administration's

Citizen Diplomacy and that of Economic Diplomacy of the Jonathan's administration. Critiques of both foreign policies adopted by both administrations were also discussed. The Theoretical Frameworks adopted in this study were also provided in this chapter. Chapter Three discusses research methodology, the research design and methods of data collection. Research instrument and administration were also discussed. Chapter Four covers data presentation and its analysis. The final Chapter provides conclusion of the whole chapters and then offers some recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses various factors that influence foreign policy formulation which are termed conditioning factors. It further explains the intricacies of the foreign policy process which include individual level analysis the impact of people as individuals or as species on policy; state level analysis *s*how the organization and operation of a government affect policy, and system level analysis the external realities and pressures that influence a country's policy. The chapter highlights the foreign policy making actors in the international system, and articulates the authority that is saddled with responsibility of making Nigeria's foreign policy. In order therefore, to bring out an objective and balanced justification on this work, a theoretical framework based on social constructivism is adopted.

2.1 NATIONAL INTEREST

The ultimate objective of any nation's foreign policy is the pursuit and protection of its national interests. National interest, according to Obiozor (1998) is the beginning and the end of foreign policy. It is employed to describe, explain or evaluate the source or the adequacy of a nation's foreign policy. It also serves as a means of justifying, denouncing or proposing policies. National interest is actually examining what is best for the nation in particular instance, what is best for the nation in the foreign policy. The concept is rooted in the priority of national values.

Every country of the world has its needs and priorities. Hence there are belief systems and sets of coherent ideas which every country uses in understanding and explaining its foreign policy as well as in ordering and regulating its affairs with other nations. The foreign policy of any nation is a reflection of its domestic reality. This begins with the identification and articulation of national interest. Yakubu (2011:4) submits that "national interest is the key

concept in foreign policy, the foundation of any state's foreign policy, and the main reason or justification for foreign policy".

Ayeni - Akeke (2008:343) defines National Interest *as* "a mix of relatively stable and clear values, ideas, convictions, goals and concerns on which the authorities of a nation-state are likely to base their policies and actions toward other states and forces in its external environment". He further refers to it as the goals that the elite groups of each state think that their country should strive to achieve in its interactions with other states in the international arena.

Foreign policy and national interest are inseparable concepts in international relations and indeed, the foundation of a state's foreign policy is her National Interest which in turn directs the course of the foreign policy. The concept of national interest has continued to play a significant role in the foreign policies of sovereign states. A state's foreign policy is not operated in vacuum. The main policy instrument in the conduct of foreign policy is the promotion and pursuit of national interest. Ogwu (1986:7), thus defines national interest as the totality or the aggregate of interests of individuals and groups within a given nation state. She further stressed that, "national interest encompasses the various strategies employed in the international interactions of states in order to ensure the preservation of the stated goal of society".

Ka'oje (1994:78) defines national interest as "the aggregate of the principal demands of a country's citizens for such core values as economic and social welfare, national security, social justice and good government". 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

considered by a state while weighing and intended foreign policy options. As an instrument of political action, it serves to justify or repudiate a state's foreign option and action in the international system. This explains the interconnectedness of foreign policy and national interest. The concept of national is so deeply interwoven with that of foreign policy that Morgenthau (1973:6) stated "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".

Therefore, national interest can be described as a guide to the formulation of foreign policy. It is not an end in itself but a means to an end. In other words, it is a method of reaching a goal; and in formulating such goals, core values and national ethos must be considered. In his address to the conference of Nigeria's foreign policy held at Kuru in 1986, President Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida aggregated the conception of Nigeria's national interest thus:

> "Nigeria's national interest can be identified as predicated on the nation's military, economic, political and social security. Anything that will enhance the capacity of Nigerians to defend their national security must be seen as being in their national interest. Anything that promotes Nigeria's economic growth and development is in the national interest. Anything that will make Nigeria politically stable is also in the national interest".

Given the former President Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida's position, National interest is all encompassing. It's major concern is the welfare and rights of citizens as a collective in which the country as an entity tries to protect.

2.2 NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY OBJECTIVES

Foreign policy is a blue print that gives direction to a country on how to interact with other nations. Obiozor (1998) posits that "foreign policy objectives are a range of actions as well as set of strategies adopted by sovereign actors within the international system". In this case,

the ultimate objective of any foreign policy is to achieve long-range or short-term goals that ensure the survival of the sovereign state and all its cherished values. The objectives of Nigeria's foreign policy have, since 1960 been consistent both in aspiration and implementation. Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, the Prime Minister, while addressing the parliament on August 20, 1960 identified certain fundamental objectives of Nigeria's foreign policy, the most prominent and on which others are anchored being "The promotion of the national interest of the federation and of its citizens". This in essence means that Nigeria's foreign policy ought to be fundamentally guided by her national interest.

Unfortunately, what constitutes the country's national interest was not clearly articulated; and both the Balewa administration and that of the two subsequent regimes of Ironsi and Gowon merely premised their foreign policies on their world perception of what they considered as Nigeria's interests. It was not until the inception of the Murtala/Obasanjo regime in 1975 that the broad-stand of Nigeria national interest were clearly addressed. Based on the commission's report General Obasanjo (who succeeded General Murtala) in June 1976 identified the elements of the national interest which also constitute the objectives of the country's foreign policy as follows:

- The defence of our sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity;
- The creation of the necessary political and economic conditions in Africa and the rest of the world which will facilitate the defence of the independence and territorial integrity of all African countries while at the same time, foster national self-reliance and rapid economic development;
- The promotion of equality and self-reliance in Africa and the rest of the developing world;

- The promotion and the defence of justice and respect for human dignity especially the dignity of the blackmen;
- The defence and promotion of world peace (Aluko 1978).

However, while the stated objectives describe Nigeria's national interest, some of them, as Aluko observes are not realizable. For instance, the second and third objectives seem to extend beyond the capabilities of Nigeria. This perhaps explains the reason why General Obasanjo laid emphasis on three broad objectives – territorial integrity, independence and rapid economic development as being central to the nation's interest. It also explains the slight modifications effected in the constitutional provision regarding the country's foreign policy. Both sections 19 of the 1979 constitution and section 20 of the 1989 constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria lucidly enact the basic objectives of Nigeria's foreign policy under the fundamental objectives and directive principles of state policy. This is contained in section 19 and 20 of the 1979 and 1989 constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria**.**

Yakubu (2011) succinctly put it that "Nigeria foreign policy goals are many, but the means of achieving them are scarce". He further classified foreign policy objectives into three in accordance with their degree of importance and resources allocated for their implementation, viz : *Core Objectives; Middle range objectives* and *Long range objectives.*

2.3 PRINCIPLES OF NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Since independence, different regimes have emerged in Nigeria, and in spite of their different orientations and leadership styles, the conduct of Nigeria's foreign policy has been guided by the same principles. These principles include:

i. **Sovereign Equality of all States:** As an independent, sovereign state, Nigeria has always emphasized the principle of legal equality of all states. Nigeria, since independence, has always made it clear that in the pursuit of her national interest, does not have any intention to dominate any country.

ii. **Respect of Territorial Integrity and Independence of other States:** This is the belief of Nigeria that the independence of any sovereign state must be respected, and that the territorial integrity of any state must be jealously guarded and not jeopardized.

iii. **Commitment to Self-Determination and Independence of other States:** Nigeria has always maintained this principle vis-à-vis her commitment towards decolonization in Africa and her active role in support of liberation struggle particularly in southern Africa.

iv. **Non-Alignment to any Geo-Political Power Blocs:** Nigeria under Balewa was perceived to believe in the principle of non-alignment to any of the geo-political power blocs. This belief was however contradicted as the country aligned and economically depended on the industrialized countries of the west.

v. **Commitment to Peaceful Co-existence and Cooperation in the World and Africa:** Nigeria's strong belief in this principle made her to identify with such various international organizations as the United Nation's Organization (U.N.O) upon her attainment of independence in 1960. She also played active role in the formation of the Organization of African Unity (O.A.U) in 1963; and in the establishment of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in 1975.

2.4 DETERMINANTS OF NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

The foreign policy of any nation is a product of its environmental (internal and external) factors. The factors include:

i. Political Structure of the Country**:** This is an important determinant of Nigeria's foreign policy. Nigeria's federal structure reflects a multi-ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious setting. The political elites who have almost unrestricted control of the country's foreign policy are products of the multi-ethnic and traditional forces. Their perception of foreign policy is therefore a reflection of these domestic realities.

ii. Structure of the Economy: The structure of a state's economy is also a major determinant of the state's behavior in the external environment. The economy of Nigeria exhibits largely a neo-colonial structure, depending on export of primary products and importation of finished goods. This has made the economy to remain underdeveloped and, has in turn hindered the country from playing a dynamic foreign policy.

iii. Geo-Political Location of the Country: This also influences the foreign policy of a state. A country that has access to the sea is more endowed and advantages than one that is landlocked. Nigeria's geo-political location is advantageous as her maritime resources provide opportunity for a formidable naval system.

iv. Character of Political Leadership: The character of the political leadership at the federal level be it under the civilian or military rule is also a major determinant of foreign policy. The degree of dynamism or otherwise of a country's foreign policy is dependent on the type of leadership the country has at a given time and period.

v. Military Factor: A fundamental aspect of Nigeria's national interest is the nation's security which makes the military factor an important determinant of Nigeria's

foreign policy. The Armed Forces as an entity is crucial in understanding the country's character and external behavior.

vi. Demographic Factor: Population constitutes an important indicator of a country's power potential and thus influences its foreign policy. The question of human resources in a country affect, in one way or the other, the foreign policy of the country. The articulate nature of the populace influences the kind of foreign policy decisions that are taken on certain sensitive issues. The more enlightened the citizens are, the higher their level of understanding of foreign issues and the greater their willingness to influence government's decisions on those issues. (Olusanya and Akindele, 1986:3-5).

2.5 INSTRUMENTS FOR CONDUCTING NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

The conduct of foreign policy requires the use of certain instruments. According to Akinboye (1999:373) these instruments are the means or mechanisms used by states in conducting their relations with other states.

- **Diplomacy:** This is a strategy through which states pursue their foreign interests without recourse to violence or war. Negotiation and bargaining are the typical tactics of diplomacy. Of all the means of conducting inter-state relations, diplomacy is the most peaceful and effective.

- **Propaganda:** This refers to the manipulation and distortion of information in order to achieve one's interest and defeat the interest of an opponent. It involves extensive use of mass media. It also requires many sophisticated technological resources and highly trained personnel to carry it out effectively.

Propagandists, according to Ayeni-Akeke (2008:359), improvise various strategies of influencing or inducing their targets to believe the distorted information about the reality surrounding them that they are being fed. First is labeling or name-calling, which refers to amethod, used by propagandists seeking to create a bad image for an idea, person or process or cast aspersions on it in order to condemn and make the people reject it. Second is transfer, which is the reverse of the first. It refers to the practice of eulogizing a person, idea, programme or the like with a view to persuading the listener or reader to adore and accept the object without examining the real evidence about it.Third is testimony, which is the practice of using the authoritative view of a revered institution or opinion of a respected and influential person-such as a sage, statesman or intellectual to justify or condemn an idea, process or person in order to encourage the target of the propaganda to accept or reject.

- **Military Force:** This is a major weapon in the conduct of inter-state relations. It involves the use of force, terrorist attack and military coercion in implementing foreign policy objectives of states. When diplomacy and other mechanisms of achieving peaceful settlement of disputes failed, it is often used as a last resort.

- **Economic Weapon:** Instead of resorting to war in order to resolve a conflict situation, certain economic devices are used as instruments for conducting inter-state relations. These devices include trade boycott, withdrawal of aids and economic sanctions.

- **Cultural and Educational Exchanges:** These are another category of instruments or techniques that states use to promote their foreign policies-and genuine understanding of

their problems and interests among foreigners, especially those with whom they must deal. This technique of promoting foreign policy may be implemented through bilateral agreements or multilateral arrangements among states using the infrastructure of international agencies such as the UNESCO or the Commonwealth.

2.6 CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

2.6.1 **Diplomacy**

Although diplomacy has been variously defined, scholars have argued that, no general definition of diplomacy can be very satisfactory or very revealing (Palmer and Perkins, 2004:84). A lucid characterization is given by Satow (1966:1), who defines diplomacy as "the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations between the governments of independent states". This definition was criticized for obvious reasons - not all diplomats are either intelligent or tactful, yet they all take part in diplomacy (Ogunsanwo, 2007:1).

McDermott (1973:37) sees diplomacy as a "science which permits its practitioners to say nothing and shelter behind mysterious nods of the head ……., a science whose most successful exponent is he who can swim with his head above streams of events he pretends to conduct". Morgenthau (1978:529),one of the leading exponents of realism described diplomacy as "the technique for accommodating conflicts of interest, and the promotion of national interest by peaceful means". However, a more comprehensive definition which underscores its essence is that 'Diplomacy is the political process whereby states establish and nurture official inter-relations, direct and indirect, to pursue their respective goals, interest and substantive and procedural policies in the international environment' (Plischke, 1977:41).

Scholars overwhelmingly subscribed the above definition as being the most comprehensive or all-encompassing because, if statesmen or diplomats are asked why they take particular action in their relations with certain international organizations their response is likely to underscore the primacy of the national interest vis-à-vis those of other nation. Thus, whatever may be his country of accreditation, the principal duty of an Ambassador is to preserve and advance his country's national interests.

In the view of Ogunbambi (1986:162), as it pertains to Nigeria, for instance,

> The national interest of Nigeria which Ambassador, ideally, should sell and prosecute include political stability, security, export, promotion, access to external resources and technology, foreign aid, the protection of its citizens abroad, the cultural and moral expressions of Nigeria and a fair, effective and vigorous presentation of Nigeria's point of view on regional and global issues.

Cutting a dichotomy between foreign policy and diplomacy, J.R Childs(1948:64) posits that the foreign policy of a state is "the substances of foreign relations", whereas "diplomacy proper is the process by which policy is carried out". In the view of Karen Mingst (2004:113-114), "diplomacy entails states trying to influence the behavior of others by negotiating, by taking a specific action or refraining from such an action".

Diplomacy usually begins with bargaining, though direct or indirect communication, in an attempt to reach agreement on an issue. This bargaining may be conducted tacitly among the parties, each of which recognizes that a move in one direction leads to a response by the other.

From pre-historic times till date, every state has to operate within an international political environment in which her values compete with those of others such that states in the

international system gear their efforts towards the maximization of the political, economic and social values. In order to minimize the effect of an conflict and maximize individual states chances of realizing her objectives, diplomacy becomes the principal technique of state action or the main instrument for the execution of foreign policy the principal device by which a state transmits or communicates its desire and designs into the decision-making apparatus of other states, whether in the form of persuasion and adjustment of one's position through coercion or negotiation.

2.6.2 Foreign Policy

Khan *et al* (1970:308) expressed that foreign policy involves the prescription and formulation of a set of objectives, priorities and procedures to guide the behaviour of a government in its external affairs. Akinbobola (1996), defines foreign policy as "the actions of a state towards the external environment with the ultimate aim and objective of achieving specific goals towards the enhancement of the national interest". Ayeni-Akeke (2008:348) defines foreign policy as "carefully considered objectives (including strategies by which to actualize them) that are drawn up by a sovereign state to guide her interactions with other states in the international areas". Adeniran (1993:185) on his part, opines that foreign policy can best be defined through an explanation of what actually is. According to him, foreign policy consists of three elements the first is the overall orientation and policy intentions of a particular country towards another, the second is the objective that a country seeks to achieve in her relation or dealings with other countries while the third is the means for achieving that particular goal or objective. The principal objective of Nigeria's foreign policy according to Olusanya and Akindele (1986:2), is to promote and protect the country's national interest in its interaction with other countries in the international system.

Rosenau (1969:46), defined foreign policies as:

Recurring forms of action or inaction that theduly constituted authorities of a polity Initiatetoward one or more objects in their externalenvironment with a view to either preventingthe object from limiting the satisfaction ofpolity needs and wants or obtaining resourcesfrom it that will facilitate satisfaction of polity needs".

Alkali (1996:62) posits that

Foreign policies are designed to promote, protect and defend a nation's vital interests such as the preservation of national sovereignty, the defence of territorial integrity; the promotion of economic, military, strategic and diplomatic interests; the increase and maintenance of power and prestige so as to influence international events, to communicate one's capabilities to both potential and actual allies and adversaries; and the defence of whatever a state might define as its vital interests".

2.6.3 Foreign policy making and its conditioning factors

Ayeni-Akeke corroborated Alkali's position that "the formulation of foreign policy is usually influenced by various factors" is relevant to this study. These factors include the quest of a state to protect her autonomy – that is the freedom to determine and carry out domestic and foreign policies based wholly on concerns that it considers as priorities that it wants to achieve in her interactions with other states.

The quest for autonomy is also compelled by the fact that most of the factors that influence the political processes of nation-states also affect their foreign policies. In formulating its foreign policy, a government, according to Khan et al (1970), must take into consideration not only the goals it wishes to achieve, but also those basic facts of existence which limit or extend its ability to act in a particular manner and determine its status in the international area. For instance, factors such as expanse of territory, fertility of the soil, nearness to the sea or proximity to a great power, are some of the diverse issues that shape the substance of both domestic and external political objectives and processes of states.

A country that is located on a very large expanse of land that is very rich in natural and mineral resources would tend to be attractive to foreigners, some of who might want to invade it.

Such a state would need to develop and deploy adequate military weapons to protect herself as well as her resources against external factors.

Ayeni- Akeke (2008) further pointed out that it is not the mere possession of natural resources such as mineral deposits, fertile agricultural land, navigable water ways etc that is important. Natural resources, according to him, only provide states with opportunities to do certain thing such as developing an industrial economy providing good living standards for her citizens and so on.

Whether they will do so is a function of several factors such as possession of an adequate technological base, an educated, innovative and enlightened citizenry, industrial capability and the like. The more of these factors that a state possesses, the more it would be able to assert itself and chart its own independent course in its relations with other states. In other words, economic factors greatly determine the degree of freedom of action that any state can exercise in the world.

The conditioning factors, according to Khan *et al* (1970), consist of such domestic factors as the geographic location of a state as highlighted above, its population, resources, ideological orientation and political beliefs. External conditioning factors may be summed up in the existence of international law and the application of the concept of "power" in international relations.

Geographic factors are of significance in the determination of a country's foreign policy goals. The study of these factors and their effect on the state is referred to as geopolitics. Geographic factors which condition the determination of foreign policy goals are many and varied. The size of a state, topography, climate, and location are of importance. Proximity to a large and powerful state, especially if relations are cordial, is also a conditioning factor.

The nature and length of the state borders, too, have a bearing on the formulation of foreign policy.

Another factor is population. The size of a country's population as a determinant of foreign policy goals should be fairly obvious. A large population may mean a large work force to perform the tasks needed to further foreign policy goals. Workforce does not mean simply a head count of the population but specifically includes skilled Labours that are capable of performing the necessary tasks. Population is, therefore, a resource like many others, which needs to be properly managed and adequately trained. Most of the developed nations of the world, such as the United States, Russia, Germany and Japan, have large work forces as well as large populations because they have successfully harnessed their human resources. On the other hand, others such as India, Indonesia, Nigeria and Pakistan, despite their large populations, have an inadequate workforce.

Nevertheless, the size of the population is a significant contributor to the capability of a state to promote its goals. Nazi Germany, fascist Italy and imperial Japan all sought to encourage a higher birth rate so as to obtain workers for their expansionist ambitions. The rate of population growth is also an important consideration. A reasonable rate of growth offers a reservoir of workers for the future; a declining rate denies that prospect while an excessive rate generates other external and internal problems.

Economic Resource is another major factor. National economic resources consist of natural resources as well as industrial and agricultural productivity (as explained by above).In this age of interdependence, no state is totally self – sufficient. Some, due to the nature of their geography and the availability of natural resources, enjoy an advantage over others in the production of particular goods and services. The extent of the demand for these

goods determines the extent of the dependence of others upon the producer. (Khan et al, 1970 and Ayeni–Akeke, 2008).

Obviously then, the more economically dependent a country is upon others, the less free it is to determine and pursue its own goals. By this same token, this freedom of action and decision is enhanced by the degree of balance between the availability of raw materials and its industrial and agricultural productivity. States strive to gain access to those areas, outside their sovereign domains, where the resources that they need to advance their national security interests are located. The importance of access to economic and other resources cannot be over-emphasized because they are indispensable to national security.

Economic resources are of vital importance to national security. Dependence upon others for the supply of necessary armaments weakens security and undermines strategy. The ability to secure needed goods and services is enhanced by the amount and variety of them which a country is able to offer in return.

Several other economic factors have a bearing on state's foreign policy and its position in the international society. They include such things as foreign trade, the balance of payments, strength and stability of the national currency in the world market, inter governmental loans and debts, and foreign investment.

Nationalism and Internationalism is also a factor. These are two opposing forces which bear substantially upon foreign policy goals. Nationalism impels a people to look inwards, to consider their interest first. Internationalism, on the other hand, inspires them to look outwards, to consider the interests and welfare of others before self. These two forces tend to influence the formulation of a nation's foreign policy goals.

Ideology is another factor. The foreign policy of a state reflects its national goals and values which are conditioned by the political, economic, social and cultural environment in the society. An ideology, as defined by Gauba (2003:13), 'means a set of those ideas which

are accepted to be true by a particular group, party or nation…'. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics (2003), is 'any comprehensive and mutually consistent set of ideas by which a social group makes sense of the world'. An ideology provides some explanation of how things have come to be as they are, some indication of where they are heading to provide a guide to action, criteria for distinguishing truth from falsehood and valid arguments from invalid. It is, therefore, logical that governments which are ideologically oriented should not only seek ideological justification for their foreign policy goals but also couch them in ideological jargon. Ideology establishes and conditions the basic goals which countries seek to achieve. For instance, the former Soviet Union dominated Eastern Europe to promote and extend Socialism as an ideology which was vigorously pursued as part of its major foreign policy goals.

International Law is another major factor. This is a body of rules, laws and norms which serves to limit the sovereignty of states in the international arena. Oppenheim (1955:4) defines International Law as that "body of customary and treaty rules which are considered legally binding by states, in their intercourse with each other". C.J. Phillip (1968:17), defines it as "that body of laws which is applicable to states in their mutual relations and to individuals in their relations with states". International Law may be divided into three areas:- Law of Peace, Law of War and Law of Centrality. The Law of War seeks to regulate and control the conduct of war by countries by attempting to define a legal state of war and by delineating conditions under which war may be conducted. Under the latter fall such things as the rights and duties of belligerents, treatment of prisoners of war, and the position of humanitarian groups and institutions operating on or near the war front, and prohibition of genocide.

The Law of Peace seeks to provide a pattern of acceptable behaviour for governments in their normal relations with each other. It deals with such matters as territorial integrity, political sovereignty, and peaceful means for the settlement of international disputes. The rights and immunities of diplomatic personnel, conditions governing the grant or withdrawal of diplomatic recognition, sanctity, and validity of international treaties are also included in it.

The law of neutrality rests on the basic belief that a condition of neutrality imposes certain responsibilities on a state, the most important of which is that the neutral state should not give any direct or indirect assistance to those at war. At the same time, it is the responsibility of the belligerents to respect the neutrality of a state and not to violate it without just cause.

All the above stated constitute a great factor in the formulation of a nation's foreign policy goals vis-a-vis its relation to others in the international system.

2.6.4 Foreign Policy Process

It is impossible to state, with certainty, how specific foreign policy issues emanate. However, it is safe to assume that the issues that invariably end up as policies usually originate from the desire of the government to promote a matter of direct concern to itself or any of the several groups that show interest and express opinions on external relations of the state. The foreign policy process, according to Rourke (2007:63), is very complex. Analysts untangle the intricacies by studying foreign policy making from three perspectives termed levels of analysis. These include:

1. Individual level of analysis - This begins with the view that at the root it is people who make policy. Therefore, it involves understanding how the human decision making process –

people (as a specie, in groups and idiosyncratically) making decisions – leads to policy making.

Foreign Policy decisions are influenced by cognitive, emotional, psychological, and sometimes

even biological factors, as well as by rational calculations.

(i) *Cognitive Factors*:- What national leaders do when deciding foreign policy is to engage in cognitive decision making. Rourke (2007) argues that this means making decisions within the constraints of "bounded rationality". External boundaries include missing, erroneous, or unknowable information. Internal boundaries on rational decision making are the result of our human frailties – the limited stamina and intellectual capacity to study exceptionally complex issues.

(ii) *Emotional Factors*:-Rourke (2007) argues further that, although it is comforting to imagine that decision makers are coldly irrational, the reality is that they get depressed, sad, angry and experience all the other human emotions.

(iii) *Psychological Factor:*- Human beings shares a number of common psychological traits that also help explain why their feelings and decisions are usually less than fully rational. One of such approach is frustration – aggression theory, which argues that individuals and even societies that are frustrated sometimes become aggressive – in decision making.

(iv) *Biological Factors:*- Although these are highly controversial, various biological theories provide yet another way to explain why human decisions fall short of being fully rational. One of the most important issues in human behaviour is the degree to which human actions are based on animal instinct and other innate emotional and physical drives or based on socialization and intellect. With specific regards to

politics, biopolitics examines the relationship between the physical nature and political behaviour of humans.

Biopolitics can be illustrated through two approaches: *Ethnology and Gender.*

Ethnology: is the comparison of animal and human behaviours. It is argued that like animals, humans behave in a way that is based partly on innate characteristics.

Gender:- Political Scientists have examined and clearly submitted that a gender opinion gap exists between men and women on a range of issues. War is one of those. Fukuyama (1998:33) contends that *"statistically speaking it is primarily men who enjoy the experience of aggression and the camaraderie it brings and who revel in the reutilization of war".* This leads Fukuyama to speculate that a world led by women *"would be less prone to conflict and more conciliatory and cooperative than the one we inhabit now".*

Other studies, however, have found more mixed results about the potential impact of women decision maker and contend that a future dominated by women "would not be as rosy as Fukuyama suggests**"**(Capriole, 2000:271).

2. State – Level Analysis:- This level of analysis emphasizes the characteristics of states and how they make foreign policy choices and implement them. What is important from this perspective is how a country's political structure and the political forces and sub national actors within the country cause its government to decide to adopt one or another foreign policy. (Buenos de Mesquite, 2002).

Those who study how foreign policy is made over time in one country or comparatively several countries realize that there is no such thing as a single foreign policy process. Instead, how policy is made varies considerably.

(a) **Type of government and the foreign policy process**:- The type of government a country has (be it authoritarian government or democratic) is one variable that

affects the foreign policy process. The more authoritarian a government is, the more likely it is that foreign policy will be centered in a narrow segment of the government, even in the hands of the leader. It is important to realize that no government is absolutely under the thumb of any individual. States are too complex and too big for that to happen as other secondary actors (such as foreign ministers, bureaucrats, interest groups, and other domestic elements) play a role in even very authoritarian political systems.

At the other end, foreign policy making in democracies is much more open with inputs from legislators, the media, public opinion, and opposition parties, as well as those foreign policy-making actors that influence authoritarian government policy.

(b) **Type of situation and the foreign policy process**:- The policy-making process also varies within countries. Situation is one variable. For instance, policy is made differently during crisis and non crisis situations. Brecher and Eilkenfield (1997) explain that a crisis situation occurs when decision-makers are:

(i) surprised by an event

(ii) feel threatened (especially militarily) and,

(iii) believe that they have only a short time to react.

The more intense each of the three factors is, the more acute the sense of crisis.

Whereas non crisis situations often involve a broad array of domestic actors trying to shape policy, crisis policy making is likely to be dominated by the political leader and a small group of advisers.

One reason this occurs involves the rally effect. This is the propensity of the public and other domestic political actors to support the leader during time of crisis.

(c) **Type of policy and the foreign policy process**:- How foreign policy is decided also varies according to the issue area involved. Foreign policy that has an immediate and

obvious domestic impact on the citizens, according to Rourke (2007:77), is called intermestic policy. This type of policy is apt to foster substantial activity by legislators, interest groups, and other foreign policy-making actors and thereby diminish the ability of the executive leaders to fashion policy to their liking. Foreign trade is a classic example of an intermestic issue because it affects both international relations and the domestic economy in terms of jobs, prices, and other factors.

Issues that have little immediate or obvious impact on the citizens can be termed pure foreign policy. A narrow range of decision makers usually make such decisions in the executive branch with little or no domestic opposition. National leaders, such as presidents, usually have much greater say over pure foreign policy than they do over intermestic policy.

Foreign Policy – Making Actors

Henry Kissinger (1982:421) noted that foreign policy making is not calm, cerebral process. Instead it is a clash of ideas and a test of political power and skills to determine which of the policy proposals will prevail. The combatants are the foreign policy making actors. These actors include political executives, bureaucracies, legislatures, political opponents, interest groups, and the people.

Heads of government and other political executives:-

In almost every country, the head of government (most commonly titled president, prime minister etc) has important formal powers granted by statutory law or the constitution which emphasizes that the most important actor in virtually every country's foreign policy process it its head of government.

Most chief executives, for example, are the Commander-In -Chief of their country's armed forces. This gives them broad unilateral authority to use the military.

Other political executives such as Foreign Affairs Ministers and Ministers of Defenceetc also frequently possess important informal powers. Their prestige as national leader is often immense, and skillful leaders can use that status to win political support for their policies.

Bureaucracies:- Every state, whatever its strength or type of government, is heavily influenced by its bureaucracy. The bureaucrats are career governmental personnel as distinguished from those who are political appointees or elected officials.

Although political leaders legally command the bureaucracy, they find it difficult to control the vast understructures of their governments. Bureaucrats sometimes do not agree with their country's foreign policy. Instead they may favour another policy option based on their general sense of their unit's mission.

How any given policy will affect the organization is also an important factor in creating bureaucratic perspective.

Ayeni-Akeke (2008:356) emphasized that, whenever there is a new development in the international arena requiring that a state takes action, the bureaucrat in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs swing into action. Usually, the officers in charge of the department that deals with the region or function concerned, set the process into motion by gathering facts about the issue, its nature, importance and ways in which it is likely to affect or has actually affected the interests of the country. Taking cognizance of the opinions of the group(s) that is likely to be most affected as well as those of the top political authorities that will take the final decision on how to respond to the development, the officer may suggest solutions and, even, map out better strategies to cope with it.

Legislatures:- In all countries, the foreign policy role of legislatures is less than that of executive branch decision makers and bureaucrats.This does not mean that all legislatures are powerless. Their exact influence varies greatly among countries. Legislatures in non

democratic systems generally rubber-stamp the decisions of the political leaders (Howell and Peeve House, 2005).

Legislatures play a larger foreign policy role in democratic countries, but legislative authority is constrained in these states by many factors. One of these, according to Leo Grande (2002), is that chief executives usually have extensive legal powers in the realm of foreign policy. Tradition is a second factor that works to the advantage of chief executives in foreign policy making. The leadership has historically run foreign policy in virtually all countries, especially in time of war or other crises.

Third is the belief that a unified national voice is important to a successful foreign policy. This is particularly true during a crisis situation, when legislature, just like the public, tends to rally behind the president.

Fourth, legislators tend to focus on domestic policy because; most voters perceive it to be more important than foreign policy. For this reason, legislators try to influence intermestic policy issues, and are apt to be much less concerned with pure foreign policy issues. By this logic, though, legislative activity is important when a high-profile issue captures public attention.

Interest Groups:- these are private association of people who have similar policy views and who pressure the government to adopt those views as policy. Interest groups such as socio-cultural, religious, economic and transnational groups are becoming a more important part of the foreign policy-making process.

The People:- Like legislatures, the public plays a highly variable role in foreign policy. Public opinion is a marginal factor in authoritarian governments. In democracies, the role of the people is more complex and public opinion plays a key role in determining foreign policy (Everts and Isernia, 2001).

2. **System-Level Analysis**:- Countries may be theoretically free to make any foreign policy decision they want, but in practice achieving a successful foreign policy requires that they make choices that are reasonable within the context of the realities of the international system. For example, Republic of Benin could exercise its sovereign authority and decide to send Nigeria's Ambassador to Benin packing over Nigeria's decision to close her borders to neighbouring countries to check smuggling activities. However, doing so would be foolhardy because the fact of life in the international system is that the market and financial support Benin gets from Nigeria in terms of relationship can only be toyed with at Benin's peril. Thus, power realities in the international system dictate that Republic of Benin would be wiser to attempt to use more subtle means in its effort to persuade Nigeria to be a more considerate neighbor.

   System-Level Analysis focuses on the external restraints on foreign policy. This is a "top-down" approach to world politics that examinesthe social-economic-political-geographic characteristics of the system and how they influence the actions of countries and other actors(Ferguson, 2004).

   Structural Characteristics:- All systems, be they international or local, have identifiable structural characteristics. Two of such characteristics are hereunder analyzed:

   (i) The Organization of Authority:-Jackson (1999:431) explains that, the structure of authority for making and enforcing rules, for allocating assets, and for conducting other authoritative tasks in a system can range from hierarchical ***(vertical)*** to anarchical ***(horizontal).*** Most systems tend toward the hierarchical end of the spectrum. They have a vertical authority structure in which subordinate units are substantially regulated by higher levels of authority. Other systems are situated toward the horizontal authority structure end

of the continuum. There are few, if any, higher authorities in such systems, and power is fragmented. The international system is a mostly horizontal authority structure.

It is based on the sovereignty of states. Sovereignty means that countries are not legally answerable to any higher authority for their international or domestic conduct as such, the international system is a state-centric system that is largely anarchic; it has no overarching authority to make rules, settle disputes and provide protection.

(ii) Scope and Intensity of Interactions:-Another structural characteristic of any political system is the scope (range), frequency and intensity (level) of interactions among the actors. At the international system level, the scope, frequency and level of interactions among the actors has grown extensively. Economic interdependence and globalization of human interactions provide the most obvious examples.

How does this affect foreign policy?. One way is that it makes isolationism irrational. All countries, even one as powerful and geographically isolated as the United States, are thoroughly and inextricably involved in the world affairs.

2.6.5 Making of Nigeria's Foreign Policy

Thompson and Macridis (1962:1),emphasized the importance of leadership role in the process of foreign policy making and further posited that policies of states vis a vis the rest of the world are mere expressions of the prevailing political, social and religious belief of the leaders. Akinboye (1999), observed that the onus of making Nigeria's foreign policy lies mainly in the President or Head of State with the Ministry of External or Foreign Affairs discharging the responsibility on his behalf. The manner of performing this function depends largely on the character of the particular leader at the helm of affairs in the country.

2.7.0 OVERVIEW OF NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY SINCE INDEPENDENCE:

2.7.1 BALEWA'S FOREIGN POLICY (1960 - 1966)

The six-year period within which Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa served as Nigeria's Prime Minister were, by all definitions, formative years of Nigeria's foreign policy thrust. At independence, Nigeria's foreign policy commenced on a moderate level as she had to advertise herself and lay down the main lines of conduct in her relations with the international community (Ubah: 1998:109).

Before independence, Ubah stresses that there were strong reasons why many Nigerians and some other contemporary observers believed that Nigeria would be a strong factor in international relations especially within Africa, especially in terms of size. The country has one of the largest territories on the African continent, and its estimated population of about 36million people was nowhere else to be found in Africa. Nigeria has the largest concentration of black people in the world. She was rich in raw materials for industrial use, producing a very significant proportion of the world's total wealth in such products or agriculture as palm produce, groundnuts, cocoa etc. Although the percentage of literacy for the whole of the country was low than the total number of educated people available for development, was nowhere to be matched in black Africa.

The government's white paper on foreign policy presented to the Federal House of Representatives in August 1960 according to Usman (1987) showed that Nigeria would:

i. Follow a policy of non alignment;

ii. Take national interests into account in her external behavior;

iii. Seek membership of both the United Nations and the Commonwealth;

iv. Follow clear and practical policies on Africa;

v. Recognize the boundaries handed over by the colonial powers; and

vi. Follows policy of non interference in the internal affairs of other states (Usman, 1987).

These foreign policy objectives were expanded by the Prime Minister, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, when he address the United Nations General Assembly on 7 October, 1960. Nigeria was on that occasion admitted as the 99th member of the United Nations. This address, according to Garba (1995:193-194) contained a carefully thought-out and forward-looking foreign policy prescription. However, it is observed that there is no aspect of Nigerian foreign policy which cannot be subsumed or validated within the context of Balewa's address or related to the four principle points he made.

i. It is the desire of Nigeria to remain on friendly terms with all nations and participate actively in the in the work of the United Nations Organization.

ii. Nigeria has absolutely no territorial or expansionist intentions.

iii. Nigeria does not intend to ally itself as a matter of routine with any of the power blocs; and

iv. Nigeria hopes to work with other African states for the progress of Africa and to assist in bringing all other African territories to a state of responsible independence.

When Nigeria's foreign policy was first articulated by Balewa, he was by extension reflecting on Nigeria's domestic capacity to enter into and fulfill certain obligations in the international arena. The very tenets of his doctrine today remain the guiding principles Nigerian foreign policy endeavours, albeit with certain amendments and expansions aimed at accommodating prevailing realities.

The bulk of these policy statements was focused on Africa. Omojuwa (2007:17) corroborated this when stressing that *"successive Nigerian political regimes since independence in articulating the country's foreign policy have maintained a consistent focus on Africa as both the centerpiece and the major foreign policy domain of Nigeria"*. The Afro centricity of Nigeria's policy manifested in her series of activities that gave rise to the formation of the Organization of African Unity (O.A.U) in Addis Abba in 1963 out of the Casablanca and Monrovia Blocs.

Two other legacies of Nigeria's foreign policy in the First Republic were: First, the struggle against colonialism. Nigeria's stand at the time was that colonialism should be eliminated without a head-on collision with the imperialist powers. In 1964, the O.A.U set up a nine-member Liberation Committee to coordinate and fund movements involved in liberation struggles. Nigeria was a member of this committee.

The second legacy was the struggle against the apartheid regime in South Africa. Sir Abubakar played a leading role in the debate which forced South Africa to withdraw from the Commonwealth in 1961. Gambari (1980:81) noted that, Tafawa Balewa told the meeting of Commonwealth leaders that if South Africa's membership was allowed to continue Nigeria would decide whether to remain within the commonwealth or not.

The Nigerian foreign policy as executed in the First Republic has been described as conservative, passive and pro-west (Delancey, 1963:164).

Akinboye (1999) agreed with this as he noted that, the pro-western policy of the Balewa government was manifested in various ways throughout the First Republic as each region in the country had its own London officer and no Nigerian embassy in the socialists countries. The military struck on 15 January, and thus terminated the civilian administration of Tafawa Balewa. Consequently marking the end of the First Republic.

2.7.2 IRONSI'S FOREIGN POLICY (JANUARY - JULY, 1966)

When the military took over power from Balewa in January 1966, the pro-western posture of Nigeria's foreign policy did not witness any significant shift. Major General Aguiyi Ironsi who became the Head of State did not stay long enough in power to formulate a well-defined foreign policy. This was also coupled with huge domestic problems he inherited from the toppled civilian political leadership. What his short lived regime achieved, according to Jibrin (2004:28), was the closure of regional offices overseas as well as stopping regional governments from sending uniform foreign policy for the whole country.

2.7.3 GOWON'S FOREIGN POLICY (1966 - 1975)

Following the counter-coup of July 1966 which swept away the Ironsi regime and led to the emergence of Lt. Col (Later, General) Yakubu Gowon as the new Head of State, Nigeria's foreign policy took a dramatic turn. Very serious internal conflicts eventually led to a civil war which brought the country to a near state of disintegration.

During the civil war, Nigerian government under Gowon solicited for military aid from her traditional western friends to prosecute the war against the secessionist forces. His request was turned down by Britain and United States. Gowon turned to the defunct Soviet Union for military assistance, which he readily got.

The Gowon regime marked the beginning of Nigeria's central role in African affairs when he declared in 1972 that "Africa is the cornerstone of Nigeria's foreign policy". The then Minister of External Affairs, Dr.Okoi Arikpo, corroborated this when he stated that Nigeria's foreign policy was "constructed in concentric circles with Africa in the centre"(Aluko, 1977:166).

Following the end of the civil war in 1970, Nigeria's economy became buoyant as oil resources boomed. By 1974, the oil sector had accounted for about 90 percent of the total revenue, and the country took dynamic steps to assert her leadership role in Africa. Nigeria directly provided assistance to Liberation Movements and opened up support for armed struggle in the decolonization of Africa territories. Within this period too, Gowon openly declared in the context of the Mogadishu declaration that there is no alternative to armed struggle and the use of force to liquidate colonialism in Africa.

Nigeria also played a leading role in the establishment of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in 1975.

2.7.4 MURTALA/OBADANJO'S FOREIGN POLICY (1975 - 1979)

In July 1975, General Gowon's government was toppled in a bloodless coup and the new government was led by General Murtala Muhammad who brought dynamism and activism into Nigeria's foreign relations. The administration's interest in foreign affairs was demonstrated by the setting up of the Adedeji Commission to overhaul the entire foreign policy machinery of the country. The Commission's recommendations led to a redefinition of Nigeria's foreign policy objectives and the setting up of guidelines that determined the course of Nigeria's foreign relations. It was on this basis that the Murtala regime made far-reaching impact and achieved significant feat in foreign affairs. The most notable was

Nigeria's dramatic and timely intervention in the Angola independence crises in 1976 which remarkably illustrates the dynamic and action oriented Afrocentric policy of the regime. Nigeria did not only recognize the MPLA government against the Unites States backed FNLA and UNITA, she also gave huge financial assistance and military supports to it.

Nigeria also gave strong support to the freedom fighters in South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe. Such Liberation Movements as the African National Congress (ANC) in South Africa, the South West African People Organization (SWAPO) in Namibia, and the Patriotic Front in Zimbabwe were allowed to open offices in Lagos.

The Murtala regime was on record to have embarked on policies that had, and still have, far-reaching positive implications for Nigeria and the African continent in general (Alkali, 1996:74).

The assassination of General Murtala on February 13, 1976 following an abortive coup did not dampen the tempo of radicalism and dynamism of the government's foreign policy. The new Head of State, General Olusegun Obasanjo (who was second-in-command to late Murtala) continued with the same policy as laid down by General Murtala Muhammad. He consolidated Murtala's effort, and Nigeria's voice continued to be heard in the international community.

Obasanjo, as Head of State, had to embark on a policy of personal diplomacy at the Heads of state level, meeting with leaders of many countries one-on-one in order to woo them to Nigeria's side. The partial nationalization of Barclays Bank in 1978, and the taking over of British Petroleum in 1979 because of their links with apartheid South Africa were part of the practical demonstrations of Nigeria's Afro-centric policy. Government also continued with vigour its decolonization policy and provided more financial and logistic support for the liberation movements across Africa.

In accordance with the Murtala/Obasanjo regime's political transition programme, General Obasanjo successfully handed over power to the civilian government of Alhaji Shehu Shagari in October 1979.

2.7.5 SHEHU SHAGARI'S FOREIGN POLICY (1979 - 1983)

After thirteen years of military rule, power was handed over to civilian administration on October 1, 1979 under the leadership of Alhaji Shehu Shagari. His regime witnessed a retrogressive reversal in Nigeria's foreign policy as the government dampened the tempo of dynamic and active foreign policy posture bequeathed to it. Nigeria once again reverted to the conservative, pro-western policy that was reminiscent of the Balewa government in the First Republic.

Although the Shagari administration supported decolonization, its commitment to it was insufficient due largely to the severe economic crisis which the country began to experience in the early 1980s. This economic misfortune forced Shagari to take some unpleasant actions in the realm of foreign policy. These included the forcible expulsion of over two million illegal aliens from Nigeria in 1983. This action resulted in widespread hostility towards Nigeria not only from the neighbouring West African States but also from Europe (Jibrin, 2004).

Also, under his administration, the tough anti-American position which characterized the previous regime greatly mellowed. The government which was in dire need of some IMF credit facilities succumbed to the United State's pressure in 1983 and agreed that a pan-African peace-keeping force should replace the Cuban force in Angola. This was contrary to the OAU's decision and those of the frontline states that there should be no linkage of the

withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola with Namibia's independence, as was then demanded by the United States. Furthermore, reduced financial capability turned Nigeria into a debtor country dependent on foreign loans.

Amidst the deepening economic crisis, the Shagari Administration was toppled by the military in December, 1983. The new military administration was headed by Major General Muhammadu Buhari (Ihonvbere, 1985).

2.7.6 BUHARI'S FOREIGN POLICY (1984 - 1985)

General Muhammadu Buhari's military regime reverted to the dynamic foreign policy posture of the Murtala/Obasanjo era. The regime prided itself as an offshoot of the Murtala/Obasanjo government made strenuous efforts to follow that regimes footprint in foreign affairs. For instance, just as the Murtala/Obasanjo government recognized the MPLA in Angola, the Buhari regime recognized the Polisario government in Western Sahara against the opposition of some African states. His government continued Nigeria's deep commitment to the cause of liberation struggle particularly in South Africa.

Also, in its commitment to inter-state economic cooperation, the Buhari government provided land in Abuja for the building of ECOWAS' permanent headquarters. The administration refused to accept the proposal by the Arab Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC) which promised Nigeria economic and financial assistance if Nigeria's observer status is changed to a full member status.

Under the regime also, relations between Nigeria and Britain became strained because of the controversy over Britain's decision to grant refugee status to Umaru Dikko (a prominent politician under Shagari who was to answer some charges of large-scale corruption and

fraud. The request for his extradition, made by the Buhari administration, was rejected by the British government. As the controversy raged, and attempt was made to smuggle Dikko to Lagos which was foiled. This made Anglo-Nigeria relations to be more strained. The Buhari government was terminated in August 1985 in a palace coup that was led by General Ibrahim Babangida as the President and Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces.

2.7.7 BABANGIDA'S FOREIGN POLICY (1985 - 1993)

General Ibrahim Badanmasi Babangida relaxed the radical posture of the Buhari government's foreign policy. He directed his first Foreign Affairs Minister, Professor Bolaji Akinyemi to organize an All Nigeria Conference on Foreign Policy in order to examine the various perspectives of the country's foreign policy. On the recommendations of the conference, the administration re-directed its foreign policy with greater emphasis on economic issues. It introduced Economic Diplomacy as a foreign policy strategy that would improve Nigeria's depressed economy and liquidate the huge national, foreign and domestic debts. It sought to attract both foreign investment and other assistance required for achieving the objectives of the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP).

However, the Structural Adjustment Programme failed to restructure the Nigeria economy in a manner as to reduce its dependence on the West. Thus, rather than reducing the nation's economic problem, it has exacerbated it. The policy of economic diplomacy merely succeeded in opening up the nation's economy to external influence.

To promote her foreign policy objective in the West African sub-region, as a regional power, Nigeria, under Babangida, contributed immensely to the ECOWAS Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) which was set up in 1990 as an interventionist mediation force, to end

the protracted Liberian civil war. The peace-keeping force on which Nigeria has expanded huge human and material resources also succeeded in achieving the same goal in the crisis-ridden Sierra-Leon. Also, Nigeria's borders closed under Buhari, were re-opened in order to facilitate trade relations in the West African sub-region.

During the Babangida administration, Nigeria ties with Israel were strengthened by the re-opening of diplomatic relations in May 1993. This was in spite of the fact that Nigeria officially recognized the new state of Palestine declared in November 1988 as well as Nigeria's membership of the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC) in early 1986 which his predecessor had earlier rejected.

Globally, under the regime, Nigeria's image was further enhanced by the appointment of Nigerians to occupy key international positions, such as the election of Joseph Garba as President of the UN General Assembly, and Emeka Anyaoku as Secretary-General of the Commonwealth. A major foreign policy initiative of the regime was the Technical Aid Corps Scheme (TAC), a deliberate programme through which willing young Nigerian professionals are sent to serve in Africa, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries for a period of two years through the scheme. Nigeria provides skilled labour and necessary expertise that such country requires in such fields as medicine, law, teaching, finance, accounting, management and others.

Following Nigeria's deliberating political crisis precipitated by the annulment of the June 12, 1993 Presidential election by the Babangida administration, an Interim National Government (ING) headed by Chief Ernest Shonekan was hurriedly organized by

Babangida to stem the smoldering heat in the polity generated by the annulment of the election widely adjudged to be the most free and fair in the nation's political history.

The Interim National Government (ING) could not find the time to articulate or implement any worthwhile foreign policy. On November 17 1993, General Sani Abacha (The ING Minister of Defence) toppled Chief Shonekan.

2.7.8 ABACHA'S FOREIGN POLICY (1993 - 1998)

The debilitating political crisis engendered by the annulment of the June 12, 1993 Presidential election. The resultant Interim National Government (ING) was unable to resolve the impasse. As the country headed towards disintegration, the military, under General Sani Abacha, considered itself well positioned to arrest the situation. This informed the seizure of power by General Abacha.

What Abacha needed to do, according to Jibrin (2004:107), was to develop a better understanding of the unfolding values gradually gaining ground in the New World Order, and devise workable approach in responding to them effectively. In such circumstances, options such as 'pragmatic liberal diplomatic approach or 'subtle diplomacy' would have been most appropriate. Instead, he opted for a reactive foreign policy, whereby an adhoc approach to policy formulation became paramount.

This preferred option prepared the ground for the effective isolation of the country from the rest of the world. Thus, Nigeria assumed a pariah status, owing to her hard-line posture, as exemplified by the degree at which the regime held international opinion in contempt. Not only was Nigeria suspended from the Commonwealth, she also became the butt of

orchestrated global criticism. A series of sanctions were imposed on the country, particularly by her traditional allies in the West.

At the domestic level, the autocratic nature of the state, terrorist activities occasioned by bombings and assassination created a pool of self-exiled Nigerians, who exploited all available means to frustrate the government. Thus, the much needed public support for a vibrant foreign policy was denied the Nigerian government. This is notwithstanding the fact that the foundation upon which a country's foreign policy is anchored is her domestic realities.

Faced with a hostile Western world, the regime had no option than to begin to search for new friends elsewhere. It was the attendant process of search that led to the establishment of closer ties with such countries in South East Asia as Korea and Japan. This policy shift to Asia manifested in the increased number of bi-lateral trade agreements signed with Asian countries as well as the increase in the number of Nigeria's trade missions that visited Asia.

The Abacha regime also embarked on flamboyant foreign policy abroad, particularly in the West African sub-region, borne out of its desperation to show to the world that all was well in Nigeria. The country's intervention in Sierra-Leone and the continuation of the one inherited from the Babangida regime in Liberia are typical examples. These efforts led to the emergence and reinstatement of a democratically-elected government in Liberia and Sierra-Leone respectively.

2.7.9 ABDULSALAMI ABUBAKAR'S FOREIGN POLICY (1998 - 1999)

Following the sudden death of General Sani Abacha in June 1998, General Abdulsalami Abubakar took over as the Head of State and Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of Nigeria. He immediately embarked on a programme of national reconciliation. The key element in this was the announcement of a nine-month transition programme which was to usher-in a democratically elected government. His efforts to repair the damage perpetrated by the previous regime to the nation's diplomacy and standing in the world were well appreciated. He released many political detainees and prisoners. He re-cultivated the goodwill of Nigeria's traditional allies, the United States, Canada, the E.U. and other African countries. One after the other, sanctions imposed on Nigeria were lifted. In West Africa, General Abubakar pursued the peacemaking agenda of ECOWAS through the ECOMOG, and these efforts yielded fruit in the final resolution of the Sierra-Leonian crises and the military coup in Guinea Bissau.

On May 29, 1999 General Abubakar relinquished power, having successfully completed his transition programme with the elections of democratic governments at local, state and federal levels, to General Olusegun Obasanjo (Rtd) on May 29, 1999.

2.7.10 OBASANJO'S FOREIGN POLICY (1999 - 2007)

The rebirth of democratic government in Nigeria on May 29, 1999 was greeted with high hope and expectations. Such expectations were informed by the fact that democracy is reputed as the best form of government, which offers better opportunities and challenges. This is underscored by the fact that democracy occupies a central position among the collapse of the Soviet Union and the emergence of a New World Order. It therefore became pertinent that any country desirous of relevance in the emerging world order, coupled with

the hope of enjoying the benefits associated therewith, must succumb to the dictates of the global wind of change.

The fact that the Abacha regime failed to properly manage the enormous international goodwill, which the country built over the years is incontrovertible. The regime's failure in foreign policy was discernible from its low appreciation of the New World Order and the value system it imposed on the international system. Thus, the responsibility of forging an articulate, proactive and productive foreign policy for Nigeria became inevitable for the nascent democratic administration.

In his inauguration speech, President Obasanjo expresses his government's foreign policy objectives as thus: *"We shall pursue a dynamic foreign policy to promote friendly relations with all nations and will continue to play a constructive role in the United Nations and OAU and other international bodies…."*.

Consequently upon this, Obasanjo's administration opted for political diplomacy. In this regard, the President embarked on several foreign trips between 1999 and 2004. As at 2002, according to Yakubu (2011), "Obasanjo had undertaken about 82 foreign trips to countries from Africa to North America, Europe, Latin America, Australia and Asia". These have brought positive change in the world perception of Nigeria and there were also positive reciprocity from great world leaders indicating that Nigeria has been favourably received back into the mainstream of international affairs.

Nigeria's image equally witnessed a face-lift in the management of the diplomatic face-off between Britain and Zimbabwe during the execution of the latter's controversial land distribution policy. On the eve of the European Union African summit in Cairo, in 2000, the

British government approached Nigeria to mid-wife a resolution of the bilateral impasse between the two countries.

Obasanjo's government inherited and successfully implemented the 2003 All Africa Games competition tagged COJA games. This feat is not far from the new diplomatic environment established by the Obasanjo government if taken into consideration the fact that such right was accorded Nigeria in 1995 to host the FIFA Youth Football competition but the hosting right was withdrawn at the eleventh hour. This was then considered a great embarrassment to the government and its foreign policy was considered responsible.

Obasanjo's administration also played host to the Commonwealth Heads of States and governments meeting (CHOGM), and organization from which Nigeria was indefinitely suspended in 1995. Nigeria subsequently assumed its chairmanship.

At the domestic scene, his administration established the Independent Corrupt Practices Commission (ICPC) and Economic and Financial Crime Commission (EFCC), geared toward fighting corrupt practices in the country. This anti-corruption crusade also boosted the country's image.

Nigerian foreign policy under economic diplomacy is another policy thrust of the regime. The administration's pursuit of economic diplomacy was multifaceted. These include the pursuit of the recovery of funds looted and stashed abroad by the Late General Sani Abacha; campaign for debt forgiveness, and the attraction of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) into the country.

Having just emerged from an era of diplomatic isolation, Nigeria exploited available means to showcase her preparedness to multilateral diplomacy**.** She had not only demonstrated her

belief in the UN system, she had even went ahead to demand for a reform of the UN Security Council to reflect the universality of the organization. This was pursuant to Africa's and particularly Nigeria's quest for a permanent membership of the Security Council. Beyond the UN, Nigeria had since become prominent in some other multilateral organizations such as the G-77, the Commonwealth, African Union, the Gulf of Guinea Commission among others. Moreover, Obasanjo's foreign policy demonstrated a renewed commitment to African Affairs. The transition from OAU to AU, the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) had enjoyed and received tremendous patronage and significant boost from Nigeria respectively.

2.7.11 YAR'ADUA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Despite the fact that successive administrations have tried to fashion out distinguishing features, Nigeria's foreign policy thrust, according to Bumah (2008), has remained the same since independence (i.e. a commitment to Africa and Pan-Africanism). All successive Nigerian governments have sought, among other things, to promote not only the unity of all African states but also the total political, economic, social and cultural liberation of Africa and African in the Diaspora.

Taking into cognizance therefore the nation's contributions towards Africa's peace and development with attendant consequences (mostly negative), one fundamental question is; can the nation afford to continue pursuing only an African Agenda at such monumental costs? Realizing the fact that Nigeria needs a far-reaching and more dynamic foreign policy thrust capable of linking and mainstreaming her domestic agenda with the global interests in a way and manner, which Nigerians anywhere in the world, can be proud to be counted as

Nigerian's, the Yar'Adua administration fashioned out a directional foreign policy for Nigeria tagged **"**Citizen Diplomacy**".**

This new foreign policy approach is constrained to mean that Nigeria's foreign policy will henceforth be focused on the Nigerian citizens at home and in the Diaspora. According to the then Foreign Affairs Minister Chief Ojo Maduekwe this is not necessarily a departure from the country's traditional approach to foreign relations in which Africa is taken as the centre-piece, however, the policy is re-branded to focus on the citizen (Bakare, 2007:7). The country will strive for a synergy between foreign policy and domestic affairs in such a way that the citizen is taken as the focus of foreign policy.

Citizen Diplomacy focuses on maximizing the economic, political and social welfare of the citizen through astute diplomacy. It is concerned with how to enhance the image and self-worth of the Nigerian people. Citizen Diplomacy proceeds further from the basic assumption that the foreign policy must be the external projection of Government's efforts at promoting the welfare of the Citizen. It was, thus, an extension of traditional diplomacy in seeking to advance and protect the national interests of the Nigerian people.

Maduekwe (2008:5) observed that Citizen Diplomacy as a foreign policy thrust was not a new foreign policy, rather, it was re-branding of Nigerian traditional foreign policy with a sharper focus on the Nigerian citizen. According to him, the basic needs of the citizens would henceforth be the rationale and the justification for Nigeria's foreign policy. Thus, while the fundamentals of Nigeria's foreign policy remained immutable, Citizen Diplomacy seeks to inject some dynamism and flexibility in the formulation and implementation of the

policy such that the needs and aspirations of the Nigerian people in our external relation are adequately reflected and guaranteed.

Explaining further, Maduekwe observed that nation's foreign policy would be citizen-centered, that is, the government was ready to defend Nigerians anywhere in the world. That

> Africa should no longerbe the only reason for the existence of our external relations because nation-states in general pursue two fundamental goals - national security autonomy and wherever possible and beneficial to their core interest, cooperation with other states at the global level (P.5).

However, the way and manner this articulation of, and paradigm shift toa new foreign policy thrust under the Yar'Adua administration was carried out for the benefit of Nigeria and Nigerians is a different ball-game.

2.8 CITIZEN DIPLOMACY AS A CONCEPT

2007 was a year dubbed by some public commentators a 'new political era' for Nigeria. Reasons was that Nigeria got it right for the first time, a successful civilian-to-civilian democratic change of power and authority since independence in 1960, and a directional foreign policy shift from Africa-centered to citizen-centered. The Yar'Adua administration adopted a new foreign policy approach called **'Citizen Diplomacy'.** The basic thrust of the new policy initiative revolve around concerns for the basic needs, human rights and socio-economic welfare of Nigerian citizens in bilateral and multilateral engagements with other countries.

Being people oriented, it is a part of the broad range of Nigeria's foreign policy that promotes the aspects that look into the welfare of Nigerian citizens and seek to defend them wherever they are.

Though the concept 'citizen diplomacy' appears self-explanatory, it is not exactly so, more so, in the context of diplomacy as a political concept depicting the involvement of average citizens engaging representatives of another country or cause either inadvertently or by design (Ogbu, 2007:9). Mbachu (2007:9) sees Citizen Diplomacy as an organized action that government takes to achieve the objectives that have been set by policy makers. And that the concept denotes re-orientation of Nigeria's foreign policy pursuit towards beneficial economic and political engagement so as to meet up with the United Nation's Millennium Development Goals for Africa. According to him, this arose from the realization that the progress, prosperity and survival of the nation must be the concern of every Nigerian at home and in the Diaspora. According to Okocha and Nzeshi (2007:3) Citizen Diplomacy is geared towards "protecting" the image and integrity of Nigeria and retaliates against countries who are hostile and who brand Nigeria as corrupt. Given reasons for the adoption of the policy, the progenitor (cited in Adejumo,2007) explains further:

> Our foreign policy has come of age and the face of innocence is over. We remain proud of our track record from Tafawa Balewa up till now. The country that is the largest black nation in the world could not have done otherwise. A world where every sixth black man is a Nigeria could not have done otherwise, or where every four Africans is a Nigerian could not have done otherwise. We should ask ourselves some hard questions: to what extent has our foreign policy benefited Nigerians? To what extent has our foreign policy put food on our tables? In other words where is the citizen in our foreign policy?

Explained differently by Akinterinwa (2007), Citizen Diplomacy "is to ensure that our foreign policy becomes the most powerful way to express who we are……". And that we are not changing the fundamentals of our foreign policy but we are changing the branding. He explains further:

> As conceptualized, individual Nigerians are to be the main focus of any foreign policy endeavour, they are to be made important stakeholders and first beneficiaries of Nigeria foreign policy efforts in any of Nigeria's foreign policy concentric circles. More important, they are to be specially empowered to respond to the changing challenges of globalization wherever they may be found.

Ogunsanwo (2007:3) argues that, Citizen Diplomacy could mean that, from now on the Nigerian citizen abroad is the centre of Nigeria's national interest and therefore the country's entire diplomatic machinery should be geared towards protecting his or her interest, economic, welfare etc. He further pointed out that, any diplomacy that does not take this into consideration will not be appropriate for our diplomatic missions abroad.

As succinctly pointed out by Eze (2007:8), 'Citizen Diplomacy articulates, what is or should be implicit as the major goad of our foreign policy. Being people-oriented, it is a step in further standing that both national and international actions will be driven primarily by the need to promote the welfare and security of citizens'.

2.9 ASSESSMENT OF YAR'ADUA'S CITIZEN DIPLOMACY

Between 2007 and 2009, citizen diplomacy seems not to have yielded that envisage dividend due largely to some actors that are both domestic and international. According to Abati(2009: ?), placing the citizen at the centre of the national programme reinforces the original purpose of the trust of the general populace and create of national solidarity and more agents for national progress. In Nigeria, we don't seem to get this. At home and in the Diaspora, Nigerians are left to their own survival tactics; many have learnt not to expect anything from their government. He stated further that: *"Those who live abroad often complain about the cruelty of Nigerian embassy officials: to renew their passports, to get Nigerian passport or visas for their dual-nationality children could be a nightmare"*.

Reconnecting the state to the citizen and vice-versa is a major area of needed intervention for all Nigerians. Back home, the average Nigerian is treated badly by the authorities. For instance, the Nigerian Police Force vested with the responsibility of maintaining internal

peace and security have in all ramifications become agents of terrorism engaging in extra-judicial killing, arrest and detention of innocent citizens, extortion of multifarious dimensions, and brutality.

In addition to the pervasive inhuman condition of living standards and prison inmates, human lives seem worthless during the period under review. Internally, over a thousand persons have been killed in the course of sectarian violence in Northern Nigeria in recent time. On the recurrent crisis in Jos, Oni (2010) argues that 150 people were killed and stuffed in wells and sewages in a small village Kuru-Jantar. Innocent lives have been lost. But nobody knows who the victims are because there is no citizens database.

In the views of Mahmood (2009), with the President lacking international exposure and the Ministers in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs also lacking any broad experience in diplomacy, there is no wonder that, in foreign policy, this government has not made any appreciable impact. Nigeria's voice is not heard in major international fora. This was corroborated by Agubamah and Moveh (2016:85) when they observed that "…after its adoption, the external image of the country did not improve and the perception of Nigerians living outside the country has not ebbed Nigerian foreign policy to a higher level…".

Mahmood further stressed, Nigeria donated substantially towards ECOWAS set up costs including the Secretariat, it regularly paid its annual contribution of approximately 32.5% of the Community's budget which was subsequently revised upwards to 40%. In ECOWAS Community Court of Justice only 7 percent of the entire staffs are Nigerians, and it is situated in Abuja. No Nigerian has been elected in the African Union (AU) Commission since 2004. A nation that has the largest population in Africa is not represented in the AU Commission. Burkina Faso defeated Nigeria in 2007.

Another case in point which undermined Nigerian citizen diplomacy is the matter that involved Dr. Ngozi Ugo. Mahmood (2009) further narrated that, she is a citizen of Nigeria who had done so much for the UN for so many years especially in the area of peace-building and was able to win a host of international awards. The UN found her worthy of being nominated for the position of Assistant Secretary-General of the UN on three different occasions. In 2007, she was nominated for the position of UN Ombudsman, Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General amongst others, a position that is equivalent to that of Assistant Secretary-General and that which required the endorsement of her home government Nigeria. But between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and office of the Attorney-General of the Federation, they kept dribbling her until she lost. What manner of citizen diplomacy is it when on merit a citizen is found worthy of holding a very important position, by the whole world but her country refused to ensures her?

Mahmood finally observed that:

> "Dr Ugo's presence in the UN system would have enhanced Nigeria's position for the UN permanent seat. Other more serious countries campaign for their citizens and that is why the highest ranking African in the UN system, as at 2009, is Tanzanian woman. Go to the Commonwealth Secretariat in London you may think you are in India's Ministry of Foreign Affairs because of the number of Indians there. And this is where our own Chief Anyaoku served for almost four decades…"(Mahmood, 2009).

Another area of assessing citizen diplomacy is to proffer answers to pertinent questions raised by Adejumo (2007). He asked, "how helpful have been Nigeria foreign missions all over the world towards Nigerians living abroad. And how helpful here Nigeria governments been to Nigerians living in Nigeria, not to talk of ones abroad"?

In his thought-provoking answers, he said: "There are too many instances of neglect to be mentioned, but it is all the same sad stories. Nigerian diplomats have never taken care of either our image or the Nigerians living abroad".

We observe therefore that, the concept-citizen diplomacy, as at the period under review, is yet to be properly articulated, its impact is yet to be felt and the result is yet to manifest till the demise of President Umaru Yar'Adua, hence the core reason of this work for the government and policy-makers to re-consider its adoption with political will and diplomatic vigour and make it Nigeria's foreign policy thrust.

2.9.1 CRITIQUE OF CITIZEN DIPLOMACY

As Eze (2007:8) pointed out, citizen diplomacy as being people-oriented is a step in further stating that both national and international actions should be driven primarily by the need to promote the welfare and security of citizens.

While declaring open the 18th Regular Course of the Foreign Service Academy in Lagos, the Foreign Affairs Minister under Yar'Adua's administration enumerated some positive results of adopting and applying citizen diplomacy. According to him:

> Because of Citizen Diplomacy, he was able to stop the killing of 30 Nigerians on death roll in Indonesia accused of drugs and other related offences". Also, "because of Citizen Diplomacy, we intervened in the hostage taken in the coast of Somalia and there was peace over that issu.

Amadi (2008) averred that citizen diplomacy as a foreign policy thrust succeeded in Nigeria in three categories. Firstly, it has creatively connected diplomacy to governance by emphasizing the ideals of citizenship and political accountability. Secondly, it has increased the productivity of the Foreign Affairs Ministry by refocusing it to the efficiency and value addition. Thirdly, the Minister's (Foreign Affairs) participation in international fora has

increased Nigeria's reputation and played the country into a holding role for democracy and rule of law in Africa.

Despite all these successes recorded, some inadequacies of the concept as a foreign policy thrust have been identified. Abati (2009) noted, at home, the average Nigerian is treated badly by the authorities. In addition to the pervasive inhuman condition of everything, human lives are worthless. Over 750 persons have been killed in the course of sectarian violence in Northern Nigeria. Innocent lives have been lost despite the propagation of citizen diplomacy.

Infrastructure as a concern in foreign policy is not being addressed in Nigeria. Roads are bad, power supply is epileptic, security is not being delivered, water is not adequate and telecommunication services, though on the increase their quality is not up to standard (Agubamah and Moveh, 2016:86 in Saliu, 2010).

In Diaspora and even at home, Abati (2009) stressed further, Nigerians are left to their own survival tactics, many have learnt not to expect anything from their government. Those who live abroad often complain about the cruelty of Nigerian embassy officials: to renew their passports, to get Nigerian passports or visas for their dual-nationality children could be a nightmare. Nigerian missions abroad complain that Nigerians also do not behave well, and they are difficult to manage, they are mostly illegal immigrants, they do not register with the embassy, they engage in crime, they have multiple identities etc.

It is surprising that this kind of image is still subsisting many years after the adoption of citizen diplomacy. Nigerians are regularly on the death roll in Libya, Indonesia, China, Poland and other countries. Indeed, between 2009 and 2010, on two different occasions, had

deported Nigerians to their country using USA's Airlines without any admirable official rebuke (Nigerian Tribune: 2009).

In addition to the poor perception, according to Agubamah and Moveh (2016), Nigerian citizen diplomacy is not being sufficiently funded. Foreign policy in this era and age is an expensive enterprise. To remain visible in the world is to be prepared to spend money. With about 102 Missions, the country must be prepared to spend more money. More so as Nigeria is perceived as a regional power or a leader in Africa with global mandate of protecting the rights of blacks across the globe, the country's budgets of N46.7 billion and N44 billion for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for 2009 and 2010 were grossly inadequate.

The basic thrust of citizen diplomacy therefore, resolves around the concern for basic needs, human rights and socio-economic welfare of Nigerian citizens in conducting bilateral and multilateral engagements with other countries (Mbachu, 2009:72).

Given the positions of Agubamah and Moveh (2016), Mbachu (2009) and Amadi (2008), this study will benefit from their assertion that citizen diplomacy emphasizes basic needs of citizens, their welfare and overall rights to the good things of life where ever they are. The ways in which foreign policy of the country will benefit citizens which is tagged citizen diplomacy is the core of this study.

2.10 GOODLUCK JONATHAN'S FOREIGN POLICY

President Goodluck Jonathan, upon his ascension to power, constituted a Presidential Advisory Council on Foreign Affairs headed by Chief Emeka Anyaokwu to review Nigeria's foreign policy. At the end of this brain storming session, Nigeria's foreign policy shifted from Africa as the centre of her foreign policy to an investment and export driven

foreign policy. His administration adopted a policy that is intricately tied to Foreign Direct Investment (FDI). This foreign policy is termed **economic diplomacy,** and is believed to be an extension of Nigeria's domestic policy to alleviate poverty, create jobs and diversify the economy. In the words of the Foreign Affairs Minister, Ambassador Olugbenga Ashiru, "Nigeria's foreign policy would now be investment driven, defining a new driving force as different from the previous focus on Africa" (2011, Sunday Punch Newspaper:3).

According to Ashiru (2011) "the emphasis of Nigeria's Foreign Policy is on investments. The investment will have multiplier effects on the economy in terms of creating jobs and the overall growth of the economy. While we retain the leadership role in the sub-region and play a leading role in the continent, the foreign policy direction will be used to propel economic development of our country. All our Embassies and High Commissions especially in Asia, Europe and America will now promote investments (Omoh, 2011).

The principle of reciprocity is also a feature of the indicated policy. The Jonathan government adopted reciprocity in both its positive and negative aspects, proposing that where countries unnecessarily delay or deny Nigerians visa applications without just cause, the Nigerian consulate will retaliate, and where visa applicants are attended to without being subjected to indignities, Nigeria will return the favour. Also, where Nigerians are being maltreated, citizens of defaulting countries will bear the brunt, as in the case of deportations between Nigeria and South Africa in 2012. (Jaji and Ayotunde: 2016).

The Jonathan's administration noted that Nigeria will not abandon the responsibility of protecting her citizens abroad, charging the Nigerian Embassies and High Commissions to care for Nigerians living in the diaspora.

Akinterinwa (2014) pointed out four techniques employed by the Jonathan administration in pursuance of his economic foreign policy, viz:

i. *Overhaul of the Foreign Service* aimed at ensuring expertise and experience in Nigeria's foreign missions;

ii. *Partnership with specialized institutions and government bodies* so as to strengthen the foundation on which foreign policies are formed and to aid in achieving the overall objective of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs;

iii. *Strategic Partnerships* with countries which Nigeria has trade relations, marketing indigenous goods and encouraging other economies to invest in the various industries;

iv. *Collaboration with the Organized Private Sector (OPS)* where the business class and the government rubbed minds after the budget, and the opinions of the former group were taken into consideration in policy making.

The final and major strategy employed by the Jonathan administration to ensure success of economic diplomacy is known as the ***Transformation Agenda***. This Agenda is a comprehensive initiative launched to address Nigeria's economic underdevelopment, as well as review the role of the legislature and the judiciary within a period of four years (2011 – 2015). Chaired by President Jonathan himself, and coordinated by the Minister of Finance, Dr. Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, the *Transformation Agenda* covers the following key sectors: "job creation, education, health, power, transportation, Niger Delta, labour and productivity, foreign policy and economic diplomacy, legislature, governance, judiciary and justice delivery, public expenditure management, and information and communication and technology (ICT)" (Gyong, 2012).

2.10.1 ASSESMENT OF JONATHAN'S ECONOMIC DIPLOMACY

The appointment of Okonjo-Iweala, a reputable Economist, clearly illustrated the main thrust of the Jonathan's Transformation Agenda: the economy. So far, the administration

did not record much in the way of success of the lofty aims of the agenda. Internal challenges constituted more of a problem to sustaining the vision of the administration's adopted foreign policy. The purpose of the transformation agenda was rendered useless with the problems of poor governance and mismanagement of funds. Corruption in the public service is also a major contributing factor. Femi Otedola, a member of the Economic Management Team was involved in a bribery scandal. In the area of trade and commerce facilitation by diplomats and ambassadors, as pointed out by Babayo (2014), Nigerian diplomats were ill-equipped for the new role that was assigned to them. They were still largely 'generalists'. The involvement of Nigerian diplomats in international economic relations was peripheral. It consisted largely of attending meetings with so-called experts from the home Ministries of Finance, Planning, and Trade that had primary responsibility for Nigeria's external economic and commercial relations. New programmes such as the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS), the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were being added to the responsibilities of Nigerian diplomats without providing them with the additional training needed to advance these programmes. For instance, after several purges in the Nigerian Foreign Service, there remained only a handful of officers in the Nigerian Foreign Service with extensive training in international economics and trade. Very few Nigerian diplomats are bilingual, not to talk of being multilingual, a crucial and necessary asset in trade promotion, outside the Anglophone countries, such as Germany, France, Spain, Italy as well as most of Latin America. (Babayo, 2014).

All these reflect very negatively on the administration and its transformation agenda as a whole. Undoubtedly, President Jonathan scored some positive points. Privatization of the power sector remain a glowing achievement of his administration. However, on the whole, Jaji and Ayotunde (2016) posited that the foreign policy techniques employed under his

administration have not in any monumental way made the country better off than it was. Foreign Direct Investment into Nigeria in 2011, when President Jonathan took office, increased from $6.5billion in the previous year to $8.9billion (Umejie, 2014). However, the figure has since been plummeting. In 2012 and 2013, FDI was $7 billion and $5.5 billion respectively (Umejie, 2014). The administration observed that "lack of continuity, consistency and commitment (3Cs) to agreed policies, programmes and projects…" is the reason why growth and development of the Nigerian economy does not correspond with "the overall welfare of Nigerian citizens, rising unemployment, inequality and poverty"(Akinterinwa, 2014).

Akinterinwa stressed further that:

> "the administration had not changed its policies between 2011 and 2014, but perhaps its level of commitment had diminished, and it was not consistent in its efforts. Contributing to the decline of investments isthe situation of insecurity in the country. Attempts to mobilize the diaspora community to either return to Nigeria or make investments in the economy have come to naught. The prevalence of unemployment, corruption and insecurity was discouraging. Expatriates were unconvinced that Nigeria had anything to offer them."

Jonathan's Foreign Policy also continued the Citizen Diplomacy of Late President Yar'Adua. He noted that his administration will not abandon the responsibility of protecting Nigerian citizens abroad, charging the Nigerian Embassies and High Commissions to care for Nigerians living in other countries. In the words of Ashiru in (Atoyebi, 2012:9):

> "past policy thrust is fair and decent treatment wherever they may be. We will continue to insist that Nigeria be accorded respect and treated with dignity. Our charge to the Ambassadors and High Commissioners is that the welfare of Nigerians in Diaspora must be taken seriously. However, as we strive to protect and promote the interests of our compatriots abroad, we also reiterate to them the imperative to be law abiding in their places of abode".

Jonathan's administration also advocated for Preventive Diplomacy as a means of conflict prevention. While addressing the United Nations Security Council in 2011, Jonathan said

that "Nigeria viewed conflict prevention as a subject. Indeed, Nigeria has invested resources to support the campaign for Preventive Diplomacy especially especially within our sub-region. We have adopted the use of Preventive Diplomacy in addressing complex questions arising from armed conflicts" (Onuorah and Obiagwu, 2011).

2.10.2 CRITIQUE OF JONATHAN'S ECONOMIC DIPLOMACY

The foreign policy position of the administration of President Goodluck Jonathan who succeeded the late Yar'Adua (who died on 5th May, 2010) was, according to Chidozie *et al* (2014), generally perceived as a continuation of the foreign policy thrust of his predecessor. In his capacity as the acting President, Jonathan embarked on a number of diplomatic shuttles, as part of a deliberate attempt to reassure the world that Nigeria was well and secure despite the internal political challenges especially with the challenges of succession it was going through. Nigeria literally returned to the international arena. One of the shuttles took him to the USA where he met with his American counterpart which enabled the delisting of Nigeria from the discriminatory rule of the Department of Homeland Security on special screening of passengers on international flights to the United States that specifically targeted Nigerians (consequent upon the Christmas day attempted bombing a US airline by a Nigerian Abdu Mutallab. Also, Jonathan recalled Nigeria's ambassador to Libya in protest of suggestion by Muammar Ghaddafi that Nigeria should separate into a Muslim North State and a Christian South. (Chidozie, Ibietan and Ujara, 2014).

The President Jonathan development programme was anchored on transformation agenda which, according to him, was to totally transform every decaying sector in Nigeria. It was also the period Nigeria was witnessing high level insecurity occasioned by the activities of Boko Haram in the North East, corruption and youth's restiveness among other problems.

All these factors, according to Boma *et al* (2015), contributed negatively to the global perception of Nigeria and Nigerians. In order to address these problems, President Jonathan's foreign policy direction focused on investment and economic cooperation within the global community. The new posture of government was that – while we retain the leadership role in our sub-region, and while we play our leadership role on the continent by taking the lead in all major issues on the continent, the Foreign Policy direction will also be used to propel the economic and industrial development of our country. Ajaebili (2011) asserts that while the President was stressing the need for a holistic effort by his government, corporate bodies and individuals to stamp out the evil of insecurity, crime and corruption so that the country will be safe for both Nigerians and foreigners, the pervasive corruption in the country had tarnished her image and had resulted in foreign nationals exercising extreme caution in entering into business transactions with Nigerians, thereby weakening the economic sector.

Jonathan's administration did not actually succeed in implementing his foreign policy as evidenced from USA government refusing to sell weapons to Nigeria, and the South Africa government also seizing Nigeria money meant to purchase weapons to combat the Boko Haram menace. Similarly, many Nigerians were executed in countries like Indonesia, Philippines, Australia and unprovoked attacks on Nigerian nationals and massive deportation of Nigerians across the globe. Nwankwo (2013) thus noted that the problem of Nigeria's foreign policy that is affecting the country's image is not in formulation, but in implementation. It therefore means, Nigeria's Foreign Policy under Jonathan's administration failed to have meaningful impact on Nigerians and the global community.

2.11.0 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Two frameworks of analysis are considered for this work. The first is critical theory which, according to Agubamah and Moveh (2016), is based on making a well known issue better by pointing out its areas of weakness in order to strengthen it if well noted and acknowledged. The theory is a social theory oriented towards critiquing and changing nations as a whole in contrast to traditional theory oriented only to understanding or explaining it. This theory stresses the reflective assessment and critique of nations and their cultures by applying knowledge from the social sciences and humanities. Propounders of this theory include Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, Walter Benjamin, and Erich Fromm (Joseph: 1960).

In both the broad and narrow senses, however, a critical theory provides the descriptive and normative bases for social enquiry aimed at decreasing domination and increasing freedom in all their forms. Horkheimer (1993:21) further stresses that a critical theory is adequate only if it meets three criteria: it must be explanatory, practical, and normative, all at the same time. That is, it must explain what is wrong with current social reality, identify the actors to change it, and provide both clear norms for criticism and achievable practical goals for social transformation.

The other theory considered for this study is the social constructivism. This is a theory employed in International Relations based on how actors define their national interests, threats to those interests and their relationship to one another. This puts International Relations in the context of broader social relations. It posits that states decide on what they want and need, not only based on material needs but social interaction. Therefore, this theory posits that what states do depends on what their identities and interests are, and it

should be noted that identities and interests change (Weber, 2005:60). Constructivism also recognizes that power is not absent from the international system, but it focuses more on social interactions based on perception (Goldstein and Pevehouse, 2011:162).

The focus of social constructivism (also known as constructivism) according to Jackson and Sorensen (2006:162) is on human awareness and consciousness in its place of world affairs. In other words, they argue that the international system exists as an inter-subjective awareness among people in the sense that the system is constituted by ideas, not by material forces. Immanuel Kant, one of the proponents of this theory, argued that we can obtain knowledge about the world, but it will always be subjective knowledge in the sense that it is filtered through human consciousness. Human beings rely on 'understanding' of each other's actions and assigning 'meaning' to them (Hacking, 1991:4 in Jackson and Sorensen, 2006:165).

The constructivist theory examines how state interests and identities are intertwined and how those identities are shaped by their interaction with other states. For constructivists, power, politics, anarchy and military force cannot explain change totally, but institutions, regimes, norms and changes in identity are better explanations (Goldstein and Pevehouse, 2011:122-123). Alexander Wendt, another proponent of the theory (1995 in Weber, 2005:65) stated that the fundamental principles of constructivist theory include:

- People act towards objects, including other actors, on the basis of the meanings that the objects have for them: SOCIAL KNOWLEDGE;
- The meanings in terms of which action is organized arise out of interaction: SOCIAL PRACTICE;

- Identities (and interests) are produced in and through 'situated activity': SOCIAL IDENTITIES AND INTERESTS.

2.11.1 Relevance of Social Constructivist Theory to the Study:

This work seeks to assess Nigeria's Foreign Policy and national interest under the Yar'Adua and Jonathan's administrations. Social Constructivism therefore helps to give a platform for its justification in the sense that when a state is able to construct a perception of itself for another state to see, it then changes the nature of relations in the international system. In other words, when Nigeria is able to create a positive perception of itself to the rest of the world in the context of social relations, then the manner in which the rest of the world relates with Nigeria will change.

To this end, the Nigerian government under the Yar'Adua administration decided to focus its foreign policy thrust on the one that places the welfare of its citizens over other sundry considerations. This new policy focus was described as "diplomacy of consequences" and was determined by concept of reprocity. It called for the international community to take responsibility for its actions towards Nigerians whether favourable or adverse. The thrust evolved into what is referred to *as* ***CitizenDiplomacy***-the central focus of this study, and Social Constructivist Theory is therefore chosen as its framework of analysis.

2.12 SUMMARY

This chapter has been able to review relevant literatures that emphasize the meaning of national interest and foreign policy objectives. Principles and determinants of Nigeria's foreign policy as well as foreign policy making and factors which influence foreign policy

of any nation in the international system were equally discussed. Also, we have been able to provide a historical overview on Nigeria's foreign policy since independence, and further examined Citizen Diplomacy as a Concept. The Chapter assesses both the Yar'Adua administration's Citizen Diplomacy and that of Economic Diplomacy of the Jonathan administration. Critiques of both foreign policies adopted by both administrations were also discussed. In order for us to be able to have a comprehensive analysis and understanding of the main focus of this study, two significant theories were considered (Critical Theory and Social Constructivist Theory) but the latter was adopted as its framework of analysis.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

In this study, the survey method was used to obtain necessary information. The choice of this research technique was informed by the descriptive nature of the research problem and also by giving credence to the portion of the population selected as representing the entire population. The work assesses both the Yar'Adua and Jonathan Administration's foreign policy thrusts through sample survey.

3.2 Method of Data Collection

The researcher used the unstructured observations, questionnaire and structured interviews to collect primary data for the study and for the secondary data; books, journals, seminar/conference papers, newspapers and internet materials were used.

3.3 Primary Source of Data

The primary data for this study were collected through questionnaires, interviews and observation. The questionnaire is a list of questions designed to collect information on aspect of research problem from the respondents on the field. Two sets of questionnaires were used. One was designed to elicit information from Staff of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs- Abuja. The other set was designed for Foreign Affairs scholars/analysts and Diplomats. Both sets were structured into two sections. While Section A contained the personal profile of the respondents without their names, Section B was designed to provide information and suggestions in the sequence of the three hypotheses postulated for this study.

The questionnaires for staff of the Foreign Affairs Ministry were administered using systematic random sampling technique to ensure that all departments and all categories of senior staff are evenly represented in the random frame. The questionnaires for scholars/analysts and diplomats were administered using accidental sampling technique. Interviews were also conducted with some diplomats who were accessible to the researcher. The oral interview is another primary source of data collection adopted in this study. It involves one-on-one interaction in question and answer form between the researcher and the respondent. The oral interview conducted was to corroborate the questionnaire responses and to provide sufficient information that could help in the successful completion of the study.

3.4 Secondary Source of Data:

Data used from secondary sources were obtained from related books, seminar/conference papers, journals, newspapers/magazines, internet and government publications found in various libraries across Nigeria.

3.5 Research Instrument and administration:

One of the instruments used for data collection was questionnaire. Although, the total estimated staff population of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was not revealed to the researcher by the officials of the Foreign Affairs Ministry, but we went ahead to produce a hundred (100) number of structured and open-ended questionnaires as the sample population of this study using simple random sampling technique. The information from the field was gathered through the administration of questionnaires. This information was directly related to the research problems and objectives. The researcher was present in the field to administer the questionnaires. Sixty (60) of these were designed for staff of the

Foreign Affairs Ministry, and the remaining forty (40) designed for such other respondents as scholars in International Relations and Diplomacy as well as seasoned Diplomats (serving and retired). Eighty (80) percent of respondents from the Foreign Affairs Ministry are of Senior cadre with vast experience in foreign affairs, while the remaining twenty (20) percent constitute Junior cadre officers. With this, it is believed that the sample will give us the quality of the whole staff population.

Out of the forty (40) questionnaires designed for other respondents, ten (10) were distributed to scholars, another ten (10) to seasoned Diplomats, ten (10) also was given to International Relations analysts and the last ten (10) was distributed among Research Assistants and post graduate students in International relations.

The other instrument used was interviews which were conducted with respondents that were accessible to the researcher.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1.0 Data Presentation:

The study assesses foreign policy thrusts of both the Yar'Adua and Jonathan's administrations vis-à-vis Nigeria's national interest, therefore in order to validate or debunk what have been asked in our Research questions and further expressed in our assumptions, we sought the opinion of members of staff of the Foreign Affairs Ministry in Abuja as well as some scholars/analysts and diplomats (both serving and retired) on the issue. The responses of these respondents provided the data we are presenting and analysed thus:

Out of one hundred (100) questionnaires distributed among the selected respondents mentioned above, seventy two (72) which constitute exactly seventy two percent (72%)were returned. Although the success achieved in the retrieval of the distributed questionnaires, particularly to staff of the Foreign Affairs Ministry, could be likened to squeezing water out of stone, the ones distributed to scholars/analysts and diplomats were very smooth and encouraging.

Specifically, sixty (60) questionnaires designed for staff of Foreign Affairs Ministry were distributed, only thirty eight (38) were returned. This, according to one of the officials, was due to the 'Ministry's policy of not releasing classified information that may constitute security risk to government and the nation'. On the other hand, forty (40) questionnaires designed for such other respondents as scholars/analysts and diplomats, were distributed, and thirty four (34) were returned. The findings therefore were augmented by the responses of interviewees ranging from seasoned scholars and diplomats etc.

4.1.1 Data Analysis

With regards to the assessment of Nigeria's Foreign Policy and National Interest under Yar'Adua and Jonathan administrations, all the data collected were carefully analyzed using simple descriptive statistics (frequency and percentage) and summarized in figures and tables.

4.2.0 Respondents' Profile:

The information obtained from the first section of the questionnaire for staff of the Foreign Affairs Ministry reveals that eighty percent (80%) of the respondents were of Senior Cadre with vast experience in Foreign Affairs and Diplomacy, while twenty percent (20%) were of Junior Cadre.

On the other hand, the profile of the respondents to the questionnaire designed for scholars/analysts and diplomats shows that thirty four (34) constituting one hundred percent (100%) of the total returned were seasoned scholars of International Relations and Career Diplomats with vast experience in both public and diplomatic services.

4.2.1 Test of Hypothesis One:

That the views, opinions and aspirations of the national elite determine what constitutes Nigeria's national interest.

To determine the validity or otherwise of this hypothesis, the table below explains further:

Table 4.2.1

RESPONDENT	VARIABLE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Staff of Foreign Affairs Ministry	**YES**	**38**	**100**

Others (Scholars and Diplomats)	**YES**	**34**	**100**
TOTAL		**Σ f= 72**	**100**

Table 4.2.1 above reveals that all respondents agree that the views, opinions andaspirations of the national elite determine what constitutes Nigeria's national interest. Therefore Hypothesis One is valid.

Response ofAlhaji Baba Kura Kaigama CON, OON,OFR (Former Permanent Secretary, Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs to an interview conducted by the Researcher on Monday February 14, 2011 in Abuja:

'… Of course YES, the national elite of any nation is the main body whose general views, aggregate opinions and aspirations determine or define the national interest of a given nation (be it developing or developed)**'.**

4.3.0 Test of Hypothesis Two:

That the definitive declaration of Africa as the Centre-piece of Nigeria's foreign policy serves Nigeria's national interest.

Table 4.3.0

RESPONDENTS	**FREQUENCY (f)**		**PERCENTAGE**	
	YES	**NO**	**YES**	**NO**
Staff of Foreign Affairs Ministry	**30**	**8**	**79**	**21**

Others (Scholars and Diplomats)	**34**	**-**	**100**	**-**
TOTAL	**64**	**8**		

Table 4.3.0 above, shows that thirty (30) members of staff of the Foreign Affairs Ministry constituting seventy nine percent (79%) agreed that the definitive declaration of Africa as the centre-piece of Nigeria's foreign policy serves Nigeria's national interest, while eight (8) constituting twenty one percent (21%) disagreed that the definitive declaration of Africa as the centre-piece of Nigeria's foreign policy serves Nigeria's national interest. Other respondents (scholars,analysts and diplomats) constituting a hundred percent agreein totality thereby validating the second hypothesis.

Response of Professor Rufa'i Ahmed Alkali (Former People's Democratic Party National Publicity Secretary to an interview conducted by the Researcher on Thursday May 19,2011 in Abuja:

'…… at the time it was declared (i.e during the first republic till early 1990s),it adequately served Nigeria's national interest…… . Even at present, it serves our strategic national interest although to some extent it has outlived its relevance in that the changing global realities has made re-designing of our foreign policy very necessary'

4.4.0 Test of Hypothesis Three:

That changing realities of global circumstance affect Nigeria's foreign policy focus, thereby making citizen-diplomacy more desirable.

Table 4.4.0

RESPONDENT	VARIABLE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Staff of Foreign Affairs Ministry	**YES**	**38**	**100**
Others	**YES**	**34**	**100**
TOTAL		**Σ f=72**	**100**

Table 4.4.0 shows, that all respondents agree that changing realities of global circumstance affect Nigeria's foreign policy focus, and has made citizen-diplomacy much more desirable. The third hypothesis is therefore valid.

Responses to the Researcher's series of interview conducted to test Hypothesis Three:

Professor JubrilAminu (A Senator of Federal Republic; Former Foreign Affairs Minister; Former Senate Committee Chairman on Foreign Affairs). Interview conducted on Tuesday December 6, 2011 in Kaduna:

'Looking at the changing realities of global circumstance….., one need not to be told that the focus of our foreign policy has been affected. Therefore there's the urgent need to re-articulate our foreign policy to conform with the current global practice… . YES- Citizen Diplomacy is much more desirable now that our traditional Africa-centered policy is no longer favourable to us. A foreign policy that will take into consideration the needs and

welfare of Nigerian citizens wherever they may choose to reside in the world is what we need now'.

Ambassador Marina Mohammed(Former Nigeria's High Commissioner to The Gambia). Interview conducted on Wednesday February 8,2012 in Kaduna:

"It is my candid opinion that changing realities of global circumstance have greatly affected the focus of our foreign policy. You can see how Nigerians are being treated across the world after the end of the Cold War, particularly in Africa- our cherished continent. Citizen-Diplomacy is highly recommended as our new foreign policy thrust. This, indeed, will accord Nigeria and Nigerians the deserved respect in the comity of nations, and will improve Nigerians' patriotic zeal"

Professor Alaba Ogunsanwo (International Relations Lecturer, University of Lagos; Former Nigeria Ambassador to Republic of Botswana). Interview conducted on Wednesday March 28, 2012 in Lagos:

" I have said this time without number that Citizen Diplomacy is much more desirable as it will ensure that Nigerian citizens wherever they may choose to reside will now become the centre of our national interest, and the entire diplomatic machinery would be geared towards protecting this interest.When adopted, it will promote the welfare and security of Nigerian citizens"

Caleb Ayuba (a Research Fellow, Institute of Conflict Resolution-Abuja). Interview conducted on Thursday 16 February, 2012 in Abuja:

"Citizen- Diplomacy as a foreign policy thrust is very desirable for Nigeria even if the changing realities of global circumstance have not affected our traditional foreign policy focus. The world is dynamic, so also international politics.Citizen Diplomacy will protect the image and integrity of Nigeria and her citizens. It will also reciprocate whatever treatment meted to Nigeria and Nigerians by any foreign nation".

Going by the above analysis, one could therefore submit that Citizen Diplomacy- a foreign policy thrust adopted and pursued by the Yar'Adua's administration should be imbibed with renewed vigour by successive governments in Nigeria in order to avert the attendant negative effects and incessant embarrassments received by Nigeria which the traditional Africa-centered policy has engendered.

4.5.0 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The findings show that all respondents agree that only the views, opinion and aspirations of national elite constitutes Nigeria's national interest. Therefore, the elites of any nation is the main body whose views and aggregate opinions determine the national interest of any nation. The response of a former Permanent Secretary, Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the researcher's interview also corroborated this assertion

Also the study reveals that majority of respondents agree that the definitive declaration of Africa as the centre-piece of Nigeria's foreign policy serves Nigeria's national interest, but a former National Publicity Secretary of Peoples Democratic Party expressed that to some extent, the notion has outlived its relevance as the changing global realities had made re-focusing of our foreign policy very necessary.

The study further brought out the fact that changing realities of global circumstance had affected Nigeria's foreign policy focus thereby making citizen-diplomacy much more

desirable. All respondents, including Professor Jubril Aminu, Former Nigeria's High Commissioner to The Gambia, Professor Alaba Ogunsanwo, etc agreed that Citizen-diplomacy is much more desirable now that all other policies had not achieved the desired outcome for Nigerians.

4.5.1 Data Source Triangulation

This work has successfully utilized information and data through primary sources and secondary sources (i.e. interviews, documents, public records etc). The credibility of this work could be traced to the data sources utilized. Observation method was also used when it was observed, in the course of the research, that the concept of **Citizen Diplomacy** had not yielded the desired impact till the demise of President Yar'Adua.

Triangulation of data strengthens research as additional sources of information often give more insight into a research topic. Multiple sources provide verification and validity while complementing similar data. Inadequacies found in one-source data is minimized when multiple sources confirm the same data, as was used in this work.

4.5.2 Methodology Triangulation

For our used data to be valid, multiple methods were employed to gather data, such as interviews, documents, observations, questionnaires or survey, at different times and in different places.

4.5.3 Theory Triangulation

Two theoretical approaches were considered for this work: ***Critical Theory*** and ***Social Constructivism,*** but the latter was adopted as framework of analysis in that it is based on how actors in international relations define their national interests, threats to those interests

and their relationship to one another. The adopted theory helps to give a platform for its justification in the sense that when a state is able to construct a perception of itself for another state to see, it then changes the nature of relations in the international system. In other words, when Nigeria is able to create a positive perception of itself to the rest of the world in the context of social relations, then the manner in which the rest of the world relates with Nigeria will change.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

Despite the criticism of the Citizen Diplomacy, this work has been able to come out with some findings that are germane to the realization of Nigeria's foreign policy objectives, and to the growth and development of our dear country – Nigeria. Firstly, the work has been able to cover the gap which made Nigeria to be referred to as "Big Brother" to other African countries in need of assistance to the detriment of her growth and development. Secondly, Citizen Diplomacy has creatively connected diplomacy to governance by emphasizing the ideals of citizenship and the need for citizens' participation in decision-making process.

It has also brought out an increased productivity of the Foreign Affairs Ministry by re-focusing Nigeria's Foreign Policy Thrust to the welfare of Nigerian citizens above any other considerations.

Although, the findings reveals the views of some respondents who believed that Nigeria's foreign policy thrust has been elitist both in theory and practice, and will continue to be so as there was nothing like Citizen-Diplomacy,it has also brought out the views of eminent Nigerians supporting the policy thrust as highly desirable.

5.2 Conclusion:

This work has clearly shown that the major premises of Nigeria's foreign policy have remained quite consistent since independence. It is worthy to note that each government or Foreign Minister that comes to power or office has its own preconceived idea or focus of foreign policy. The first casualty of this mindset, as we have seen in the work, is policy

continuity. Whatever was on the board was immediately discarded. Nigeria's foreign policy between 1960 and 1965 has been described as conservative. The Ironsi regime that came to power in 1966 inherited this weak and vacillating stance thereby leaving him little or no time to formulate any notable foreign policy.

The nine years of the Gowon administration occasioned a new pattern of diplomacy by emphasizing favourable publicity rather than the policy content of Nigeria's foreign policy. When Murtala-Obasanjo regime came to power in 1975, it set out to reverse that trend. The import of the radical change in Nigeria's foreign policy in 1975 placed Africa as it's cornerstone. The conduct of foreign policy during the Shagari years has been viewed as a failure to meet the challenges constructively. The Buhari regime took a decisive action in the matter of recognizing the Saharawi Arab Democratic Republic in 1984, thus facilitating its admission into the O.A.U. The Babangida administration's execution of foreign policy was inconsistent and self-serving.

While global realities continued to affect the shaping of Nigeria's foreign policy over the years and in response to the New World Order, the Abacha regime opted for a reactive foreign policy. After General Abacha's demise in 1998, General Abdulsalami who took over immediately embarked on a transition to civil rule programme which eventually ushered in a democratically-elected government. Having just emerged from an era of diplomatic isolation, Nigeria, under Obasanjo, embarked on multi-lateral diplomacy.

Yar'Adua's government in 2007 realised that Nigeria needs a far-reaching and more dynamic foreign policy capable of linking her domestic agenda with the global interest in a way that Nigerian citizens could be accorded the deserved honour and respect anywhere in

the world, fashioned out a directional foreign policy tagged 'Citizen Diplomacy'. This new foreign policy thrust was not necessarily a departure from the country's traditional approach to foreign relations in which Africa is taken as the center-piece but, the policy is to specifically focus on the Nigerian citizens before any other sundry consideration.

However, since its postulation, citizen diplomacy has been subjected to the most anxious but well meaning scrutiny by both domestic and international commentators. The new policy has attracted praise and criticism in like manner, hence the decision to carry out this research with a view to bringing out the need for the sustenance of the policy.

Jonathan's Foreign Policy also continued the Citizen Diplomacy of Late President Yar'Adua. He noted that his administration will not abandon the responsibility of protecting Nigerian citizens abroad, charging the Nigerian Embassies and High Commissions to care for Nigerians living in other countries.

Finally, it is our opinion that Nigeria's foreign policy should reflect the real interests of the entire citizenry. We should constantly review our foreign policy in line with the changing global circumstances so that our policy option will be appropriate to the emerging situation. And at each point in time, the over-riding interest of the citizens should be seriously taken into account.

5.3 Recommendations:

Nigeria's foreign policy is the continuation of her domestic policy. It is a policy that is formulated internally and projected externally. Therefore, the domestic environment needs to be properly developed in order for it to have a positive impact on its external projection.

Okafor (2004) stresses that "the interest of Nigeria should be the first in whatever area we are intervening or in our interaction with Africa or the outside world".

In their opinion, Nwosu and Adeniyi (2011) noted that for Nigeria to be relevant in the new realities in international relations, the focus of her foreign policy should stand on two principles: *The Principle of Reciprocity; and Economic Diplomacy.* The principle of reciprocity should remain the guiding principle in our international trade and politics. Nations should assist one another without strings. They noted that, it is unsustainable contradiction to provide financial and material assistance to nations that later show hostility to our interests and citizens. In addition, Nigeria should pursue an aggressive economic diplomacy, as a dependent economy cannot pursue an aggressive foreign policy.

For the Citizen Diplomacy to succeed therefore, it must be backed up with the sincerity of purpose and approach to Nigeria's problems at home. Adejumo (2007) posits that,

> "it is not good enough to know that after fifty years as a nation (blessed with various kinds of human and material resources), our people are still wallowing in abject poverty and desperation, while our leaders are looting the treasuries all over the country and living unimaginable expensive lifestyles and spiriting the loot out of Nigeria and depositing it in the countries we are trying to impose this citizen diplomacy on".

Nigeria must develop an agenda of engagement. This would entail creating a mechanism to investigate and deal with any diverse publicity reports relating to Nigeria. This would help in identifying and collating all incidents of adverse publicity. Operational directions for Nigerian Missions abroad must be formulated, issued and implemented worldwide within Nigerian High Commissions and Embassies. Resources must be made available for this purpose. In addition, there should be enhanced monitoring of the mission's activities to ensure that identified objectives are met.

As pointed out by Mato (2009), Nigerian Missions abroad especially in those countries where Nigerians are facing difficulties due to the behavior of few disgruntled citizens must step up effort to discourage those who are dubious and encourage hard work, dignity and honest living. Nigerians abroad must be sensitized to the peculiar responsibilities of nationalism.

We believe that the introduction of Citizen Diplomacy in Nigeria is desirable, noteworthy and must be pursued. It is a policy thrust that is inherently proactive, decidedly dynamic and conceived to protect Nigerian citizens' rights wherever they choose to live. Rather than ventilate unproductive drawbacks, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs should be encouraged and supported, using incisive critical appraisal not as a tool to denigrate but as an encouragement.

The Federal Government should study Nigeria's Foreign Policy machinery and try to make it more dynamic, more focused and more responsive to the needs of vibrant citizen diplomacy. Staff of Foreign Affairs Ministry should be given adequate training to perform their duties more effectively, not down-sizing "as canvassed for by the Presidential Advisory Council (PAC) on Foreign Relations". This is an era when we need meticulous planning and deployment of sufficient skills to achieve her goals.

Nigerian foreign policy should be urgently reviewed and re-packaged in the light of the new realities of the globalized world order, to make it more efficient, responsive, dynamic and proactive, based on citizen diplomacy. Citizen Diplomacy, a noteworthy proactive policy thrust, if well articulated and pursued with passion could lead to better management and allocation of resources to meet the pressing needs of Nigerian citizens everywhere. The

Ministry of Foreign Affairs should be wholeheartedly encouraged and supported, using incisive, critical appraisal not as a tool to denigrate but as a source of encouragement, advice and information.

REFERENCES

Abati, R (2009) "North Korea and Clinton's Citizen Diplomacy" The Guardian, Friday August, 7.

Adejumo, A. (2007) "Re-OjoMaduekwe's Citizenship Diplomacy". Available on INTERNET at http://209.85.129.132/search?q=cache:R5j9cuj4sj:www.nigeriasinamerica.com/articles/20.

Adeniran, T. (1993) Introduction to International Relations. Lagos:Macmillan

Agubamah, E. and **Moveh, D. O. (2016)**"Critical Assessment of Nigeria's Citizen Diplomacy" *Kaduna Journal of Political Science*, Vol.3, No.1, June.

Agbu, O. (2007) "Nigerian Foreign Policy under President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua: Challenges and Prospects". Being a Paper Presented at the One-Day Seminar on Citizen Diplomacy Organized by the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos. November, 29.

Ajaebili, C. (2011) The Option of Economic Diplomacy in Nigeria's Foreign Policy. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science.* 1:277-280.

Akinbobola, A. (1996) Foreign Policy Analysis: Issues and Trends in Selected Countries. Ibadan: Cohop Publications Nigeria Ltd.

Akinboye, S. O. (1999) "Nigeria's Foreign Policy" in R. Anifowose and F.C. Enemuo(eds) Elements of Politics. Lagos: Sam Iroanusi Publications.

Akinterinwa, B (2007) "Foreign Policy under the Yar'Adua Administration" THISDAY Newspaper.

Akinterinwa, B. (2014) Nigeria's Foreign Policy Strategies and Techniques. InJ. Ayoade, A. Akinsanya, O, Ojo, *The Jonathan Presidency* (pp. 225-287). Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.

Alkali, R.A. (1996) Issues in International Relations and Nigeria's Foreign Policy. Zaria: Bob Academic Press Inc.

Almond, G.A. and Lasswell, H.D.(1948) "The Participant Observer: A Study of Administrative Rules in Action" in Harold D. Lasswell (ed) The Analysis of Political Behaviour: An EmpiricalApproach. New York.

Amadi, S. (2008) "Ojo Maduekwe and Nigerian Foreign Policy".Daily Independent, Monday, May 5.

Ayeni-Akeke, O.A.(2008) Foundation of Political Science. Ibadan: Ababa Press Limited.

Babayo, M. (2014) Economic Diplomacy and Nigeria's Foreign Policy. Lagos: NIIA.

Bakare, W. (2007) The Punch, July, 31.

Bumah, J. (2008) "Foreign Policy: Yar'Adua and the Diplomacy of Consequences". The Punch, September 30.

Buenos de Mesquita, B. (2002) "Domestic Politics and International Relations" International Studies Quarterly, 46:1-10.

Brecher, M. and Eilkenfeld, J.(1997)A Study of Crisis. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Caprioli, M. (2000) "The Myth of Women Pacifism" in Taking Sides: Clashing Views on Controversial Issues in World Politics, Nineth Edition(ed) Rourke,J.T, Guilford, C.T.:McGraw-Hill/Dushkin.

Chidozie, F, Ibietan, J., Ujara, E. (2014) Foreign Policy, International Image and National Transformation: A Historical Perspective. *International Journal of Innovative Social Sciences and Humanities Research.* 2: 49-58.

Childs, J.R (1948) American Foreign Service New York Holt.

Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1980) Research Method in Education, London. Croom Helm.

Constitutions of Federal Republic of Nigeria 1979 and 1989

Delancey, M.W (1963) "Nigeria: Foreign Policy Alternatives", in T.M Shaw and Olajide Aluko (eds) Nigerian Foreign Policy, London.

Eke, O.A. (2009) Globalization Challenges and Nigerian Foreign Policy. Abakaliki: Willy Rose & Appleseed Publishing Coy.

Eze, O.C (2007) "Citizen Diplomacy, Legal Perspective, National/International Dimension". Being a Paper Presented at the One-Day Seminar on Citizen Diplomacy Organized by the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos. November, 29.Presented at a Seminar on Citizen Diplomacy Organized by the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos. November, 29.

Everts, P.andIsernia, P.(2001) ed. Public Opinion and the Use of Force. London: Routledge.

Ferguson, N. (2004) "A World Without Power" in Foreign Policy, 143 (July/August):32-40

Frankel, J. (1963) The Making of Foreign Policy: An Analysis of Decision Making. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fukuyama, F.(1998)"Women and the Evolution of Politics in Foreign Affairs, 77/5: 24-40.

Gauba, O. P. (2003) An Introduction to Political Theory. Delhi: Macmillan India Ltd.

Gambari, I.A (1980) Party Politics and Foreign Policy: Nigeria under the First Republic. Zaria A.B.U Press.

Garba, J.N (1995) Fractured History: Elite Shifts and Policy Changes in Nigeria. Princeton N.J Sungai Corporation.

Gyong, J. E. (2012) A Social Analysis of The Transformation Agenda of President Goodluck Jonathan. *European Scientific Journal*, July edition, Vol. 8, No. 16 ISSN: e-ISSN 1857-7431. 95-113.

Horkheimer, M. (1993) Between Philosophy and Social Science, Cambridge: MIT Press.

Howell, W.G. and Eilkenfeld, J. C. (2005) "Presidents, Congress and the Use of Force". International Organisation, 59/1:209-232.

Ihonvbere, J.O (1985) The Rise and Fall of Nigeria's Second Republic. London: Zed Press.

Jackson, R. (1999) "T.I.Sovereignty in World Politics: A Glance at the Conceptual and Historical Landscape". Political Studies, 47:431-36.

Jackson, R. and Sorensen G. (2006) Introduction to International Relations Theories and Approaches. 3rd Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jaji, R. and Ayotunde, A.Y. (2016) The Contours and Depth of Nigeria's Foreign Policy Under Goodluck Jonathan. *International Affairs and Global Strategy.* Lagos: NIIA, Vo. 48. P13-17.

Jibrin, A. (2008) Obasanjo and the New Face of Nigeria's Foreign Policy, Kaduna-Nigeria: M.O.D Publishers.

Joseph, A. (1960) Perspectives of Critical Theory. Ibadan: Longman Nigeria.

Ka'oje, U. M. (1994) ""Nigeria's National Interest and its Membership of Opec" Published in the Nigerian Journal of Political Science, Vol.7. No1. Department of Political Science, A.B.U.Zaria.

Khan, McNiven and MacKown (1970) An Introduction to Political Science. Princeton:NJ, Irwin Publishers.

Kissinger, H. A. (1982) Years of Upheaval, Boston: Little Brown

Leo Grande,W.M. (2002) "Tug of War: How Real is the Rivalry between Congress and the President over Foreign Policy?". Congress and thePresidency, 29:113-118.

Maduekwe, O. (2008) " Citizen Diplomacy And Nigeria's National Interest", a speech delivered at the Eleventh Orientation Course for Volunteers of the Technical Aid Programme for the 2008-2010 Biennium, Aminu Isa Kontagora Theatre Complex, Makurdi, Benue State, Monday, 19th May – Sunday 1st.

Mahmood, A. (2009) "What Manner of Citizen Diplomacy?" Available on INTERNET at: http//209.85.129.123/search?q-chache:vikknolout:www.leadershipnigeria.com /index.php/c.

Mato, K (2009) "A Case for Citizens Diplomacy"Weekly Trust, November 6.

Mbachu, O. (2007), "Citizen Diplomacy: The Challenges for Nigerian Defence and Security in the 21st Century".

McDermott, G (1973) The Diplomacy and its Apparatus: London: Plume Press/Ward Lock Ltd.

Mingst, K. (2004) Essentials of International Relations (3rd Edition). New York: W.W.W. Norton & company.

Morgenthau, H. (1978) Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace (5th Edition) New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Nigerian Tribune (2009) *"Editorial: A Flood of Deportees"*, 19th November, Online.

Nwankwo, O. (2013) Shifting the Paradigm in Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Goodluck Jonathan and Nigeria's Vision 20:2020. Social Science, Science Publishing Group. 2:212 – 221.

Nwosu, N, and Adeniyi, O (2011) Nigeria's Foreign Policy. *This Day Newspaper.* P.19. Wednesday, June 15.

Obasi, I.N. (1999) Research Methodology in Political Science. Enugu: Academic Publishing Company.

Obiozor, G. (1998) "Nigeria's National Interest" in Nigeria and the Contemporary World (ed) Aderinto, A.A and Ubah, C.N. Nigerian Defence Academy, FASS.

Ogwu, J. (1986) Nigerian Foreign Policy: Alternative Futures Lagos: Nigerian Institute of International Affairs.

Ogunbambi, R.O (1986) "Foreign Service: The Nigerian Ambassador and his Tasks", Nigerian Journal of International Affairs 12 (1 &2).

Ogunsanwo, Alaba (2007) "Citizen Diplomacy: Challenges for Nigeria's Foreign Policy". A Paper Presented at the One-Day Seminar on Citizen Diplomacy Organized by the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos. November, 29.

Okafor, E. (2004) Redefining Nigeria's Foreign Policy. *Daily Champion Newspaper.* Sept. 8.

Okocha, C. and Nzeshi, O (2007) "Nigeria to Adopt Citizenship Diplomacy". Available on INTERNET at: http://209.85.129.132/search?q-chache:we189qw/wwwj:nigerianbronds.blogsport.can/2007/0.

Okoli, A. (2007) "Nigeria States and Conduct of External Relations with South Africa:An Appraisal". *Journal of International Politics and Development Studies*, 3(1).

Olusanya, G.O and Akindele, R.A (1986) "The Fundamentals of Nigeria's Foreign Policy and External Economic Relations" in G.O Olusanya and R.A Akindele (eds), Nigeria's External Relations: The FirstTwenty-FiveYears. Ibadan: University Press Ltd.

Omoh, G. (2011) Economic Diplomacy Strategy Needed to Transform Economy. Vanguard, 13 June.

Omojuwa,K.A (2007) "Continuity Despite Change: An Appraisal of Nigeria's Foreign Policy in West Africa in the 1990s in Nigeria Journal of Political Science, January - December, Vol.11, Nos 1 & 2 A.B.U Zaria.

Oni, S. (2010) "Re-The Slaughter at KuruKarama" The Nation. February 2.

Oppenheim, A. (1955) International Law: A Treastise. London: Longman's Green.

Phillip, C. J. (1968)A Modern Law of Nations. Hamden, Conn: Archon Books.

Plischke, E. (1961) Conduct of America Diplomacy. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company Inc.

Rosenau, J. (1969) Linkage Politics: Essay on the Convergence of National and International System. New York.

Rourke, J. T. (2007) International Politics on the World Stage, Eleventh Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Saliu, H. A. (2010) Democracy, Governance and International Relations, Ibadan: College Press.

Satow, Ernest (1966) A Guide to Diplomatic Practice: London. Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd.

Ubah, C.N (1998) "Strands in Nigeria's External Behaviour" in Nigeria and the Contemporary World (eds) Aderinto, A.A and Ubah, C.N Nigerian Defence Academy FASS.

Umejei, E. (2014) Nigeria's FDI Fell 21.4% to $5.5b in 2013 – UNCTAD. *Daily Independent,* 6, February.

Varma, S. P. (1975) Modern Political Theory, New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt Ltd.

Weber, C. (2005) International Relations Theory: A Critical Introduction.New York: Routledge.

Yakubu, Y.A. (2001) Nigerian Foreign Policy: A Basic Text.Kaduna – Nigeria.

APPENDIX I

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STAFF OF THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS MINISTRY.

INTRODUCTION

A research is being conducted on**Foreign Policy and Nigeria's National Interest: An Assessment of Yar'Adua and Jonathan's Administrations (2007-2015).**Your honest answers to the questions below will assist the researcher to confirmor otherwise whether the changing realities of global situation affect Nigeria's foreign policy focus.

You are kindly requested to fill in the blank spaces and mark or tick **(x)** the appropriate answer.

Please be assured that all the information you give will be treated with absolute confidentiality.

Thank you!.

SECTION A: Personal Profile of Respondent

1. **Sex ----------**
2. **Department ----------**
3. **Nature of your work: ----------**
4. **Year of Experience ----------**
5. **Age ----------**
6. **Rank ----------**

SECTION B: Nigeria's Foreign Policy and National Interest

7. Does the definitive declaration of Africa as the Centre-piece of Nigeria's foreign policy serves Nigeria's national interest?

   YES ( ) **NO ( )**

8. Briefly explain how ----------

   ----

9. To what extent are the views, opinions and aspirations of the national elite determine what constitutes Nigeria national interest?

Greater extent ( ) Lower extent ( ) No impact at all ( )

10. How does the changing global realities affect Nigeria's foreign policy focus?

Greatly ( ) Partially ( ) No effect at all ( )

11. Briefly explain your answer----------
---

12. As a Foreign Affairs Officer, do you think Citizen Diplomacy as a foreign policy thrust is desirable now for Nigeria? **YES ( ) N-O ( )**

13. Examining the pros and cons of Citizen-centered foreign policy, how sustainable would it be if adopted by Nigeria? ----------
---
---

14. With its adoption in 2007 by the Yar'Adua administration, how would you rate its success or failure? ----------
---

APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FOREIGN POLICY SCHOLARS/ANALYSTS AND DIPLOMATS

SECTION A: Respondent's Profile

1. **Age** ----------
2. **Sex** ----------
3. **Position Held or Holding** ----------
4. **Years of Working Experience** ----------

SECTION B: Nigeria's Foreign Policy, National Interest and Citizen Diplomacy

5. Does the definitive declaration of Africa as the Centre-piece of Nigeria's foreign policy still relevant today? **YES ( ) NO ( )**

6. Could you explain HOW and WHY? ----------

---

7. Do the national elite consider the views, opinions and aspirations of the teeming populace before determining what constitutes our national interest? **YES ( ) NO ( )**

8. How do they carry the teeming populace along? ----------

---

9. Do the changing global realities affect Nigeria's foreign policy focus? **YES ( ) NO ( )**

10. Would you suggest the adoption of Citizen Diplomacy as a foreign policy thrust for Nigeria now? **YES ( ) NO ( )**

11. Kindly assess Citizen Diplomacy as a Foreign Policy Thrust for Nigeria ----------

---

-

APPENDIX III

LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

1. **Professor Jubril Aminu** – (A Former Senator of Federal Republic; Foreign Affairs Minister; Former Senate Committee Chairman on Foreign Affairs. Interview conducted by the Researcher on Tuesday, 6th December, 2011.

2. **Ambassador Marina Mohammed** (Former Nigeria's High Commissioner to The Gambia. Interview conducted on Wednesday, 8th February, 2012.

3. **Alhaji Baba Kura Kaigama** (Former Permanent Secretary, Federal Ministry of foreign Affairs). Interview conducted by the Researcher on Monday, February 14, 2011 in Abuja.

4. **Professor Alaba Ogunsanwo** (International Relations Lecturer, University of Lagos; Former Nigeria Ambassador to Republic of Botswana). Interview conducted by the Researcher on Wednesday, 28th March, 2012.

5. **Professor Rufa'i Ahmed Alkali** (A Political Scientist, and Former Peoples Democratic Party National Publicity Secretary). Interview conducted by the Researcher on Thursday, 19th May, 2011 in Abuja.

6. **Mr. Caleb Ayuba** (a Ph.D Student in Political Science and a staff of the Institute of Peace and Conflict Resolution, Abuja). Interview conducted on Thursday, 16th February, 2012.