

**AN ASSESSMENT OF THE BILATERAL COOPERATION BETWEEN NIGERIA AND
THE UNITED STATES AGAINST ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFICKING FROM 1989-2012**

By

SANUSI, SULEIMAN MOHAMMED, B.Sc. (ABU) 1986

P15SSPS8036

**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 DEGREE IN
POLITICAL SCIENCE**

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

DECEMBER, 2017

DECLARATION

I declare that the work in this dissertation entitled **An Assessment of the Bilateral Cooperation between Nigeria and the United States against Illicit Drug Trafficking from 1989-2012** has been carried out by me in the Department of Political Science and International Studies. The information derived from the literature has been duly acknowledged in the text and a list of references provided. No part of this thesis was previously presented for another degree or diploma at this or any other institution.

Sanusi, Suleiman Mohammed

Signature

Date

CERTIFICATION

This dissertation entitled AN ASSESSMENT OF THE BILATERAL COOPERATION BETWEEN NIGERIA AND THE UNITED STATES AGAINST ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFICKING FROM 1989-2012 by Suleiman Mohammed SANUSI meets the regulations governing the award of Master degree in Political Science of the Ahmadu Bello University, and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

Dr. Abubakar M. Siddique _____

Chairman, Supervisory Committee

Signature

Date

Mal. Saidu Adamu _____

Member, Supervisory Committee

Signature

Date

Dr. Aliyu Yahaya _____

Head of Department

Signature

Date

Prof. S. Z. Abubakar _____

Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies

Signature

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to Allah in every situation. Before starting the academic pursuit, I was warned that the relationship between a graduate student and supervisor was the most significant professional relationship in academia. This is undoubtedly true, and I was extraordinarily lucky to find in Dr, Siddiq Abubakar and Mallam Saidu Adamu exceptionally talented and capable supervisors, whose friendship and guidance were instrumental in helping me to develop, modify and improve this research. This dissertation couldnot come into being without their ideas about the central arguments, concepts, methodology and the organization of the entire work.

My appreciation goes to the National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (NDLEA), particularly Umar Isah Adoro (Head, Internal Affairs), for the cooperation and assistance given to me during the field work. Other NDLEA staff and members of the Joint Task Force are hereby acknowledged also, for their contribution to this research.

I also express my thanks to my internal examiner, Dr. Edgar Agubamah whose invaluable comments and observations have improved the dissertation immeasurably. My deepest debt of gratitude goes to the former HOD, Prof. Yusuf Abdullahi Yakubu, and the present HOD, Dr. Aliyu Yahaya and all the Professors and Lecturers who helped me throughout the duration of my studies.

I owe my loving thanks to my wife and the children without their encouragement and understanding, it would have been impossible for me to finish this work. The Z.B.C.C Family deserve special mention for their immeasurable support, particularly Alhaji Adamu Hussaini who has been very supportive.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my late friend, Muhammad Kabir Hussaini (Namahuta) whose inspirations, determination and encouragement has made me achieve this goal.

ABSTRACT

Bilateral or multilateral cooperation is indispensable in combating drug abuse and trafficking effectively. Nigeria and United States are working cooperatively together to reduce the demand for illegal drug through prevention, education and public awareness, treatment, training and research. In addition, the two countries have accepted that they are transit and drug consumer countries, respectively. Based on this understanding, Nigeria and United States have proceeded with technical exchanges and cooperative projects in areas of control of illicit cultivation, drug treatment and demand reduction. This study assesses the cooperation between Nigeria and the United States against illicit drug trafficking from 1989 to 2012. The qualitative approach used in this thesis employed both primary and secondary data which were collected from National Drug Law Enforcement (NDLEA) Headquarters at Ikoyi, Lagos. The primary data utilised was obtained through in-depth interview with some staff members of the NDLEA and an official of the United States Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) while the secondary data, in form of publications and annual reports of the agency of documents and records, was collected from the management of the NDLEA. Further consultations were made with journals, books, and research papers or articles. The liberal theory of international, which gives a better explanation of the reasons behind the bilateral cooperation between Nigeria and United States, was employed as the framework of analysis in the study. The study finds that the bilateral cooperation between Nigeria and the United States has minimised the flow of drugs from Nigeria into the United States marked; however, despite the present efforts of NDLEA and collaborative strategy put in place by the two countries in the fight against illicit drug trafficking and abuse, the number of people involved in drug trafficking within Nigeria is still on the increase. This has exposed a weakness in the nature of the bilateral cooperation, thereby raising the need for the strategy to be enhanced by a greater coordination and efficiency in the United States interdiction efforts, not only around flow routes of illicit drugs into the United States, but also around and within Nigeria's borders, in order to check the entry, production and trafficking of illicit drugs. From the lessons learned from the Nigeria-United States cooperation against illicit drug trafficking, there are a few obvious conclusions: attacking the source of drugs, as desired by the United States government, has not completely defeated the enemy in the war on drugs. So long as the United States does not deal with the demand signals from within the United States market, it will render efforts at eradication, interdiction and enforcement moot. Also, a wholesome strategy must be developed to address the menace within Nigeria in order to ensure that the Nigerian society will cease to be a breeding ground for any illicit drug production and/or trafficking activities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page.....	i
Declaration.....	ii
Certification.....	iii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
Dedication.....	v
Abstract.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables.....	ix
Abbreviations.....	x
CHAPTER ONE: GENERAL INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background to the Study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the Research Problem.....	4
1.3 Objectives of the Study.....	5
1.4 Scope of the Study.....	5
1.5 Significance of the Study.....	6
1.6 Research Assumptions.....	6
1.7 Limitations of the Study.....	7
1.8 Organization of the Work.....	8
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	9
2.1 Introduction.....	9
2.2 Conceptual Clarification.....	9
2.3 Cooperation Against Drug Trafficking.....	11
2.4 The Global Drug Trade.....	13
2.5 Effects of Illicit Drugs.....	15
2.6 Drug-Related Crimes.....	18
2.7 Drug Trafficking Control Measures.....	20
2.8 International Drug Control Framework.....	25
2.9 Theoretical Framework.....	31
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	37
3.1 Research Design.....	37

3.2	Study population and Sampling Procedure.....	37
3.3	Source of Data.....	38
3.4	Procedure for Data Collection.....	38
3.5	Method of Data Analysis and Presentation.....	39
CHAPTER FOUR: PERSPECTIVES OF DRUG TRADE AND CONTROL MECHANISMS IN NIGERIA AND THE UNITED STATES.....		40
4.1	Introduction.....	40
4.2	Perspective of Illicit Drug Trade in Nigeria and the Control Mechanism.....	40
4.3	The Drug Perspective of the United States and the Control Mechanism.....	53
CHAPTER FIVE: THE NIGERIA-UNITED STATES BILATERAL STRATEGY AGAINST ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFICKING.....		63
5.1	Introduction.....	63
5.2	The Nature, Goals and Achievement of the Bilateral Strategy.....	65
5.2.1	Training.....	66
5.2.2	Aids and gadgets.....	68
5.2.3	Legal proceedings.....	69
5.2.4	Joint Task Force and interdictions.....	71
5.2.5	The West African Joint Operations initiative.....	73
5.2.6	Intelligence management.....	74
5.3	Challenges to the Cooperation.....	77
5.4	Discussion of Findings.....	79
5.4.1	The nature of the bilateral agreement between Nigeria and the United States.....	79
5.4.2	Socioeconomic impact of drug trafficking and abuse in Nigeria.....	80
5.4.3	Effectiveness of the strategy of the cooperation.....	81
5.4.4	Challenges confronting the cooperation between Nigeria and the United States....	83
CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....		85
6.1	Summary.....	85
6.2	Conclusion.....	86
6.3	Recommendations.....	87
REFERENCES.....		90
APPENDIX I: Interview Guide.....		100
APPENDIX II: Seizures in Kilogramme in Various States.....		101
APPENDIX III: List of People Interviewed.....		102

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Interdiction Score Card 2000-2011	45
---------	-----------------------------------	----

ABBREVIATIONS

CIA: Central Intelligence Agency

CID: Criminal Intelligence Department

DEA: United States Drug Enforcement Administration

DOD: Department of Defence

FATF: Financial Action Task Force

FDI: Direct Foreign Investment

FIIB: Federal Investigation Intelligence Bureau

FRN: Federal Republic of Nigeria

GIABA: Intergovernmental Action Group Against Money Laundering and Financing of Terrorism in West Africa

HIV/AIDS: Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome

HONLEA: Head of National Law Enforcement Agency

INTERPOL: International Police

JTF: Joint Task Force

LFN: Laws of Federation of Nigeria

MLAT: Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty

MOD: Miscellaneous Offences Decree

MoU: Memorandum of Understanding

NDCMP: National Drug Control Master Plan

NDLEA: National Drug Law Enforcement Agency

NYSC: National Youth Service Corps

ONDCP: Office of National Drug Control Policy

UN: United Nations

UNCND: United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs

UNDCP: United Nations Drug Control Program

UNEDAC: United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control

UNODC: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

WAJO: West Africa Joint Operation

WHO: World Health Organization

CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Illicit drug trafficking has proven to be one of the major problems that the global community faces. The global problem of hard drugs has lately assumed an alarming proportion with the expansion of traditional drug routes into areas hitherto thought to be immune to the problems especially African countries, with Nigeria, Guinea Bissau and Ghana leading the way (UNODC, 2003; Central Intelligence Agency, undated). Because of this fact, the drug trade became deeply rooted in the economic and social cultures of many nations, which makes it very difficult to control. This is a legitimate concern because not only do hard drugs have inherent destructive effects on people's physical and social health, but they also activate some subsequent negative multiplier effects into the social, political and economic fabric of the country and the world at large.

The nature and dynamism of the illicit drug trade has made international cooperation necessary in order to deal with it. The reason is because activities relating to illicit drugs in a country might be just a cause, an effect, or even a mere stage in the entire process of the global illicit drug business. This brings to the fore the need to collectively lay hands on any and every part of the world that is affected by the drug menace using the best available and adaptable approach. An effective international framework of cooperation for tackling the drug menace must therefore be one that is adaptable, all-inclusive in geographic scope and far reaching in its coverage of the different processes, parties and stages in the entire illicit drug business.

Otherwise, the efforts to address the problem of drug trafficking will yield results that are less than what is desirable.

The Central Intelligence Agency (undated) notes that Nigeria is not only a transit route for heroin and cocaine headed for European, East Asian and North American markets, but also a consumer of amphetamines, a safe zone for Nigerian traffickers operating worldwide, a major money laundering centre replete with massive corruption and criminal activity, although there are improvements in anti-money laundering controls that attracted a positive international recognition from the Financial Action Task Force (FATF). The United States, on the other hand is the world's biggest market for cocaine, ecstasy, methamphetamine, heroine, marijuana, depressants, stimulants and hallucinogens, in addition to being a money laundering centre (UNODC, 2003; CIA, undated).

Nigeria, as a leading drug route in Africa, is concerned with the consequences of drug menace, especially its linkages with other conventional and organized crimes such as money laundering, corruption, terrorism, human trafficking, as well as health problem. Nigeria is not a producer of cocaine or heroin, but her strategic geographical location coupled with her porous borders have made her a transit point for the illicit trafficking of drugs from the source countries like Pakistan, Thailand, Columbia, and India, among others (UNODC, 2017; UNODC, 2003).

The only internally controlled drug produced in Nigeria is *Cannabis sativa*, popularly known as Indian hemp, which has spread widely due to the favorable climatic and social conditions of the country. More so, the cultivators believe that profit derived from cultivating cannabis is much higher than what is earned from the cultivation and sale of other legitimate cash crops (NDLEA, 2010; UNODC, 2003). Nigerian illicit drug smuggling remains a serious

threat to both Nigeria and United States. In order to confront this common threat, Nigeria and United States have taken numerous steps to cooperate in the interdiction of cross-border drug trafficking since 1989. Together they have made some outstanding achievements in minimizing the inflow of drug into the United States and eradication of Indian hemp cultivation in Nigeria.

So far, numerous measures have been adopted by successive governments in Nigeria to overcome trafficking in narcotic and psychotropic substances. On the international scene, Nigeria has been a signatory to numerous bilateral and multi-lateral treaties, as well as the United Nations conventions on drugs control, including the 1988 UN Convention Against Illicit Trafficking in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances. In line with this convention and in response to the public outcry by Nigerians about the damaging effects of drug abuse and illicit drug trade, the Federal Government of Nigeria established the National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (NDLEA) via Decree No. 48 of 1989. The Agency has been given the responsibility to not only curb the cultivation but also to stop both the use in Nigeria and the traffic of drugs to other parts of the world. This has prompted a bilateral agreement between Nigeria and the United States on illicit production, trafficking and abuse of narcotic drugs and other controlled substance, signed on 21 March, 1990, which provides for a Joint Task Force on Narcotics composed of officers selected from appropriate agencies of the two countries. This agreement is a direct consequence of the Nigeria-United States Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty (MLAT) signed in Washington on 13 September, 1989 (Congressional Record, undated). Although the general framework of Nigeria's international co-operation for the purpose of fighting trans-border drug trafficking crimes includes the Quadrupartite Agreement with Benin Republic, Togo and Ghana, the Tripartite Agreement with Niger and Chad, and the Nigeria-United Kingdom

Agreement on Cooperation and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, this dissertation gives special emphasis to the Nigeria-United States cooperation against illicit drug trafficking.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

This study is an assessment of the bilateral cooperation between Nigeria and the United States against illicit drugs trafficking from 1989 to 2012, with focus on the impact of the bilateral cooperation in addressing the menace of illicit drug production, trafficking, and/or use (abuse) in the two countries involved in the cooperation. The underlying motivation here is the fact that the bilateral cooperation was entered into for more than two decades from 1990 to date, as a direct consequence of the Nigeria-United States Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty (MLAT) signed in Washington on 13 September, 1989, with definite objectives, it is logical that there should be some observable impact of the agreement on the drug problem in the two countries involved, and hence the need for an assessment of the effectiveness of the cooperation.

In order to do this, the following questions are therefore asked:

1. What mechanisms were put in place by Nigeria and the United States in combating drug trafficking based on the bilateral agreement between them?
2. How effective are the mechanisms put in place by Nigeria and the United States in combating drug trafficking in line with the objectives of the bilateral cooperation between Nigeria and the United States?
3. What are the challenges faced by Nigeria and the United States cooperation against illicit drugs trafficking?

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To identify the mechanisms that were put in place by Nigeria and the United States in combating drug trafficking based on the bilateral agreement between them.
2. To examine the mechanisms put in place by Nigeria and the United States and how effective they are in combating drug trafficking in line with the objectives of the cooperation.
3. To identify the challenges that Nigeria and the United States confront in their fight against drug trafficking.

1.4 SCOPE OF STUDY

This study is focused on the bilateral cooperation between Nigeria and the United States which was signed in 1990. Due to the fact that the bilateral agreement was a direct consequence of the Nigeria-United States Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty (MLAT), signed in Washington on 13 September, 1989 – which was the same year that the National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (NDLEA) was established – the study covers the period from the late 1989 to 2012. It questions whether the efforts of the United States together with Nigeria against drug trafficking have been as effective as intended or assumed. The period under review was the time when the National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (NDLEA) was established and almost the same time when the treaty was signed in 1990, against illicit drug trafficking between the two countries.

1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This assessment of the bilateral cooperation between Nigeria and the United States against illicit drug trafficking from 1989 to 2012 not only establishes the extent to which the strategy adopted by the two countries has minimized the illegal movement of drugs between the two countries, but also exposed the weakness of the strategy in its inability to provide a

comprehensive panacea to both countries. In other words, although the flow of illicit drugs from Nigeria to the United States has been reduced, the demand for illicit drug consumption within the United States market, and the inflow into and expansion of the illicit drug market within Nigeria has remained largely untouched and has not been addressed, respectively, by the cooperation. This opens up a basis further bilateral negotiations, and/or unilateral strategies by the two countries in order to provide a comprehensive solution to the problem of illicit drug trafficking as it affects them.

1.6 RESEARCH ASSUMPTIONS

This study is based on the assumptions that:-

1. The cooperation between Nigeria and the United States has reduced the flow of illicit drugs into the United States.
2. The cooperation between Nigeria and the United States did not stop the flow of illicit drugs into Nigeria; rather a large drug market has been created in Nigerian society.

1.7 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Any research exploring a clandestine activity is bound to run into great difficulty in gaining an accurate picture of the level of illegal activity taking place. At the beginning of this study there was much confidence about getting the complete record of illicit drugs seizures from 1989 to 2012, but only that of 2002 to 2011 were made available to the researcher. The officials of NDLEA have confirmed to the researcher that the agency has been unable to publish the complete record of illicit drugs seizures and drug-related crimes from 2013 to date, due financial

constrain. Nevertheless, the study considers the available records sufficient to both establish facts and also show the trend of the achievements in the drug war to a considerable extent.

In addition, the security challenge in the country at the period of field work made it impossible to interview any officials from American Embassy. However, the researcher was able to interview one American DEA agent who was a member of the Joint Task Force established by the bilateral agreement. Nevertheless, the study considers the information so far generated through the interviews as quite relevant to assess the Nigeria-United States cooperation against illicit drugs trafficking, complemented by the secondary data generated.

1.8 ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK

The study is a social research that examined the Nigeria-United States counternarcotics cooperation. Chapter One is the introductory chapter, consisting of the background to the study, the statement of research problem, objectives of the study, research questions, assumptions, scope and significance of the study, methodology and chapter arrangement. Chapter Two covers the review of relevant literature and theoretical framework. Chapter Three is devoted to the research methodology, comprising the research design, the sources of data, the population of the study, the population sample and sampling procedure, the procedure for data collection and the method of data analysis and presentation. In Chapter Four, the overview of drug trade in Nigeria and the United States with particular focus on the perspectives of and mechanisms put in place by the two countries. More details are also presented to present the picture of the nature and consequences of illicit drug trade in Nigeria for a better understanding of the context for the operation of the Joint Task Force on narcotics. Chapter Five covers the assessment of the

bilateral agreement, especially the strategies employed by the two countries in dealing with illicit drug trafficking, based on the presentation and analysis of the data generated from primary and secondary sources. Chapter Six contains the summary, conclusion and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Literature review focuses on identifying contributions already made on the subject under investigation. This chapter presents a review of literature on illicit drug trafficking and the Nigeria-United States bilateral cooperation to defeat this trade. The chapter is divided into subsections namely; conceptual clarifications, uses and effects of illicit drugs, global drug business or trade, Nigeria-United States fight against drug trafficking, extent, patterns, and trend of drug abuse in Nigeria, and drug trafficking control measures in Nigeria.

2.2 CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATION

Some basic concepts here include drug, illicit drugs, illicit drugs trafficking, and drug related crime. According to Ahire (1990:141), “A drug is any substance which, when taken into the body, may modify or change one more of its functions.” However, the researcher’s concern here is with drugs that are most commonly abused, also referred to as psychoactive drugs, which exert their major effect on the brain and the central nervous system to produce sedations, stimulations or mood change. The term “illicit drug,” according to the United Nations Drug Control Program (1997:11), is used to describe “drugs which are under international control (and which may or may not have licit or permissible medical purposes) but which are produced, trafficked and or consumed unlawfully.” The UNDCP (1997:131) describes trafficking as a “crucial link in the chain between illicit drug production and consumption.” It involves the unlawful distribution, possession with intent to distribute, manufacture, import or export illicit

drugs. Generally, it is a crime to use, possess, manufacture or distribute drugs classified as having a potential for abuse, for example cocaine, heroin, marijuana and amphetamines.

The discourse of the crime aspects of drugs has given rise to some related concepts such as drug-defined offenses, drug-related offenses and drug-using lifestyle. Drug-defined offenses refer to violations of laws prohibiting or regulating the possession, use, distribution or manufacture of illegal drugs, including the possession, cultivation, production or sales of, say, marijuana or cocaine. Drug-related offenses comprise offenses of which a drug's pharmacologic effects contribute they are offenses motivated by the user's need for money to support continued use of drugs, and offenses connected with the distribution of such illicit drugs. Drug-using lifestyle is a lifestyle in which the possibility and frequency of involvement in illegal drug activity are increased because drug users may not participate in the legitimate economy, and are exposed to situations that encourage crime (Spiess and Fallow, 2000).

The importance of these concepts is their elaborative effect on our understanding of the depth of illicit drug trade, indicating it has been interwoven in the very fabric of society down to the level of individuals' lifestyles and occupational productivity. The implication here is the fact that the fight against illicit drug trafficking is likely to succeed only if these details are taken into cognizance and included in the fighting strategy. In other words, the concepts help to clarify the scope of the illicit drug business, namely that it is beyond mere trans-border manipulations: it is about the very people that live and work in the societies from/to where these illicit activities take place.

2.3 COOPERATION AGAINST DRUG TRAFFICKING

Keohane and Martins (1995) define cooperation as when actors adjust their behavior to the actual or anticipated preferences of others, through the process of policy coordination. And cooperation is an important part of avoiding collective failure on issues of international concern in which states have pre-existing agreement, including areas of illicit drug trafficking. According to Osinbajo (1990), Article 10 of the 1988 United Nations Convention spelt out the international cooperation measures for drug transit states. That, parties to this convention are enjoined to assist and support transit states especially developing countries through programs of technical cooperation on interdiction and other related activities. It was in the spirit of this clause that a memorandum of understanding (MoU) between Nigeria the United States of America was signed on the 21 March, 1990. The MoU recognized the need to wage a war against illicit production, trafficking and abuse of narcotic drugs and other controlled substances. The memorandum also outlines, among other things, agreements on the part of the United States Government to provide technical and management training to assists to the newly created National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (NDLEA) of Nigeria in developing a professional base and agreement by both governments to cooperate in the establishment of a Joint Task Force (JTF) and provide other facilities by which intelligence reports on drug trafficking can be regularly exchanged.

Chukwurah (1990), an expert in international law who has examined the bilateral cooperation in the control of drug trafficking, notes that the first step to take by any nation in the global war against illicit drug is to sign and ratify all the existing international conventions and protocols aimed at stemming drug abuse and drug trafficking so as to give a firm base for whatever internal measures it may well embark upon, including bilateral agreements. Equally

important is the political will to implement the provisions of the international treaties and cooperation agreements on the subject to which such a state is signatory.

Chukwurah (1990) further reveals that before the Nigeria-United States cooperation agreements, the situation at the Murtala Mohammed and Aminu Kano International Airports in Lagos and Kano respectively was reported to be chaotic, causing the two entry ports to be described as the scenes for overt and covert battles between various arms of the security agencies over whose duty it is to check drug trafficking. But since August 1987, a program had been set in motion to unite the efforts of the various security forces for the purpose of greater efficiency. And these developments have been taken as immediate benefits from the cooperation agreements between the two countries.

Oyakhilome (1990) states that, the entire world has admitted that there is drug problem, and has agreed on a ceasefire in the cross recriminations as to who was responsible for introducing it in the first place, whether the producers or the consumers. A diagnosis of the problem appears to have been effectively carried out at a global level with almost all countries participating. Countries are in fact encouraged to enter into bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements of mutual assistance in the exercise since the drug issue cuts across states' boundaries. In addition, Arthur (2012) indicates that West Africa has become an ideal place for drug trafficking and warned that if African countries do not act quickly to deal with the drug menace, global powers may have to act in a manner that could undermine their sovereignty and national dignity. He identified the shift by cartels from Mexico using West Africa as a transit route for drug trade because of its long and poorly protected coastlines, its weak government institutions, its debilitating poverty, and its strategic location between America and Europe.

2.4 THE GLOBAL DRUG TRADE

There is no single identifiable cause of drug trafficking; a lot of its activities take place in the illegal economy and under cover. What is mostly known is the nature, effects, profit and other related issues to the drug trafficking problem, one of which is its global reach – it is a global trade that accrues huge sums of money. The United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNEDAC) Report (1990 cited in Adesugba, 1990) has it that the world trade in illicit drugs has grown dramatically to \$500 billion per annum, and may have possibly overtaken oil as the second largest commodity in world trade (second only to arms). The secretive nature of drug trade makes it difficult to ascertain the actual amount realized. Thus one major cause of illicit drug trade is money – it is the central issue in drug trade.

From the sociological perspective, according to Ahire (1990), drug abuse (the end of drug trade) is essentially a social problem that is the product of societal reaction; sociologists believe that the genesis of drug abuse has to be found in a fabric of the society. So, just like crime, prostitution, juvenile delinquency, among other similar vices, the problem of drug trafficking or abuse is deemed to be related to the social structure and the daily struggles of the citizens to ensure their material survival. In other words, the problem of drug abuse, which predisposes some people to drug trafficking, cannot be divorced from the social structure within which it thrives. It is instructive to note that both well advanced societies like the United States and developing societies like Nigeria have social structures that predispose to one activity or the other, in the drug trafficking process (Chukkol, 1990). This implies that any attempt to effectively address the problem of drug abuse must be based on an approach carefully developed and adapted to the societies in which they are implemented, because the nature of some societies could predispose them to either production or trafficking or consumption of illicit drugs. An

understanding of the social structure of a society is critical to understanding not only the cause of, but also the possible solutions to the drug problem.

According to Willoughby (1988:23), money laundering is the process where profit from illicit narcotics operation is transformed into a more manageable, 'legitimate' form while concealing its illicit origins; this is a vital component of drug trafficking operations. Ochejele (1996) remarks that drug trafficking and money laundering are inseparable crimes; he argues that drug trafficking leads to money laundering because the proceeds that are made from its sales are channeled into other legitimate businesses. By implication, in the absence of drug trafficking that generate illegal income, there will be no drug money laundering to perpetuate the commission of other related crimes. Illicit drug trafficking is a lucrative venture and due to the high profit margin derived from the trade, little or huge seizure are unlikely to stop traffickers from the business. UNDCP (1995) and Emafo (1990) agree that the benefit derived by the illicit drugs producers and traffickers in developing countries encourage them to distribute and sell drugs to all parts of the World. It enables cartel members to move easily from one country to the other and invest their drug profit also in legitimate areas which make attractive returns, and also to perpetrate other crimes like organize insurrection and armed terrorism, destabilize governments and corrupt officials, organize crimes such as the sale and illicit traffic in arms, or even to influence government decisions, among others. Drug barons in the United States and all over the world make several billion dollars every year (Adesugba, 1990). The international trade in illicit drugs is motivated mainly by the money that is realized or realizable from it. Money is the central issue in international drug trade. Adesugba (1990) notes that between 1984 and 1989, drug seizures at the Murtala Mohammed International Airport, Lagos alone amounted to

₦379,024 million. This airport is one of the major illicit drug trade route to other important markets in other countries of the world, including the United States and Western Europe.

As identified above that money is the main motivating factor in international trade in illicit drugs, there can hardly be any other explanations for the pains and risks that traffickers go through as they go about the business. Other variables or factors (mostly negative, e.g. cultivation, production, use and addiction and crimes) that explain the entire drug trade either precede or succeed the money factor. Put in another way, the persons that have the biggest push for the entire illicit drug system are those that have money as their objective, not minding the consequences on individuals (e.g. addicts) or society (e.g. increased cost of maintaining hospitals and fighting drugs). This implies that there is a capitalist (profit-making) undertone to the international illicit drug trade phenomenon.

2.5 EFFECTS OF ILLICIT DRUGS

The proliferation of hard drugs and its subsequent abuses has led to mental illness among young people and the deterioration of the health of the nation's active population. Baniyi (2008) says that drug and alcohol abuse contribute significantly to the increase of domestic aggression, violent crimes, broken homes and juvenile delinquency. Etannibi Alemika (1990) argues that the problems associated with illicit production, distribution, sales and trafficking of narcotics have intensified since the early 1980s and threatened human welfare and dignity in many parts of the world. The consequences of illicit drug operations, including illicit drug use and abuse, are grave and multi-dimensional. They range from distortions in National Economy and Monetary Policies due to Laundering of profits, violence, terrorism, assassination and corruption of public officials.

Isabella Okagbue (1990) argues that psychoactive drugs are physically and psychologically addicting. She adds that this is true for both licit and illicit drugs: they enslave the users so that they continue to take the drug even though they might wish/try to stop. Abstinence could create unpleasant physical or psychological symptoms, and the user might thereby be compelled to continue using the drug. Similarly, Omoluabi (1984) notes that addiction to narcotic drugs such as cocaine can result in poor sleep, poor appetite, and irritability and heat sensation over the body and even mental illness. Furthermore, withdrawal from drugs such as cocaine and heroin can lead to withdrawal distress which, depending on the level of severity, may involve heavy sweating, headache, convulsion and even death.

Ahire (1990) states that consumption of psychoactive drugs exerts a definite impact on either the brain or the central nervous system of the consumer, and it may thus influence his/her social behavior with grave consequences for himself/herself and the society as a whole. Furthermore, WHO (1993) emphasized that the consequences of drug abuse are varied and complicated. They differ from person to person and from one environment to the other. These effects include criminal deviations and other social effect. One of these effects is social stigma. In another study, the United Nations (1988) notes that some drug addicts become mentally deranged to the extent that they become public nuisance and lunatics on the streets. Some resort to various forms of deviations to obtain money to maintain the habit. This has implications on the economy like the need to strengthen law enforcement and cost in clearing the streets of the mentally sick and wanderers. It increases the investment in psychiatric hospitals.

With regards to addiction to drugs, WHO (1993) observes that hard drugs have taken an enormous toll on human life world-wide. Drug abusers and members of the family and national governments experience many adverse effects when appropriate and effective policies are not put

in place. These adverse effects extend to community members. In fact, the United States Department of Health and Human Services (2000) reports that each year, drug abuse kills 14,000 Americans due to medical complications. Another drug that has serious consequences to its users, although not on the list of banned drugs is cigarette. According to WHO (1993), there are over a billion smokers in the world, and some four billion deaths a year can be attributed to tobacco. This figure is expected to rise to about ten billion over the next 20 to 30 years. WHO (1993) further states that cigarette smoke contains more than 4,000 health-threatening compounds, of which 200 are known poisons. Apart from the toxins, there are many devastating consequences of smoking.

There is a general consensus among writers that abuse of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances has grave, negative consequences on individuals involved and society in general, and therefore the need to stage effective illicit drug production, trafficking, and abuse within and across countries that are affected. The entire chain of activities in the illicit drug sector (production, trafficking, consumption, trade, etc.) have negative consequences that affect those that are involved directly, and indirectly affects all other members of society. Issues ranging from deterioration in health to increase in and/or perpetration of vices in society, and even drug-related crimes like money laundering, terrorism and assassinations, among others, are real variables that are among the destabilizing factors in any society, as the cost of dealing with any of them is high. Most importantly, the chain of negative ‘multiplier effects’ that will be generated by any one single illicit drug activity (whether production, or trafficking, or sale, or consumption) is a phenomenon that is difficult to trace, let alone tackle. Effective drug trafficking control measures, whether preventive or curative, must address every shade of illicit drug activities in any society.

2.6 DRUG-RELATED CRIMES

We have already defined drug-related crime to include offenses of which a drug's pharmacologic effects contribute, offenses motivated by the user's need for money to support continued drug use, and offenses connected with drug distribution itself. Spies and Fallow (2000) affirm that drugs generate violent crimes, citing reasons for the relationship between drug trafficking and violence to include, first, competition for drug markets and customers; second, disputes and rip-offs among individuals involved in the illegal drug market; and third, the tendency toward violence among individuals involved in drug trafficking, since there cannot be any legal resolution. Furthermore, locations in which drug markets proliferate are usually economically and socially disadvantaged; therefore legal and social controls against violence in such areas tend to be ineffective, and so the proliferation of lethal weapons which make drug violence more deadly.

However, Spies and Fallow (2000) warn that the drug-crime relationship should be interpreted cautiously because most crimes result from a variety of factors, including drugs as one in the midst of many. However, drug users are likely than nonusers to commit crime, because people arrested for drug-related offenses admit frequently that they were under the influence of a drug at the time they commit offense.

Yet we must not ignore the question of how much crime is drug-related? This is because, according to Caulkin and Kleiman (2004), the history of official estimation method, notably the tripartite framework of drug-crime relationship, has shown some limitations, thereby pointing to potential improvements. There are special crime types related to drugs, such as drugged driving, prostitution, and diversion of precursor chemicals, money laundering, and corruption of

government officials, homicide, aggressive assault, sexual assault and robbery, among others.

The tripartite framework of drug-crime relationship can be articulated as follows:

- i. Psychopharmacological mechanism: intoxication and withdrawal, use by victim as well as perpetrator, and irrational effects (e.g. clouded judgment, hair-trigger nerves, mental and physical health failures etc.) and intended effects (e.g. boost courage).
- ii. Economic-compulsive violence: robbery, assault, etc. committed in order to finance the purchase of expensive drugs.
- iii. Systemic violence: conflicts between rival organizations, intra-organizational violence, conflict between sellers and customers, killing and intimidating witnesses, etc. (Caulkin and Kleiman, 2004; Brian *et al.*, 2013).

The drug-crime relationship is difficult to estimate because of the clandestine nature of the illicit drug business. However, it cannot be overemphasized that drugs generate crime to a considerable, undeniable extent. There may not be sufficient data on the aspects of illicit drug trade that are concealed due to its illegality and in order to avoid the law, but there is sufficient data from the arrest made, particularly in the United States and in Nigeria, that the drug-crime relationship is strongly positive. Investigators into certain types of crimes in these societies ought to trace the possible link between those crimes and drugs. In other words, there may be a drug factor underscoring some common crimes experienced in society, particularly in areas where social and legal controls are either not very effective or not far-reaching in their coverage.

2.7 DRUG TRAFFICKING CONTROL MEASURES

The United Nations (1999) asserts that because drug abuse constitutes a serious social problem which cuts across nations and continents, coordinated multi-national efforts is very

important for its prevention, and control. NDLEA (1999) reports that illicit drug problem has been the concern of the Nigeria Government and its people since 1935. One of the reasons for this concern follows the international aspect of the Nigerian drug trafficking problem, which includes the humiliating searches and shabby treatment that Nigerians, both great and small, encounter abroad in their travels. Most importantly, the country has, as a result of illicit drug traffic activities and the arrests of drug traffickers, earned a bad image in the eyes of other nations (Azinge, 1990). This has led to some of the decrees passed and ordinances made by present and past government. The period 1935 to 1979 saw the abuse of a limited number of drugs, with the government paying attention to drug abuse more than drug trafficking. Even then, the laws were more repressive due to the hasty nature in which the laws were made and implemented without achieving the desire goals of eradicating the problem.

Between 1980 and 1990, the drug problem attracted more attention than before, involving many categories of people, types of drugs, and methods of use, trafficking, criminal dimensions and other consequences. This complex nature of the drug problem was reported by Odejide (1980) and Ibanga (1997). Even worrisome to the Nigerian drug problem and the people of Nigeria was the trafficking of illicit drugs by Nigerians across national boundary that became rampant, leading to an increase in drug deals in and across the country. As a result of this trend, government reviewed all its existing drug laws, which saw the enactment of the 1984 Miscellaneous Offences Decree (MOD). This law prescribed death penalty by firing squared for possession, growing, trafficking or dealing in cocaine, heroin or similar drugs. This resulted into the execution of three Nigerians who had been convicted of the offence prior to the promulgation of the Decree, and generated a lot of condemnation from members of the public until it was amended in 1986 through the 1986 Special Tribunal (Miscellaneous Offences) Amendment

Decree. The amendment decree reduced the death penalty to life jail and made provision for appeal. However, by 1988, the drug problem had increased. The categories of people involved (young and old men) and the types of drugs trafficked become more sophisticated. As a result, the government established the National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (NDLEA) through Decree No. 48 of 1989 to check the increasing drug menace. Despite these noble attempts made by successive governments, the scourge drug trafficking has continued unabated. In the United States, like in many countries, the death penalty is not applicable. Rather, it is mainly imprisonment and fines that are applied to offenders who are caught in the drug trafficking business, as outlined in the Federal Trafficking Penalties (DEA, 2016). Suffice it to note here that the three key international conventions (1961, 1971 and 1988) of the United Nations on the control of illicit drugs did not support the death penalty for drug-related crimes; rather, they called for imprisonment, deprivation of liberty, pecuniary sanctions, and confiscations. In fact, they called for appropriate, science based approach or measures for drug use prevention and drug dependence treatment (UNODC, undated).

Drug law is hence one of the veritable drug control measure put in place to curb the menace of illicit drug trade. Iyamabo (1990) notes, from the police viewpoint, that the perspectives and strategies in the control of the traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances are based on laws; all agencies involved in the fight against illicit drug trafficking are operation based on law. For example, the Interpol together with the Narcotics Section of the Criminal Investigation Department (CID), now Federal Investigation Intelligence Bureau (FIIB) handles drug-related cases as follows: Interpol handles cases that have international connections, while FIIB polices every part of the country to reduce or eradicate drug trafficking. These however, are bedeviled by economic constraints, inadequate funding and human constraints.

Iyamabo (1990) therefore recommended preventive eradication and bilateral agreements, among others, as remedies to the challenges of illicit drug control in Nigeria.

Odekunle (1986) observes that the Nigerian government is doing a lot through its agencies to stem the problem of drug abuse and trafficking in the country, but is handicapped by shortage of facilities and corruption by government officials, among other problems. Having observed the drug problem and its attendant consequences, Arthur (2012) calls for the strengthening of law enforcement institutions in West Africa, especially the Police, so as to prevent them from falling prey to drug cartel bribery. The welfare of the law enforcement agencies should be of paramount importance. Philip Emafo (1981) on his part says that we should develop strategies that shun wealth, acquired through unknown sources, and our leaders must be committed to a planned program of eliminating drug abuse and illicit traffic.

Drug laws require effective drug law enforcement agencies. It is an immense credit to Nigeria for the creation of the National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (NDLEA), in addition to other national and international institutions that collaborate in the fight against illicit drug trafficking. Several writers (Iyamabo, 1990; Mohammed, 1990; Gills; 1990) have recommended areas around which drug fight activities should revolve, including exchange of intelligence, technical assistance, training of personnel, modern equipment for detection, surveillance, drug addicts, etc. These are the areas around which drug laws should be tied, the implication of which includes making drug law one of the widest in scope and embracing a large range of institutions and organizations, both national and international, governmental and non-governmental. A carefully developed drug law which covers every aspect of illicit drug activity and embraces every relevant institution or organization that is effectively functioning is a most critical tool for the fight against illicit drug trafficking in any society.

A major argument put in place in order to deal with the problem of illicit drug trafficking is the death penalty. Isabella Okagbue (1990) notes that the community of nations has from the beginning of the 20th Century gradually evolved global and regional mechanisms intended to limit illegal traffic in drugs, because it has been realized that no single country can cope effectively with the menace unilaterally. The most important of these measures were developed under the umbrella of the United Nations conventions (Single Convention on Psychotropic Substances, 1971 and the Convention Against Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances in 1989). However, none of these conventions recommended the death penalty as a stringent measure (punishment) on drug traffickers. Rather, only punishments like imprisonment or similar penalties that deprive the convict of liberty. However, Okonkwo (1990) advocates that drug traffickers who possess more than a stipulated quantity of a specified drug should be sentenced to death; he feels this is the best way to keep the 'disease' at bay. Suffice it to note that this solution may be applicable only where the drug trafficker is arrested; what happens if he continually escapes and successfully carries out his activities? Death penalty becomes useless.

Because drug trafficking has different dimensions and is very dynamic in nature, the measure to be put in place in order to address it must also be dynamic, adaptable and suitable; the aim is to secure a lasting solution to the illicit drug problem, rather than to just deal with one aspect of the entire drug traffic system. Therefore, the different drug trafficking control measures, which provide immediate solution to different aspects of the illicit drug traffic menace, could be synthesized to provide a comprehensive approach to reducing the problem and its consequences in society. Every effective drug control measure must therefore be multi-faceted.

2.8 INTERNATIONAL DRUG CONTROL FRAMEWORK

The world illicit drug trade represents a multidimensional problem that has implications for the national interests of many countries, especially those affected by the menace like Nigeria and the United States. This informed the need for cooperation among countries in order to manage the menace. The international drug control system is based on three conventions: the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1954 as amended by the 1972 Protocol Amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1954, the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971, and the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988. However, before the advent of these conventions, there had been some international efforts towards the control of controlled substances, including 1909 when the International Opium Commission brought together 12 countries in Shanghai to discuss options for international controls on the opium trade, the 1912 Hague Opium Convention and treaties negotiated in the League of Nations, which were regulatory and prohibitive in nature, aimed to control the excesses of unregulated free trade regime, substantially regarding opium (Jelsma, 2011).

The 1954 Single Convention replaced the previous international agreements that had been developing piecemeal since early 20th Century, but included new provisions and creating a stricter zero-tolerance, prohibitive system of control. Its key goal was to eliminate opium over a 15 year period, and coca and cannabis within 25 years (Jelsma, 2011). The 1971 Convention was developed in response to the diversification of drug use; therefore it introduced controls on more than 100 psychotropic substances, while the 1988 Conventions provided special measures

against illicit cultivation, production and trafficking of drugs, the diversion of precursor chemicals, and agreement on legal assistances such as extradition, reinforcement of countries' obligations to apply sanctions, combat all aspects of the drug trafficking system.

UNODC (undated) has noted that the 1961 and 1971 conventions were based on genuine concern for human welfare so that psychotropic substances under control should be made available exclusively for medical and scientific purposes. Therefore, the approach made by the three conventions (including the 1988 Convention) is health-centered. However, a growing body of empirical evidence indicates that initiating drug use and the development of dependence, which is beyond purely medical and scientific purposes, cannot be considered as an individual's isolated choice, but as the behavioral expression of a complex set of psychobiological vulnerabilities and conditions (UNODC, undated). This agrees with the recognition by the 1961 Convention that an unwholesome environment is a primary factor contributing to the susceptibility of individuals to use controlled drugs, outside the intended or prescribed medical or scientific purpose. Thus, the conventions consistently differentiated between drug dealers managing the illicit distribution of controlled drugs, and people affected by social and health problems due to usage of drugs.

To some extent, therefore, some countries, especially those with inefficient government and weak institutions like Nigeria (Udama, 2013), are a part of the entire problem of the drug menace through their inability to develop a social and legal environment within which vulnerability to the illicit drug web is minimal. One of the most important, albeit preventive, measures for stalling the illegal drug menace is through social and legal policies that will engender a system that people are satisfied with, without needing to do anything illegal or clandestine in order to make money or derive pleasure.

Jelsma (2011) notes a recent trend in the international drug control system among countries of Europe, South America, and Canada and Australia, namely a soft defection from the zero-tolerance repressive model to opting for regulated legal market for cannabis, decriminalization, embedding human rights principles in drug control, and harm reduction. This is as a result of some consequences resulting from a worldwide escalation of the last two decades in the form of rapid increase in the prison population, human rights violations, and restricted access to essential medicines, criminalization of users, creating obstacles for healthcare including strategies for HIV/AIDS prevention, etc. There is also the reluctance of South America to remain a field for military antidrug campaign and the ineffectiveness of the repressive antidrug efforts to reduce the illicit drug market. All these have combined to reduce support for the United States style war on drugs.

Underlying arguments identified by Jelsma (2011) in favor of regulation, for example, of cannabis include the following:

- i. The cannabis market will not disappear, and the law enforcement has not contributed in any way to its availability and use, but has changed certain patterns in the market such as the decentralizing of production. In other words, the volume of international trafficking has reduced because a great deal is now cultivated locally for domestic markets, making it even more difficult, even impossible to control.
- ii. Given its volume and large number of users, cannabis represents a significant share of the global illicit market, and thus an important source of funds for criminal organizations and corruption.
- iii. In the current financial crisis, nations are checking public expenditure in all areas; regulating the cannabis market would achieve significant savings on cannabis-related

expenditures by law enforcement and criminal justice system, and would generate substantial revenue through taxation.

Earlier, Julia Buxton (2008) in a paper that outlines the institutional history of the international narcotic drug control regime, giving details the evolution of the control system, from its foundations at the beginning of the twentieth century - a period of mass, unregulated narcotic drug use - to the current period, argues that the contemporary international control model is ill-positioned to address the dynamic and rapidly changing nature of the global narcotics trade. She says:

The persistence of anachronistic guiding first principles, specifically the utopian idea of prohibition, is identified as the key impediment to the adoption of a more humane and effective policy approach. But while there is growing pressure for a revision of founding ideas, this is not supported by a host of powerful actors that includes the United States.

From the stand point of the United States on the current status of the international drug control system, the New York City Bar Association's Committee on Drugs and The Law (2012) notes the current criticism of the international legal system and the prevailing cry for the liberalization of the drug policy, and undertook a study of the true implications of the international law on United States domestic drug policy reform, argued that the options for reform under the treaties as they stand today are severely limited, although there are chances of reform given the nature of recent challenges:

It would seem that nations have gone to great pains to stay within technical compliance as much as possible while still enjoying more liberal drug control environment within their own borders...One thing that is evident is that U.S. drug control is intertwined in some very complex ways with the international

system as a whole...Indeed, if marijuana is legalized, what will become of the treaties and the international system as a whole? (New York City Bar, 2012).

This means that the stand of the United States on the international control system remains the same, despite the prevailing criticism of the system and calls for liberalization. One insight from the response of the New York City Bar Committee is the fact that United States drug control is intertwined in some very complex ways with the international system as a whole, implying that changing or altering the international drug control system might mean altering the United States system. Therefore in this matter, the United States is still conservative. Raphael F. Perl (2006) had earlier noted that the United States international narcotics policy requires cooperative efforts by many nations that may have domestic and foreign policy goals that rival the international requirements of drug control. One contentious issue has been the congressionally-mandated certification process, designed to persuade some drug-exporting countries to prioritize or pay more attention to the fight against narcotics businesses. Current law requires the President, with certain exceptions, to designate and withhold assistance from nations that have failed demonstrably to meet their counternarcotics obligations.

Jelsma (2011) concludes that the current treaty is plagued with inconsistencies which hinder policy improvements, and sooner than later the current set of drug control conventions need to be revised – inevitably, the ongoing reform process will collide with the zero-tolerance nature of the United Nations Conventions and the policy of the United States. Recently in 2014, the United States defended the integrity of the United Nations drug control conventions, while allowing more flexible interpretation and permitting some degree of national differentiation (Jelsma, 2014). This so far is the only visible change in the United States position on the United Nations conventions, and this nascent leniency does not extend to areas such as harm reduction measures or Bolivia's coca leaf policy.

It must be noted that the international approach to solving drug-related problems is faced with some obstacles because it has been challenged by various legal, practical and political factors that generally frustrate the effective provision of assistance by other countries that needed to be involved for the process to be effective. For example, international case proceedings take place in a complex environment where different national legal systems, institutions, modes of investigations and prosecution constitute an obstacle to effective legal cooperation across borders. Another obstacle is the actual exercise of political will beyond the signing of treaties; therefore, the existence of treaty cooperation, for example Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty, is not only a technical and legal matter, but also a complex political process taking place in channels in which national interest and security considerations may engender political reluctance. Furthermore, some countries may apply conflicting or inconsistent national policies that may override a treaty. In some other cases where a country draws economic benefits from money laundering-related activities, there will be little or no incentive to put up an effective fight against such crimes, much less give full commitment to any treaty in that regard.

Matthew S. Jenner (2011) surveyed the history of the illegal drug industry focusing on violent drug traffickers, examined past attempt to control the drug industry and assessed their strengths and weaknesses. He notes that governments have instituted dozens of programs to undo illegal drug activities, but they have seen only marginal success. He identified one strategy that has yet to be fully tested, namely universal legalization of all drugs which, he believes, would attack the illicit drug market head-on, destroy the profit incentive for drug traffickers and place the control of the clandestine industry in the hands of national governments.

This proposition is highly unlikely to have acceptance by the current configuration of international drug control led by the United States and the United Nations. Not only that, it also

based on faulty assumptions: first, that the oversupply of illicit drugs will cause the price to fall, thereby crushing the incentives for the illicit trade, and second, national governments should take responsibility for the control of illicit drug industry. They are faulty assumptions because illicit drugs are addictive substances, so legalizing the industry will only multiply the negative effects. Also, most national governments, especially of the producer and transit countries, lack the capacity to control such a clandestine activity. Therefore, the universal legalization proposal should be perused carefully before adoption.

2.9 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The liberal theory of international relations, that is idealism, guides this study. The liberal theory of international relations arose after World War I in response to the inability of states to control and limit war in their international relations. Early advocates of the theory include Woodrow Wilson and Norman Angel, who argued vigorously that states mutually gained from cooperation and that war was so destructive as to be essentially futile (Encarta, 2008). The liberal approach to international relations prides itself on the belief that humans have the capacity to work in harmony and behave with mutual respect for one another. Ideas on institutional, cooperative and multilateral arrangements provide core alternative features that have manifested in more recent times. The key liberal points most relevant for this dissertation include the following:

1. Human nature is essentially good or altruistic, mutual aid, cooperation and concern for others' welfare make progress possible.
2. War and injustice are international problems. Collective or multilateral, rather than national (unilateral), efforts are required to eliminate them.

3. International societies must recognize its institutions to eliminate the anarchy that makes problems such as war likely.
4. Bad human behavior is not just a product of evil people, but of bad institutions and structural arrangements that motivate people to act selfishly and to harm others, including making war.

These four broad indicators provide further compelling argument for the perceived liberal motives underscoring the Nigeria-United States cooperation. Humans have the capacity to be good and altruistic. Within the United Nations, concern for other states' welfare has seen progress of inter-state cooperation, with mutual aid at the forefront of such endeavors. This ideal has been expanded to Nigeria with the ongoing support against drug trafficking to Nigeria by the United States. Increased inter-state cooperation and institutionalization has enhanced the idea of an international society, and moved the world away from anarchy, towards order. This leads to the idea of having good global institutions to deal with the world problems and decrease in the chance of war.

This inter-state cooperation does go very far in explaining Nigeria-United States cooperation, at least with illicit drug trafficking becoming a core focus. Americans are concerned with halting the drug flow to the United States, whereas Nigerians are worried more about the involvement of members of its citizenry in illicit drug trafficking. Hence, there seem to be a natural harmony of interests as proposed by the liberals. However, although it appears as if the war on drug is an interest that the two countries share "mutual grounds" insofar as they both fight illicit drug trafficking, but their interests and goals may be different. United States has become more engaged in Nigeria's security problems, which could have spill-over effects in the West African sub-region.

In the last two decades several scholars have been working on the idea of redefining the concept of security. The main argument of the proponents of the redefinition of security has been that non-military threats are important elements of insecurity in today's world (Lopez, 2009). Liberalists, as opposed to traditional realists, move security out of the military sector – the so-called extended security perspective (Buzan and Weaver, 1998). Juliet and James (2011) also argue that:

The debate on a new and extended term is in large degree based in the idea that there are other threats against security -political, economic, social and environmental-that should have as high of a priority as War and threats against integrity of territory.

Juliet and James (2011) distinguish between three types of security: political, economic and social security. This study is concerned with a social security phenomenon, namely illicit drug trafficking. While political security is associated with democratizing action, economic security, deals with elements of economic cooperation and reciprocal dependence as very important variables for any society. Note that Nigeria is one of the suppliers of oil to the United States its largest trading partner in Africa. Also, United States' firms have provided some 20% of Nigeria's foreign direct investment (FDI), of which petroleum investments are an important part. Within the past decade, oil companies were engaged in the exploration of significant petroleum reserves in Nigeria which suggests that the country was an important source of petroleum for the United States. Economic progress in Nigeria would mean more resources to combat drugs and terror which, in turn, may lead to increased stability in Nigeria. Social security on the other hand is based on the argument that illicit drugs have negative effects on the social lifestyle of any society.

Drugs, as a social security issue, fit better into liberal perspective. With regards to the pursuit of social security, it may mean first that both countries must identify illicit drugs as something bad for their societies, second that drugs lead to health problems, and also that drug abuse often leads to criminal actions. The liberal theory of international relations fits within its framework the mission of the United Nations, which is acclaimed to be one of the major achievements of the idealist persuasion. This is demonstrated in the United Nations conventions. Because there is no over-arching authority to ensure cooperation, states may support international organizations as a forum for coordinating states' interests. What liberalists demonstrated is that greater cooperation can be achieved in the long run among actors who have interactions because such actors ultimately realize that illicit drug trafficking is a global phenomenon which can only be met with sufficient financial and political resources of the international community's collaboration.

Levy (1989) argues that liberalist pre-occupation with a normative agenda such as human rights and their universal appeal has allowed liberals to disrespect the sovereignty of countries where non-democratic governments prevail. On the economic interdependence principle which the liberals claim increases cooperation in international relations by using institutions, theorists have outlined that states seldom trust one another in order to participate in an exchange of absolute gains because of trust deficit that exists between one state and another due to the structure of anarchy in the international system. It has also been argued that international institutions, like United Nations and World Trade Organization, are basically representations of the distribution of power that exists in today's world due to America's control over them and their functions (Mearsheimer, 1994).

Neo-liberalists such as Keohane and Martin (1995) have accepted the fact that institutions will not be significant if a conflict of interest exists between two states at the international level, as such a conflict cannot be possibly resolved by institutions alone due to the pursuit of state interests by each state. However, they do outline that institutions can produce a mechanism through which states can cooperate and thus increase the possibility of peace in international relations.

Although liberal theory of international relations is one of the popular theories in world politics, it has been subject to fair criticism. The Marxian school of thought argues that the freedom that liberalism offered were insufficient, specifically political freedom that were undermined by inequality between the 'haves' and the 'have nots' in the society. Those from the economically privileged groups tend to be educated, more cultured, to have higher social status, to be more successful professionally and politically. This means that economic inequality reproduced itself endlessly in series of other inequalities (Eric, 2008). In short, because of liberal's ambitious assertion of international relations, it provides an optimistic forecast of cooperative inter-relations and conflict resolution. For this reason, the theory was chosen as the framework of analysis for this study.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

This study employed the quasi-experimental research design as the means of generating the information needed. The primary sources of information are not subjected to any predetermined condition; rather, the nature of their work and responsibilities provides the natural setting for requisite experience, knowledge and capacity to provide relevant information related to the topic of study, which deals with a highly specialized and clandestine activity, namely drug trafficking. The study is a qualitative research because the information used for the analysis was not based on the number of respondents, but on the quality and relevance of the information provided by the respondents.

3.2 STUDY POPULATION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE

The population of the study comprises all stakeholders in the fight against illicit drug trafficking undertaking the mandate of implementing the objectives and strategies of the bilateral relationship between Nigeria and the United States, namely the members of the Joint Task Force office in Lagos.

Consequently, ten (10) officers NDLEA officers and one United States DEA agent were selected for in-depth interview as key informants (see Appendix III), using the purposive sampling technique. The reason for this sampling technique is that, given the highly specialized and clandestine nature of drug trade which they are mandated to combat, they all are officials with extensive knowledge on drug trafficking issues, by reason of their special duties and

responsibilities. They were chosen because they are the persons most likely to provide the information needed to answer the research questions. The snowball sampling technique was also employed so that through the people initially interviewed, hints about other potential contacts within the agency for interview to obtain further information.

3.3 SOURCES OF DATA

The qualitative approach used in this thesis generated data from both primary and secondary sources. Primary data was generated through in-depth interview with officials of the Joint Task Force on narcotics, while secondary data was generated from the records, reports and archives of the National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (NDLEA) Headquarters at Ikoyi, Lagos, in addition to other textbooks, journal articles and internet materials, among others.

3.4 PROCEDURE FOR DATA COLLECTION

Data was collected using interview and from careful study of secondary sources or materials. The primary data was obtained through interviews with staff members of NDLEA and an official of the United States Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA), using an interview guide (see Appendix I). On the other hand, secondary data was generated through a careful study and analysis of records, reports and publications obtained from the management of the NDLEA, and also from other journals, books, research papers or articles. The internet was widely used in search of these.

The researcher made several trips to NDLEA Headquarters at No. 2 Shaw Road, Ikoyi, Lagos to create the necessary rapport with the selected respondents. This attempt was made possible by means of an introductory letter from the Department of Political Science and

International Studies, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria for this exercise. At the NDLEA Headquarters the respondents were briefed on the researcher's mission, which included the need to assess areas/mechanisms of the cooperation between Nigeria and the United States against illicit drug trafficking. To ensure cooperation from respondents, anonymity was emphasized. Before each interview, a list of questions was sent to the respondents in advance so that the respondents would have a better idea of what they would be asked.

The interview guide (see Appendix 1) was used to drive the interview sessions with the respondents, namely the staff of NDLEA and the United States DEA agent, who also happened to be a member of the Joint Task Force. The field work was conducted between March 2013 and November 2013. The researcher had fifteen contacts with the respondents.

3.5 METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

Data obtained from both primary and secondary sources was subjected to qualitative analysis and presented thematically. Inferences are drawn from generated facts and tied together with the theory and objectives of the study to establish the findings, draw conclusion and make recommendations.

CHAPTER FOUR

PERSPECTIVES OF DRUG TRADE AND CONTROL MECHANISMS IN NIGERIA AND THE UNITED STATES

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter is devoted to understanding the perspectives of the drug situation, and control mechanisms put in place by Nigeria and United States. This explains the context within which the illicit drug activities take place, which is the geographical, socioeconomic and political environment which the bilateral agreement is concerned with. It also provides the basis for contextualizing the bilateral agreement, which is one among some others that the two countries have each entered with several other countries in their attempt at grappling with the menace within their societies, so that the details of this bilateral agreement and the corresponding strategic impact may not be confused with that of other active agreements, and also nexus between this agreement and other similar agreements may be properly acknowledged.

4.2 PERSPECTIVE OF ILLICIT DRUG TRADE IN NIGERIA AND THE CONTROL MECHANISM

The drug problem is as old as man. No society is isolated from the negative consequences of illicit drug. In Nigeria however, the problem of drugs began to assume very worrisome dimensions at the end of the Second World War following the return of some Nigerian soldiers from mainly Burma, India where they had fought. One negative consequences of the war, was the return of the soldiers with some seeds of cannabis sativa, also known as Indian hemp, which they in turn experimented and discovered that the illicit plant could do well in some parts of the

country. With time the cultivation of cannabis sativa began to grow and so was the trafficking abuse of cannabis plant. Drug barons soon discovered that the geographical location of Nigeria, with thick population, bustling commerce and vibrant transportation hold so much attraction for thriving drug business. Cannabis production, distribution and consumption provided pathways for the incorporation of cocaine and heroin from the 1980s. By 1960, drugs (including alcohol) had become a major public issue in Nigeria as evidenced by a large increase in drug seizures, arrest, and prosecutions for prohibited drugs notably cannabis (Asuni, 1990; Obot, 2004). The need to curtail sale and use was also a major concern. From period onward, domestic legislation which focused on control and prohibition of drugs, especially hemp (cannabis sativa), became entrenched. Oloruntoba (2006) explained that the vigor and sustained efforts to legislate against drugs in contemporary Nigeria was because of the country as a transit point or centre for recruitment of drug couriers, and a growing pattern of consumption of these drugs within the country.

By 1980s, it became clear that more Nigerians were getting involved in the distribution of drugs, both within the country and beyond, while citizens also experimented with, and used these drugs. Elis (2009) points that the drug trade is not new to Nigerians as some of them have played important role in trafficking drugs across the globe. They have been credited with inventing the swallow method of drug in condom in which couriers smuggled across borders in their bodies. The same period marked the beginning of a truly sustained war on drugs and or war on the people as evidenced in the creation of separate agency, known as the National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (NDLEA), to wage this war to its logical conclusion. Nigeria's increasing notoriety in the illegal drug economy in the 1980s did not help matters at all. If nothing else, it impelled the Nigerian authorities to intensify their war policy on the traffickers and users alike.

According to UNDCP (2001), drug related arrests in Nigeria between 1994 and 1999 increased from 693 to 2,501 persons, an increase of (235.8%). Arrests of Cannabis accounted for 91.6% of arrests in 1999, followed by arrests for psychotropic substances (3.4%), and heroin (2.6%). NDLEA (1999) reports that there is no reliable statistics on the extent of cannabis production, which is the main drug abused in Nigeria. However, the output is substantial based on the seizures made by the government. NDLEA (1999) also observes that 17,691.141 kg of cannabis were seized and burnt through Operation Burn the Weeds (OBW) in 1999. One year later, FRN (2000) reported the destruction of 3,499.411 hectares of Cannabis plantation across the country. The highest proportion was in Akure in Ondo State (93.4%), followed by Makurdi in Benue State (5.3%), Warri in Delta State (0.6), and other places such as Yola, Bauchi, Port Harcourt and Calabar in Adamawa, Bauchi, Rivers and Cross River states respectively. A recent study by Evelyn Obekpa (2017) puts Kano State as top habitat of drug addicts, with the conviction of 93 persons and 273 others reintegrated back into the society.

This increases in the cultivation and seizures show the extent to which the demand for the drug was increasing in Nigeria. NDLEA (2001) reveals the statistics of drug seized between 1994 and 1999: Cannabis constitutes 97.6% of the 18,120.6 kg of drug seized, followed by Diazepam (1.6), heroin (0.4), Cocaine (0.1%) and other substances such as Amphetamine, Pemoline, and psychotropic substances. Higdon (1991) also points to the increasing drug abuse among young people, and he observes that evidence of money laundering arising from drug trade include the \$66 million declared by 3,300 Nigerians comprising 2,700 men and 600 women on entry to Thailand between July 1989 and June 1990. It is possible that the number of drug-related offenders at that time was more, but due to the non-declaration of assets by some offenders, it is difficult to know the actual number of persons involved. In almost all the states that studies have

been conducted in Nigeria, the statistics are startling going by the number of people involved, the types of drugs abused and other criminal deviations committed by offenders (Odejide, 1993; NDLEA, 1999; FRN, 2000). In particular, Odejide (1993) found that a total of 14,950 Nigerians were arrested.

The fear imposed by these statistics, centered around drug control activity at border points, is that there is growing domestic buildup drug problem that is yet to be fully addressed – the spillover effect of which is international drug trafficking – as attention is focused mainly on addressing the problem of drug transition through Nigeria. This fear was earlier expressed by Mohammed (1990) who says: “With the rising trend of drug trafficking in Nigeria, one is bound to be apprehensive of our graduating into a ‘user’ country, not just a transit country.” It is truly a concern to appreciate, especially in the light of the consequences thereof, as discussed in the section following. Some clear facts about the drug menace in Nigeria, from the above, include the following: first, the major drug in trade is cannabis, both in terms of cultivation and trafficking; second, Nigerian offenders (at least majority of those arrested) are usually trans-border traffickers, meaning that intra-border trafficking and trade have no conclusive data that can explain the extent of drug use, except with respect to cultivators.

Though regulations continued to oscillate between stiff and mild outlooks, perhaps in response to the prevailing circumstances (Obot, 2004; Oloruntoba, 2006), the bulk of these regulations have continued to lay emphasis on prohibition and punishment. In Nigeria the spread of drug abuse and illicit drug trafficking have not been a serious problems in the past. However, the data on the involvement of Nigerians in international drug trafficking show that between 1979 and 1988 there were 14,833 arrest and 4,574 convictions in foreign countries (Iyamabo, 1990). Most of the arrests were made in Britain, the United States, Saudi Arabia, India, Pakistan

and Thailand. Back home, the first arrest for trafficking in an illicit drug other than cannabis was in 1982 with the seizure of cocaine weighing 1.2 kg from one trafficker in the process of taking the drug out the country. Another single arrest was made in 1983 and beginning from 1984, there was significant increase in the arrests of cocaine and heroin traffickers and also in the quantity of seizure at the international airport and sea port (Oyakhilome, 1990). In 1989 alone, the number of arrests was 146.

Gyong and Tanimu (2010), in their study, found that there was a steady increase in the number of suspects arrested for drug related offences in Nigeria over the past two decades. For instance, they revealed that the number of suspects arrested rose from 293 persons in 1991, to a maximum of 6,323 persons in 2006, showing an increase of 2,158%. The study also showed an increase from 61 females in 1994 to 440 in 2006. In the first three month of the year 2009, the NDLEA arrested a total of 38 persons at the Murtala Mohammed International Airport Lagos alone. The agency also disclosed that it has arrested a total of 6,308 suspects in 2007 and 7,899 in the year 2008, showing an increase of 1,591 cases representing 20.14 percent.

The United States’ State Department 2007 International Narcotics Control Strategy Report shows that the sale and local consumption of Marijuana in Nigeria was on the increase. It linked the rise in domestic use of Marijuana in Nigeria to the increased quantities seized, the number and size of illicit plots discovered and destroyed, and number of arrests made by NDLEA. Below is a table showing the drug situation in Nigeria between the periods 2000-2012.

Table 3.1 Interdiction Score Card 2000-2011: Distribution of drug seizures and Arrest

Canna	Co	H	Ot	Total	M	F
-------	----	---	----	-------	---	---

ear	bis	caine	eroïn	hers	ale	emale		
000	0.02	272,26 42	53. 6.6	5 4.28	23 4.32	272,69 ,253	2 32	1
001	0.20	317,95 5.82	19 6.63	4 8.84	30 1.49	318,50 ,693	2 36	1
002	6.09	506,84 35	35. 5.62	5 1	79 8.06	507,72 ,549	2 08	1
003	3.75	535,59 4.74	13 7.58	8 7.41	93 3.48	536,75 ,316	2 74	1
004	.07	68,310 4.47	12 0.94	9 3.83	23 .31	68,759 ,382	3 18	3
005	9	125,98 5.91	39 0.42	7 72	88. 3.65	126,54 ,181	3 92	2
006	8.30	192,36 435.88	14, 3.09	3 5.57	51 2.84	207,35 ,883	5 40	4
007	8.30	210,36 3.678	39 20.638	1 9.735	69 6.00	211,47 ,891	5 77	4
008	5.34	335,53 5.4904	36 1.6054	1 0.4033	53 2.84	336,44 ,584	7 15	3
009	0.71	114,70 2.05	39 04.71	1 2.77	71 0.24	115,91 ,700	6 42	3
010	1.59	174,66 6,433	70 02.08	2 50.622	2,5 20.73	178m1 296	6 92	4
otal	477.97	2,854, 233.24	17, 79.91	8 03.18	7,6 192.96	2,880, 8,728	4 ,226	3

Source: National Law Enforcement Agency (NDLEA), Lagos, Intelligence Databank

Analysis of the table shows that with the exception of a few years, there was a consistent upsurge in the quantity of drugs reportedly being interdicted by the NDLEA in 1990-2011. For

instance, from 1994, it is clear that the figure shifted from that of single digit to double digits, and continued in an upward direction with three digits. The same trend is observed with the number of persons interdicted for various drug dealing offences. These figures may have been the product of several factors and given that the figures continued to rise even with the cooperation.

Although initially females played a secondary role and were outside the radar of trafficking records, they however became vital part of the business in the late 1980 and early 1990s (Okpalakunne, 2006:16). Factors such as poverty and greed have been attributed to their involvement in the phenomenon. According to NDLEA, the number of females getting involved in this illicit business is also on the increase since 2008. Nigeria which initially served as drug transit point has produced a large population of users and addicts. The effect of this illicit trade on the country's image abroad is as traumatic as the effect on the economy. It is a known fact that drugs aggravate the crime rate within any particular society. As some Nigerians began to use drug, they engage in selling their properties to meet their drug needs.

The most profound effect could be that of reallocation of scarce resources within the economy. Government has provided funds for the rehabilitation of traffickers, hospitals and equips the law enforcement agents to actively discharge their duties. The resources will have been better utilized and the provision of social amenities of people instead of using it for rehabilitation of addicts. It is against this background the led to Nigeria-United States cooperation against illicit drug trafficking.

Against the backdrop of the established link between drug markets, crime and violence and the moral indignation directed at the use and sale of drugs, legal controls had a longtime ago

been instituted with widespread appeal. Past and present Nigerian authorities have shared in the belief that to eliminate the dangerous crimes caused by drugs and promote moral uprightness in the society, it is desirable to target both those who distribute these drugs, and those who use them (NDLEA 2009). The first official drug control law in Nigeria was the Dangerous Drug Acts of 1935 which was aimed at the prohibition of importation, exportation, transit, production, sales, distribution of opium, coca leaves, Indian hemp, heroin and other dangerous drugs (Oloruntoba, 2006). This was followed by the Indian Hemp Decree of 1966 which prescribed stiff punishment of death penalty or 21 years imprisonment for the cultivation, 10 years imprisonment for exportation and for those found smoking it or in possession of it (Federal Military Government, 1966). Obot reported in his seminal assessment of Nigeria drug policy that between 1994 and 2000, the 1966 Decree was amended in 1975 with less severe penalties. He noted for instance, that the death penalty was abrogated while for smoking was reduced to six months imprisonment or fine. This dynamic local market absorbed most of the Nigeria's Cannabis production, while the Nigeria Police headed by the energetic late Inspector General. Muhammadu Dikko Yusuf until his retirement in 1979 prevented more than a minuscule amount finding their way abroad (UN, 1974).

Throughout the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s when the military controlled the affairs of the country there was uncertainty on drug matter by the military, either partly because drugs issue was not perceived as a public problem, or the international agencies and Western Countries had not brought pressure to bear on the authorities they apparently tolerated. However, beginning from the mid 1980s the lukewarm attitude of the military towards the problem of drugs changed as a result of international pressures, particularly the United States started from 1984 to mount

pressure on the country's government to adopt stern measures against trafficking in narcotic drugs by Nigerians.

Consequently, the military regime of Muhammadu Buhari came up with a tougher and repressive laws and policies on illegal drug sale and use. Obot (2004) explains that this attitude, which occasioned the 1984 Nigerian Drug Law, was done to reflect the mood of the new military officers in power. This mood appeared to be that of corrective intolerance. Two significant changes occurred in the statutes book of Nigeria's drug policy and law during the 1980s and 1990s period of military rule. One was the amendment and subsequent repealing of the already amended 1975 Indian Hemp Act (Decree) which brought back stiff penalties for trafficking in and or sale of Cannabis. The second and most pronounced was the creation of a Special Tribunal (Miscellaneous Offences). The Decree expressly prescribed death penalty by firing squad for dealing in, buying, selling, exposing or offering for sale or luring somebody to buy, sell, use, smoke, or inhale any drug known as cocaine or related drugs (Federal Military Government, 1984). Worst still, the Decree had a retroactive effect, being backdated to 31 December 1983, when the government of Gen. Buhari came to power. The turning point of the Decree and historic in the annals of drug regulations in Nigeria was the execution (by firing squad) of three men who had been convicted of the offence prior to the promulgation of the Decree (Elis, 2009). A sociological study of the pattern in drug trafficking at the Murtala Mohammed Airport based on records available from the Department of Customs and Excise, by Omotola. O. Idowu (1988) offers some insight on the country's drug problem. The study at the nation's busiest international airport covered a six year period-1982-1987 and its main findings are summarized below. The study reported 284 seizures within the period-1982 (1) 1983(1) 1984(16) 1985 (25) 1986 (118) 1987 (123), depicting significance increased in the number of seizures in 1986 and 1987.

As a result of public outcry which greeted the execution by both local and international communities, there was a moratorium on the punishment. On 27 August 1985, the Decree was repealed when Gen. Babangida came to power. In 1989, the National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (NDLEA) was founded by Decree No. 48. The Decree created a drug law enforcement agency and institutional framework charged with the responsibility of regulating what was perceived to be an ever-increasing trafficking in and abuse of illegal drugs. The Decree specified punishments for illicit drug use and trafficking in cocaine, heroin or similar drugs, for 15 years but not exceeding 25 years for possession or use (NDLEA Annual Report, 2011).

The war on drug took a dramatic turn in 1993 with the ascension to power of a new military administration after an unpopular coup. During the reign of late Gen. Sani Abacha, drug control became a government priority; a budget of \$70 million was set aside for the NDLEA and the agency placed in the hands of late Gen. Musa Bamayi. In an analysis of Nigeria's drug policies, Obot (2004) explains that the war on drug in Nigeria during the military era was based on the perceived need to achieve the United States certification benchmarks which consequently led to failure to evolve a home grown solution to the problem drug. In fact, as his argument implied, the war on drugs resulted in significant economic, social, and psychological consequences for Nigeria and Nigerians (Obot, 2004). Decree 48 was amended in 1995, providing the NDLEA with more power to enforce drug laws. For instance, the Money Laundry Decree of 1995 conferred greater power on the Agency to mount clandestine surveillance on the Bank accounts of suspected traffickers, or tap any telephone line and access any computer system in an attempt to locate narcotic drugs or the proceeds earned in the trade. The same Money Laundry Decree placed a ceiling on cash and mandated banks to report deposits beyond the limit set. The Decree obliged banks to disclose any transaction in excess ₦500,000 by an

individual and of ₦2million for a corporate body. The number of convictions has shot up from 67 in 1994 to 1,026 in 1997. Many other coercive practices introduced under the Abacha regime have become institutionalized through drug laws that gave NDLEA officials excessive powers to arrest, to seize assets of suspects and to publicly parade them before they appear in court.

In spite of these continuities of drug control, there has been one significant change since the end of military rule in 1999, namely declining domestic political support for drug war. In contrast to the late 1990s when drug policy was a top priority of the Abacha regime, political support and funds decreased with the handover of power to civilian government in 1999. Most of the informants interviewed stressed that in the last years, the lack of funding from the Nigerian government is the major challenge to the work of their department and to the drug agency in general (Interview, 2013). Several high-ranking officials blamed the financial problems directly on the lack of political will shown by the democratically government of Obasanjo and Yar'adua administrations. Increased bureaucratic huddles to acquire funds were seen as reason for the decline in funds. Most often, the president was not properly committed to the drug war, compared with military regime of the 1990s (Interview, 2013). Consequently, the NDLEA has perceived the lack of political will as the greatest threat to its work since 1999.

While this decline in political support emerged from the Presidency and the new democratic institution, NDLEA has been able to find alternative allies in international drug control agencies and other countries. In fact, for example, NDLEA never perceived the United States as a threat; it was rather seen as a resource for additional funds and recognition throughout the history of NDLEA. Even during Abacha regime when the Nigerian government was internationally isolated, the NDLEA was still cooperating closely with United States (Drug Salvation Force, 1997).

Therefore, international cooperation has been judged excellent in most parts of the Nigerian drug community since 1999 (Interview, 2013). This close inter-agency relationship also meant that, aside from the so-called drug menace, Nigeria and United States drug officials now faced a common enemy, the Nigerian government's low interest in drug control. The close NDLEA relations with foreign counterparts were even used to put pressure on the Nigerian government. In an interview, an informant (Interview, 2013) recounted how the United States drug control representatives in Nigeria helped the NDLEA to push for a higher capital budget by pressuring the president. In other words, intensified United States' cooperation helped to retain the NDLEA's favorable position in domestic struggles over powers and influence. However, this relative political disinterest in drug control might change due to the return of President Buhari, the newly elected President in May 2015.

Expectedly there was a barrage of criticisms that trailed these Decrees and their contents by individual Nigerians, and the civil society groups. In 2004, Decree 48 was further amended by the CAP N30 Laws of Federation of Nigeria (LFN, 2004). The act stipulates, among other things, life imprisonment for production, import, export, sale, purchase, and possession of drugs such as cocaine, heroin or any other similar drugs upon conviction. There was also a provision for imprisonment of between 7 and 25 years for various categories of offences such as letting out one's premises for use in drug transaction, smoking or using illicit drugs, impersonating any staff of the Agency, aiding and abetting in the commission of the offence, etc. (Annual Report, 2009:78-85). This amendment was without prejudice to some of the provisions of the 1995 amendment which included the Money Laundering and Forfeiture of Assets Decree.

Beginning with the Indian Hemp (Cannabis) Decree of 1966, punishment for drug offences has generally been extreme. Under this decree, cultivation of cannabis attracted the

death penalty or 21 years imprisonment and exportation attract ten years jail term. A stiff penalty of at least 10 years in jail was reserved for those found smoking or in possession of the drug (Federal Military Government, 1966). This law was amended in 1975 and less severe penalties was instituted. For example, the death penalty was abolished and the punishment for cannabis smoking was reserved to six month and or a fine (Federal Military Government, 1975). However, to reflect the mood of the new military leaders in power, there were drastic changes in Nigerian drug law in 1984, with a significant feature being the re-introduction of the death penalty. Two years later, with the coming of new military regime, the 1984 Decree was amended in life imprisonment was substituted for the death penalty. The most significant drug law in Nigeria has been the NDLEA Decree No. 4 of 1989, a response to the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, 1988. Among many of its provisions, the NDLEA Decree set up an agency of the same name and listed the punishment for drug offences, including forfeitures of asset of arrested persons. In this decree, trafficking in cocaine, LSD, heroin or similar drugs is punishable by life imprisonment, while possession or use attracts a sentence of 15 years but not exceeding 25 years (Federal Military Government, 1989:730).

Before 1994, the NDLEA, which held the mandate to fight the drug war in the country, was racked with a series of problems. One of the evidences of the problems of the Agency, according to an informant located at the Murtala Muhammed International Airport (Interview, 2013), has been the rapid turnover of chief executives, due to combination of factors like corruption, incompetence and the self-interest interventions of the international community, especially the United States. UNODC (2008) has noted that a major problem in combating illicit

drug trade is the unwillingness of the government to address deficiencies in the policing of illicit drug activities.

More recently the National Drug Control Master Plan (NDCMP) 2015-2019 was developed by Nigeria with support from the European Union and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, and signed by former President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan, GCFR (NDLEA, 2015); it proffers both an integrated and comprehensive strategy that would address a set of drug-related issues, including illicit drug supply, drug demand reduction, and control of licit substances based on international drug control conventions and in line with the principles of balanced approach to drug control. This shows a possible rise in the Nigerian government's commitment to illicit drug control recently which only time will prove to be true, given the timeframe of the master plan.

4.3 THE DRUG PERSPECTIVE OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE CONTROL MECHANISM

The global illegal drug trade represents a multifaceted challenge that has implications for United States national interests as well as the international community. The United States intelligence community notes that international drug trafficking can undermine political and regional stability and bolster the role and capabilities of transnational criminal groups involved in the drug trade. Some key regions of concern include Latin America and Afghanistan, which are focal points in United States efforts to combat the production and transit of cocaine and heroin respectively, the use of, and addiction to which have the potential to negatively affect the social fabric of communities, hinder economic development, and place an additional burden on national public health infrastructures (Rosen, 2015).

Historically, the United States and international policy makers directed relatively little attention to counternarcotics issues in Africa largely because the potential consequences for the United States and other non-African countries arising from drug trafficking in the African region were typically viewed as limited. The perception that such activities may indeed threaten United States and other international interests have grown however, as Africa's role in global trafficking has expanded. Some United States observers now argue that the rise in drug trafficking in Africa is so rapid that it must be given consideration within the context of United States counternarcotics goals and strategies.

International efforts to combat drug trafficking are based on some long standing set of multilateral agreements to which the United States has committed. The country's involvement in international drug control rests on the central premise that helping foreign governments to combat illicit drugs abroad will ultimately minimize availability in the United States. To this end, the United States maintains the objective of reducing and eliminating the international flow of illegal drugs into her borders through international cooperation to disrupt the drug trade, interdiction efforts and support for demand reduction (Rosen, 2015; ONDCP, 2012).

The fight against illegal drugs in the United States has led to the emergence of divergent views between Nigeria and United States. As far back as early 1980s, the United States government began to express its unhappiness with the Nigerian government because of the growing role of Nigerians in exacerbating the drug problem in United States; not only were Nigerians bringing drugs from their country into the United States, those resident to their country and in Asia were using inner-city gangs to distribute drugs in urban neighborhood. The United States Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) asserts that at some point in the 1990s, Nigerian traffickers controlled between 70% and 90% of the market for south-east Asian heroin sold in

Chicago (DEA, Undated). By 1987, the Nigerian connection with drug trafficking seem to have been well established and drug issues had become a regular features of discussion between the United States and Nigerian officials.

It is confirmed that the United States is the world greatest consumer of hard drugs and about 80% of drugs consumed in the United States came from Columbia alone. The United States is suffering from evils effect associated with drug. The rate of violence in American streets is on the increase, so also with drug-related murder. In 2007 the cost of illicit drug use totaled more than 193 billion US dollars. This level of usage clearly worries the rest of the population. From 1985 until 2001, drugs were consistently one of the most important problems facing the United Nations. In response to such concerns, federal and state legislators and executive branch officials have enacted and implemented policies that, while diverse in approach, are oriented toward enforcement. These policies include the prohibition of almost any use or possession of cocaine, heroin, marijuana, and a wide variety of other psychoactive substances. To make it difficult to buy such drugs, strategies have been implemented that range from eradication of crops like coca in source countries, through interdiction of smugglers, to disruption of street markets and incarceration of dealers within United States borders. At the same time, governmental agencies have sought to reduce Americans demand for drugs through treatment of substance abusers and prevention programs offered through schools and over the media. However, most of the expenditures on drug at federal, state and local levels combined have been directed to enforcement.

The United States antidrug efforts have expanded, according to Rosen (2012), to include a broad range of ways to attack the global drug trade, such as reducing drug production at the source, combating drug on transit, dismantling international illicit drug networks, reducing and

preventing drug demand abroad, and creating in countries cooperation on drug control. To date, the United States federal antidrug budget has been tilted toward enforcement. In 2003, for example, 53 percent of the President's requested drug control budget was for enforcement, 29 percent for treatment, and 18 percent for prevention. The emphasis on enforcement is often pointed out by critics of prevailing spending priorities. However, that allocation in itself does not imply that enforcement is being overfunded relative to the other approaches. If enforcement were able to produce greater progress towards drug policy goals per dollar spent on it that, might justify the emphasis on enforcement.

Furthermore, treatment attacks demand directly, whereas enforcements do so by raising prices (insofar as its target suppliers and not users). Thus, while treatment unambiguously reduces the dollar value of the black market, enforcement may or may not. Treatment is also much cheaper than enforcement in that it costs much less to run a heavy user through treatment than it does to incarcerate a seller (or user). While putting more emphasis on treatment, and perhaps prevention as well, might have led to more success in reducing drug consumption, these alternative approaches can, at best reduce America's drug problems. Although the effectiveness of drug policies varies over the course of an epidemic, they are largely crafted and implemented as if drug use were indeed static. Treatment's share of the annual United States federal antidrug budget, for example stayed between 17% and 20% from 1987 to 1995, as the nature of the drug problem changed considerably.

According to the United States Office on Drug Control Policy (2012), Americans spend roughly \$64 billion to consume illicit narcotics for recreational purpose, while their government spends over \$13 billion in an attempt to prevent them from doing so. As a result, illicit drug use in America has contributed to \$193 billion (estimate) in crime, health and lost productivity cost

in 2007 (the year for which the most recent estimate was available). Public perception of the issue is governed by the belief that drug abused harms both the individual and society as a whole. Policy makers typically made the argument that drugs drive up healthcare cost and increase criminality and immorality among users. Perhaps the simplest approach to this problem is to prohibit the use of drugs; the United States has attempted to do this by enacting laws prohibiting the production, distribution and personal non-medical use of narcotics over the past century.

The Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP), in the Executive of the President of the United States, is responsible for overseeing the implementation of the United States drug control policy, including international counternarcotics efforts. Primary agencies involved in formulating and implementing counternarcotics efforts in Africa include the United States Department of State, the United States Department of Defense (DOD), and United States Drug Enforcement Agency. The State Department coordinates all the United States foreign assistance to support international efforts to combat illicit narcotics production and trafficking. The United States Department of Defense is responsible for the detection and monitoring of aerial and maritime transit of illegal drug and is also authorized to provide counternarcotics training and equipping assistance to foreign countries in certain circumstances. Drug Enforcement Agency leads the United States coordination of law enforcement investigations involving international production, trafficking and sale of illegal drugs and other control substances. The Department of Homeland Security is responsible for drug related maritime security and border control and related policy issues, while the Treasury Department occasionally undertakes activities to combat drug-related financial crimes.

The first criminal penalties for drug abuse were put in place by the states and localities because they have primary police power. It was not until 20th Century that the Federal

Government involved itself in policing drug abuse. The Congress passed the Harrison Narcotic Tax Act of 1914 and the Marijuana Tax Act of 1937. For several decades congress policed the consumption of opiates and marijuana through its tax power. The Boggs Act of 1951 and the Narcotic Control Act of 1956 started the trend of tough mandatory sentences for violation of the nation's drug laws and helped developed the rational that marijuana induces its users to move on to more dangerous drugs.

The passage of the Controlled Substance Act in 1970 was the first time the Congress relied upon its power to regulate interstate commerce to attempt to prevent drugs abuse. This law superseded all other drug control laws that the Federal Government had passed throughout the 20th Century and has been amended several times to include penalty for possession of drug like methamphetamine and crack cocaine. Based on his knowledge of the United States control policy, one of the United States Drug Enforcement Agent, a key informant (Interview, 2013) revealed that United States federal drug control policy has two dimensions: first, domestically, both the Federal Government and the states use the threat to criminal penalties to discourage both the recreational use and the production and distribution of narcotic drugs. Second, internationally, the United States seeks to disrupt domestic drug markets by reducing the supply of narcotics through interdiction of drug shipments in drug-transit countries and crop eradication in drug-producing countries (Rosen, 2015). This is intended to increase the price of raw materials necessary for production and decrease the purity of the final product. In theory, this course of action will lead to users paying higher prices for an inferior product, which will theoretically lead to a decrease in consumption. These types of policies have been in place for decades, and according to the key informant (Interview, 2013), there has been no appreciable impact on domestic demand for drugs or the street price of illicit – narcotics such as cocaine, heroin, or

marijuana. Roughly, 20 million Americans aged 12 and older, use illicit drugs; this number has remained constant for several years. Despite implementation of these policies, prices, purity, and rates of use have all remained relative stable over time.

From the early 20th Century, the United States was able to induce other nations to illegalize the production and distribution of narcotic drugs with remarkable success. The dominant view within the United States is that drugs are foreign problem, and by reducing the international supply of drugs, the domestic costs of demand reduction will gradually decrease. After originally spending a great deal of time and effort inducing other nations to control their own drug production problems, it has been the United States policy for the last 30 years to put money toward the disruption of drug markets through interdiction of international drug shipments and eradication of illicit crops grown in developing countries.

According to one of the key informant (Interview, 2013), throughout 1980s, increases in funding for domestic and international drug control programs had not had any success in reducing the number of drug users. Indeed, drug use increased between 1981 and 1989. The Congress sought to include the military in drug control efforts because previous policies were not achieving their desired outcomes. As a result, the American defense agencies, intelligence agencies, and law enforcement agencies are substantially involved in efforts to reduce the flow of narcotics into American markets and have even set up field offices in drug producing and transits countries. By the early 1990s, more than 9 out of every 10 dollars appropriated for military and police assistance was marked for supply reduction efforts including interdiction and weapon purchases.

Another potent tool the United States has adopted, unlike Nigeria, is the dissemination of a lot of reliable educational materials into the society which provide important information about the harms and consequences of drug use, so that citizens can be aware of that illicit drugs are all about. This is a preventive measure that is suitable for a highly literate citizenry. Although this strategy is quite important, the force of the United States' war against illicit drugs is more obvious and forceful around enforcement of drug laws. However, put within the entire framework of her control mechanism, the use of educational materials is equally important as enforcement, since each strategy addresses different categories of people, in terms of their relationship (closeness or distance, immunity or vulnerability) with the illicit drug industry.

The discussions above have brought to light some obvious differences between the drug control mechanisms of Nigeria and the United States, although the drug perspectives of the two countries are similar in some points, because one is merely a transit route, while the other, a destination point for illicit drugs, respectively. However, the problem of illicit drug trafficking has almost similar magnitude of negative impact on both countries, although from different social, economic and political angles. The most obvious difference is based on the generally observable disposition of the two countries' control mechanism: Nigeria has hoisted a reactionary, law-based approach that threatens offenders with severe sanctions; its application seems to hold full force only after the offence is committed and, by implication, uses threat of punishment as a deterrence to would-be drug traffickers within Nigeria, with no serious consideration or application to other traffickers elsewhere. An attendant factor to this strategy is the presence of weak political, social, and security institutions that, with respect to illicit drug activities, made the execution of those stiff anti-drug laws ineffective within the country. This continues for a long time until the establishment of NDLEA which, with the help of the United

States via the bilateral agreement against illicit drug trafficking, has ever remained a powerful force to reckon with in the drug war not only in Nigeria, but also in West Africa the entire globe.

The United States on the other hand is an advanced country with strong political, economic, security, social, and diplomatic institutions. Therefore, the policy that she pursues against illicit drugs, by consequence, reflects all these characteristics. The United States drug control mechanism concentrates resources around the enforcement of laws that will prevent, trail, interdict and undo illicit drug circles not only within the United States but all over the world, especially drug producing and transit countries, because she has the power capability for such intensive and extensive feats in favor of her national interests. Unlike Nigeria, the United States uses educational approach to preventing the vulnerability of her citizens to the seductions of drug trafficking activities. This is partly what informed its bilateral relationship with Nigeria against narcotics. The bilateral agreement against illicit drug trafficking is what blended the two countries' disposition against the menace; thereby ensuring some definite results that otherwise could not be achieved.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE NIGERIA-UNITED STATES BILATERAL STRATEGY AGAINST ILLICIT DRUG ACTIVITIES

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Corruption, money laundering and drug-related crimes are often and increasingly transnational in nature, thus frustrating the efforts of individual countries, particularly the developing ones that lack the expertise, resources, capacity and legal frameworks to effectively tackle problems like illicit drug trafficking. In the absence of adequate domestic framework, international cooperation provides an alternative means of tracking illegal funds, including funds generated through drug-related activities that have been laundered in other countries. There are several agreements entered into by Nigeria with other countries in order to address the problem of international drug trade, especially as it touches Nigeria as a transit country and Nigerians as producers or traffickers of these drugs. Chukwurah (1990) enumerated some of them as follows:

1. The Quadripartite Agreement between Nigeria, Benin Republic, Togo and Ghana.
2. The Tripartite Agreement with Niger and Chad.
3. The Nigeria-United States Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty in Law Enforcement Matters (1987).
4. The Nigeria-United States Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty in Criminal Matters (13 September, 1989).
5. The Nigeria-United States Agreement Against Illicit Production, Trafficking and Abuse of Narcotics Drugs and other Controlled Substances (21 March, 1990).
6. The Nigeria-Thailand Agreement to Combat Lagos-Bangkok Drug Route (April 1990).

All these agreements reflect that there was some level of political will to curtail international drug trafficking activities that directly or indirectly involves Nigeria and/or Nigerians as a transit country and/or as drug traffickers or producers respectively. Mutual legal assistance is a process by which countries give assistance in gathering evidence for use in the investigation of crimes. The forms of assistance covered by mutual legal assistance usually include the power to summon witnesses, compel the production of evidence and other relevant documents, and issue search warrants, among others. This chapter unveils the areas, the goals, the achievements and the challenges of the cooperation between Nigeria and the United States in their collective fight against illicit drug trafficking.

Nigeria-United States relations have seen remarkable transformation over the last decade. The convergence of mutual interests and values has affirmed the global strategic partnership between the two countries. Common values and complementary strengths of Nigeria and the United States provide a strong foundation for addressing the global challenges of the political spectrum in both countries to strengthen counternarcotics co-operation, in order to complement broader bilateral relations. The transnational nature of illicit drug trafficking has made it imperative for the country to work hand in hand with other nations of the world to form a common front against the deadly trade.

We have earlier noted that the first step for a nation in the global war against drugs is for it to sign and ratify all the existing international conventions and protocols aimed at stemming drug abuse and drug trafficking so as to give a firm base for whatever internal measures, including bilateral agreements it may choose to embark upon. To do otherwise amounts to merely paying lip service to the serious threat that the magnitude of a rising trend in the illicit production or demand, and the dangers that traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances

pose to the health and welfare of human beings and their adverse effects on the economic, cultural and political foundations of human society. Equally important is the political will to implement the provisions of international treaties and co-operation agreements on the subject to which such a state is a signatory.

5.2 THE NATURE, GOALS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE BILATERAL ANTIDRUG TRAFFICKING STRATEGY

Drug trafficking became such an issue in the United States' relations with Nigeria that it was discussed continuously at the highest level. It featured as one of the prominent issues which George Shultz, the then United States Secretary of State discussed with Nigerian officials when he visited Nigeria in January 1987. The discussion resulted in the cooperation agreement under which Nigeria's anti-narcotic war received the assistance of two officials from the United States Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) (Interview, 2013).

The Nigeria-United States Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty (MLAT), signed in Washington on 13 September, 1989, was intended to foster joint efforts between the two countries in identifying or locating criminal offenders, service of relevant documents, examination of witnesses, search and seizure of assets, facilitation of the personal appearance of witnesses before an administrative panel, a court, a tribunal or similar proceedings, effecting temporary transfer of persons in custody to enable them appear as witnesses, securing the production of official or judicial records and tracing, seizure and forfeiting the proceeds of criminal activities. Most of the bilateral mutual assistance treaties which Nigeria has entered into generally adopted this list of assistance with little or no modification. The following is an analysis of the key goals of the cooperation, the extent to which the two countries have made

achievements with respect to each goal, and the challenge facing the cooperation. The data used for analysis are partly from primary sources, generated through in-depth interview with selected key informants, and partly from secondary sources, generated through a careful study of secondary materials. The names of the key informants and specific dates of interview are removed from definite pieces of information in the course of analysis to ensure anonymity, due to the sensitive nature of the information provided.

5.2.1 Training

A major provision of the cooperation between Nigeria and the United States is the training of Nigerian security officials with respect to the fight against drug trafficking and other related offences. It has been ascertained by informants (Interviews, 2013) that the United States DEA officials ran a series of training program for the Nigerian Customs and Police officials detailed at the Murtala Mohammed International Airport and the Aminu Kano International Airport, and helped their Nigerian counterparts to set up an airport interdiction program. They also conducted training on drug identification and on the beat test that enabled Nigerian officials confirm immediately substances suspected to be hard drugs, through the use of the Margius Reagent (pending the identification of the type of drugs at the forensic laboratory at Oshodi, Lagos).

Furthermore, efforts were also made to combat the illicit business and by extension reduce the use of women as couriers. The United States of America was a leading external actor in the fight against drug trafficking in Nigeria. At the signing of bilateral agreement between Nigeria and the United States, the United States granted huge amounts as assistance to Nigeria to finance programs in the following areas: \$150,000 to the National Drug Law Enforcement

Agency for training at its Academy in Jos, \$400,000 for the police modernization program to train the trainers and officer cadets at the officer Academy in Kano, and \$560,000 for expansion of basic recruit training to the Police College in Maiduguri, Enugu and Lagos. Indeed, the total of United States' government assistance to Nigerian Law enforcement programs to combat hard drugs trafficking amounted to about \$10,000,000 since 1999 (Onwubiko, 2004:13).

As a result of Nigeria's positive response to the various international assistance received, the country obtained a drug-free certification for three consecutive years in 2001, 2002, and 2003. Nigeria was also admitted into the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs (UNCND) after four years of exclusion (Onwubiko, 2004:13). The country received more positive recognition from international bodies by 2009.

Training or provision of facilities and resources for training the staff members of agencies that are responsible for maintaining law and order in general, and addressing issues related to illicit drug trafficking is an indispensable means of assisting the highly undeveloped drug control mechanism. The Nigerian drug control mechanism is largely based on strict laws and decrees that lack effective implementation and supervision agencies that will ensure compliance in applicable quarters of society, especially in circles that are connected with the illicit drug business both nationally and internationally. These agencies do not only lack the needed intelligence to identify the different phases of such a clandestine activity as illicit drug trafficking, but also lack the operational know-how and strategies to undertake effective operations in line with their mandate. The establishment of the NDLEA was a welcomed development; however, it was largely through the training strategy of the bilateral agreement between Nigeria and the United States that the agency has seen remarkable achievements in its operation.

5.2.2 Aids and Gadgets

The fight against narcotics requires the use of specialized aids and gadgets, and so the provision of some of these aids and gadgets for Nigerian operatives was one of the objectives of the bilateral cooperation. The study has found that the United States DEA made available to Nigerian officials some sniffer-dogs and body scanners. According to an informant (Interview, 2013), this proved effective in identifying smugglers and couriers taking cocaine from Latin America to the United States via Nigeria. Most of the traffickers arrested at the airports were found to have ingested drugs such as cocaine, heroin and amphetamine-type stimulants (ATS) without minding the health hazard. Nigeria has also made progress and achieved some commendable successes in the area of drug control delivery system.

This aspect of the drug war strategy adopted by the two countries is complementary to that of training, as mentioned above. In fact, one of the aspects of training is that of knowing how to use modern aids and gadgets to identify or uncover drugs on transit, especially at border points like the Murtala Mohammed International Airport, Lagos and the Aminu Kano International Airport, Kano. These are special points of interest for the United States because they are critical in the drug route from Nigeria to the United States. What these aids and gadgets do is to help the agencies to check for drugs at hidden levels that are beyond abilities of the human senses to detect, including inside of the bellies of drug couriers. It must be noted, however, that the installation of these modern gadgets are only in the above points of interest for the United States, with a view to preventing the movement of drugs from Nigeria to the United States. Other viable entries and exits for illicit drug traffickers are left unchecked. This is enough to trigger a reconfiguration of illicit drug trafficking activities so that these special points of interest are avoided, thereby sustaining the illicit trade in Nigeria and elsewhere.

5.2.3 Legal Proceedings

Assets and financial investigation, as an aspect of the strategy of the bilateral agreement, enables the agency to trace all assets and finances of drug trafficking syndicates with a view to securing their forfeitures to the Federal Government of Nigeria. Under the Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty (MLAT), an informant (Interview, 2013) explains that 39 cases involving ₦141,000,000 were investigated. Others include \$312,000 as well as 21 properties and nine (9) vehicles in various locations. These include value of frozen bank accounts and properties traced to suspects investigated (Interview, 2013).

The Agency also acted on a request from Swiss authorities that came through the INTERPOL to investigate the assets of a Nigerian, Okemadu Sunday who was arrested in June 2010 by the Swiss authority in Switzerland for trafficking in cocaine. Raid operation on various targeted areas led to the arrest of Okemadu's father and two of his younger brothers in Enugu on 25 November, 2011 who assisted Okemadu in the laundering of the drug proceeds from Switzerland to Nigeria. Acting on another request for assistance from Swiss authorities which came through the United States DEA in respect of aggravated money laundering linked to a Nigerian national, Chukwuemeka Chibuzo Igwebuike was arrested in Switzerland in January 2011. The request was to assist the Swiss authorities in tracing and seizing illicit funds and assets purchased with illegal proceeds linked to him (Interview, 2013).

Another complement to the enforcement of treaties, convention and even domestic laws on illicit drug trafficking and abuse is extradition. By its nature, trafficking in drugs involves highly mobile offenders and various trans-borders activities and communication. This is another aspect of the cooperation between Nigeria and the United States. The sharing of critical

information is one of the best means of cementing an alliance. With a keen awareness of the dangers of disclosing data to corrupt officials, the United States has engaged its support to Nigeria drug control activities by focusing their effort with intelligence. Nigeria and the United States have collaborated in control delivery operation.

Control drug delivery method involves operation of several countries to identify, learn, and hold liable in criminal terms the drug traffickers who carry out criminal activity in several countries. This cooperation has been yielding significant operational results. Intelligence sharing, including intelligence shared by United States, was especially useful in confronting drug smuggling rings operating between the two countries. This included cooperation on busting one of the drug baron in Nigeria, Chike Lawson (alias Egwe), which was one of the joint law enforcement operations in a controlled delivery (Interview, 2013).

The bilateral cooperation between Nigeria and the United States has provided for a relatively joint legal framework for investigating drug-related crimes, and also for legal actions that can cripple the financial strength of drug syndicates operating within Nigeria. It provided a platform for the safe sharing of intelligence that could lead to arrest, extradition and prosecution of drug traffickers. The configuration of the legal settings of both countries is not yet a perfect mechanism because there are differences and bureaucratic issues that hinder effective investigation and prosecution as expected. In other words, the strategy lacks a uniform legal and penal framework between the two countries to ensure effectiveness on both sides.

5.2.4 Joint Task Force and Interdictions

Nigeria-United States counter-narcotic cooperation focuses on interdiction efforts at major international entry points, and on enhancing the professionalism of the NDLEA and other

law enforcement agencies. United States training programs, technical assistance and equipment donations have continued, with the NDLEA as the primary target. The Nigeria-United States agreement on illicit production, trafficking and abuse of narcotic drugs and other controlled substance, signed on 21 March, 1990, provides for a Joint Task Force on narcotics composed of officers selected from appropriate agencies of the two countries, the Nigerian NDLEA and the United States DEA. The DEA country office in Nigeria works with the Joint Task Force and other operations personnel to train, coordinate, plan and implement internal and regional interdiction operations.

Under the agreement, the United States provided financial, material and training assistance to Nigeria's newly created National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (NDLEA). On its part the Nigerian Government was expected to prevail on its airlines, the then, Nigeria Airways, to implement security measures on flights to the United States that conform to United States Customs Service guidelines. This was meant to protect Nigeria Airways from incidents of drug smuggling which otherwise will incur penalties on the company from the United States Customs Service (Interview, 2013).

Suffice it to note here that before the Nigeria-United States cooperation agreements, the situation at the Murtala Mohammed and Aminu Kano international airports in Lagos and Kano respectively had been reportedly chaotic, causing the two entry ports to be described as the scenes for overt and covert battles between various arms of the Security agencies over whose duty it was to check drug trafficking (Chukwurah, 1990). However, a program had been set in motion to unite the efforts of the various security forces for the purpose of greater efficiency since August 1987.

The efforts of the Joint Task Force has yielded some positive results, including the arrest of six drugs traffickers who reportedly imported more than two kilograms of heroin from Far East Asia; this has been attributed to an understanding struck recently between the NDLEA and other security agencies operating at the airport under the framework of the bilateral agreement (Interview, 2013).

The Joint Task Force on narcotics is a step further than just financial and training assistance, or the provision of modern aids for illicit drug detection; it also involves the synergy of forces on the field where the counter-narcotic operations actually take place. In other words, it is the two countries working together in training activities, and in coordinating, planning and implementing internal and regional interdiction operations. Working together is a very crucial aspect of the bilateral relationship between Nigeria and the United States, and it is in this context that sharing of intelligence, mounting of training programs, and even the pursuit of legal actions against drug-related crimes become realizable, as evident by the level of success in fight against narcotics put up by the two countries. The Joint Task Force is a very practical aspect of the strategy employed by the two countries.

5.2.5 The West African Joint Operations Initiative

Before 2001, drug law enforcement departments in other West African countries did not appreciate the need for collaboration with one another. Drug traffickers have taken advantage of this communication gap between them to establish cells across the region and involve in illicit drugs trafficking along the West African corridor with relative impunity. Indeed, where intelligence is to be shared with neighboring countries, one Agency would find it difficult to release the information because of the uncertainty of the preservation of confidentiality of the

information in the destination country. This situation led to the founding of the West African Joint Operations (WAJO).

The WAJO initiative commenced as a collaborative effort between Nigerian's National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (NDLEA) and the United States Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) Regular office in Abuja (Interview, 2013). The focus of WAJO was to contain the exploding illicit drug trafficking problem across the West African Sub-region. This in turn, would create the opportunity for harmonization of the core activities of policing agencies within the region and help to pay the collective drug law enforcement scope, capacity and effectiveness for improved social security and well being of the people of the region. However, this initiative still remains weak.

A major achievement here is that in 2011, NDLEA in collaboration with the United States participated actively in all regional and international meetings convened to review and fashion out drug control approaches. NDLEA was part of the United Nations sponsored meeting for the Head of National Law Enforcement Agency (HONLEA) in Addis Ababa in September 2011. The Agency attended the meeting of the group of experts of the Intergovernmental Action Group Against Money Laundry and Financing of Terrorism in West Africa (GIABA) in Dakar, Senegal. Other regional and international meetings included bilateral meetings which afforded the Agency the opportunity to cross-fertilize ideas and share intelligence that has helped to dismantle numerous transnational drug trafficking networks under the auspices of Joint Task Force (Interview, 2013).

5.2.6 Intelligence Management

As earlier noted, the United States donated body scanners for use at Nigeria's four international airports in Lagos, Abuja, Port Harcourt, and Kano respectively. It has been noted earlier that interdiction as a component of drug control strategy is an area in which Nigeria and the United States cooperated. However, a primary barrier to intensified cooperative interdiction programs has been lack of trust. The United States drug agents are suspicious, and their distrust of the Nigerian NDLEA officials is apparent. Therefore, the United States DEA in the country has developed a mechanism for circumventing corruption. The measure includes withholding of critical intelligence until the final stage of an operation, and that has yielded result. With an increasing significant transit route for drugs produced in the Golden Triangle, Nigeria and United States counternarcotics officials increased intelligence sharing and joint drug interdiction operation among themselves. The joint intelligence initiative has produced results in terms of illicit drugs seized and arrests of high level criminals (Interview, 2013). The bilateral agreement's strategies of intelligence sharing, mutual legal assistance, and extradition have enabled important convictions. For example the investigation and evidence collection leading to the prosecution of a major drug trafficking case in the country in 2008 were only possible through legal and investigation assistance provided by the United States (Interview, 2013). Similar progress has been made with regard to drug trafficking cases prosecuted in Nigeria, enabled by support provided by United States DEA.

According to an informant (Interview, 2013), the first recorded case of a Nigerian smuggler transporting heroin in bulk is that of Joe Brown Akubueze in 1993 who imported some 250 kilograms of heroin from Thailand by sea, packed in water coolers. He was arrested at the Apapa Seaport through intelligence from the United States Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), and sentenced to 115 years imprisonment, of which he served ten years before being

released. Not too long again, precisely in the year 2001, sixty kilograms of cocaine was intercepted at the Tin-can Island Seaport in Lagos. This was brought in by Olatunji, a notable drug baron who was arrested along with a Philipino a crew member who came with the illicit consignment (Interview, 2013).

Furthermore, intelligence sharing particularly in Nigeria was especially useful in confronting drug smuggling rings operating within the two countries. According to the informant (Interview, 2013), the agency exchanged considerable information and intelligence with foreign counterparts in the areas of arrest and seizures, telephone enquiries on persons who are connected to drug cases in Nigeria and abroad, new mode of concealments, among others.

Based on the bilateral agreement, especially the strategy of intelligence sharing and law enforcement, Nigeria and the United States governments have jointly cracked down on drug production and trafficking cases. In addition with the Tin-can Island cases, in May, 2001, an informant (Interview, 2013) with the Joint Task Force, while acting on intelligence from United States trailed a container load of chemicals to a factory in Ikeja industrial area where it was found that a large quantity of Acetic acid (a precursor chemical) had been imported without approval from authorities. The proprietor of the company, one Chief Eric Umeofia, and a staff of the company were arrested.

In 2010, with a tip up from the United States DEA, 450.4 kilograms of cocaine and 138.73 kilograms of heroin were seized in two separate 20 footer containers coming from Latin America and Iran respectively. In July 2011, according to an informant (Interview, 2013), the agency investigated a case of clandestine laboratory manufacturing Methamphetamine found at

Monkey Village in Iba area of Lagos State. Experts from the United States DEA were invited to access and dismantle the laboratory without causing any harm to people.

However, the study found that the two countries achieved these successes in collaboration with some friendly countries like Great Britain, South Africa and Thailand. According to an informant (Interview, 2013), acting on intelligence from the United States DEA in a control delivery operation arrested one Oluwaseun Dehinwa, a National Youth Service Corps (NYSC) member on 14 June, 2011 in connection to 250 grams of cocaine sent to him by his brother ‘Abdullahi Sikiru’ (real name Adewunmi Dehinwa) from Kenya which was intercepted at JF Kennedy Airport in the United States on the 22 February, 2011. This cooperation has yielded significant operational results since 2002.

All these show that the bilateral cooperation between Nigeria and the United States is quite practical, because the fight against a clandestine business like illicit drug trafficking requires practical measures; they must go beyond making mere laws and decrees. The bilateral relationship between Nigeria and the United States has added the enforcement strategy of the drug war to Nigeria’s largely law-based approach. The United States enforcement strategy has added a proactive stance that prevents and interdicts illicit drugs to Nigeria’s more or less reactive law-based approach that waits to make arrests before imposing heavy punishments.

5.3 CHALLENGES TO THE COOPERATION

Clearly, the bilateral counternarcotics cooperation has effected many significant improvements in intelligence sharing, mutual legal assistance and joint operations. However, Nigeria and United States will always face challenge of corruption which they must adjust accordingly. Interdiction is the key method in attempt to curb illicit drug trade and it is the point

of contact between anti-narcotics officials and drug traffickers, thereby providing the Agency with two options here: namely either to apply the full weight of the law on any suspected drug trafficker when apprehended, or exchange drug traffickers' freedom after negotiation and settlement. Both have their effects. If the latter option is preferred to the former, as indications have shown, the issue of illicit drug activities will continue to be a problem. An example cited above is that of Joe Brown Akubueze who imported some 250 kilograms of heroin from Thailand, was arrested in 1993, sentenced to 115 years in prison, but released after having served just 10 years (Interview, 2013). This is underscored by a lack of uniform legal framework in the two countries to ensure comprehensive effectiveness.

Eight respondents (Interview, 2013) agree that corruption in NDLEA is a very serious problem that hampers the fight against illicit drug activities which the United States has to contend with. This is in consonance with the report of the UNODC (2008) which notes that the main reason for the flourishing of the illicit trade is corruption among the leaders. It also notes, with regrets, that when the people who are charged with stopping illicit drug activities take bribe in order to let off drug kingpins, then their illegal trade will continue to boom at the detriment of the nation.

There were also operational inefficiencies besides corruption and compromise by officials, such as the declining interest of the Nigerian government in the Nigerian Fourth Republic in the drug war; suspicion and lack of trust among the Joint Task Force officials with respect to intelligence confidentiality; lack of confidence in the Nigerian legal system to bring the full weight of the law on offenders due lack of uniform legal and penal framework between the two countries; and the weakness of the West African Joint Operations (WAJO) initiative to effectively tackle the problem from the regional angle, and there are still pockets of drug-

trafficking strongholds operating effectively, though clandestinely, within the region (Interview, 2013).

5.4 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

5.4.1 The Nature of the Bilateral Agreement between Nigeria and the United States

This study has established the fact that the strategy adopted by the Nigeria-United States bilateral agreement is quite practical in its approach to addressing illicit drug trafficking menace in the two countries to some extent. Before the agreement, the drug war mechanism put in place by Nigeria is largely based on strict laws that impose heavy punishments against offenders, a strategy this study considers to be highly reactionary, in the sense that it has its greatest strength only in the punishment of offenders, unlike the more proactive strategy of the United States that focuses on enforcement as a means of preventing the drug trafficking menace. Given the weak nature of both democratic and security institutions in Nigeria, there were few chances that illicit drug traffickers and trafficking in Nigeria would be apprehended, and that explained the marked increase in drug-related activities that accompanied the Nigerian oil boom, to which successive Nigerian military regimes responded with strict laws that threaten offenders with severe sanctions.

This means that unless the drug criminals are apprehended – apprehending criminals has proven difficult due to inherent weaknesses in the security institutions of Nigeria – the force of the law may not be felt by drug trafficking circles in the country, and the dangerous multiplier effects of drug trafficking and consumption continued to be felt within Nigeria. Jenner (2011)

has noted that the attempts put in place to control the illicit drug industry by governments have seen only marginal success. However, with the advent of the bilateral agreement between Nigeria and the United States, a more proactive touch of enforcement was added to Nigeria's largely reactive, law-based strategy, thereby providing for practical operations to be taken to address the problem. The financial and technical assistance in training and equipping of training facilities, the provision of modern aids and gadgets, the establishment of the Joint Task Force, the legal framework for financial and criminal investigation, the management of intelligence, and the West African Joint Operation initiative are effective strategies for curtailing illicit drug trafficking.

5.4.2 Socioeconomic Impact of Drug Trafficking and Abuse in Nigeria

The study found that the socio-economic impact of drugs trafficking and abuse in society exert a very complex and negative multiplier effect, because the movement of drugs through Nigeria as a transit route inevitably creates a market, and thereby led to increased local consumption and the accompanying consequences, including addictions, violence, robbery, psychological malaise, breakdown of families, terrorism, money laundering and other drug-related crimes. As it bears on the government, there was an increase in the Nigerian government's disrepute within the global community, due to its inability to effectively handle the drug menace through its security agencies, particularly with the long list of notable drug barons and traffickers that have been arrested, who are Nigerians. Not only that, it has exposed the weakness of Nigeria's judicial system with respect to illicit drug trafficking crimes.

The Nigerian economy has also suffered some setbacks: there was a general loss of human capital to drug-induced mental problems and illnesses, thereby perpetuating the vicious

circle of dependency and poverty. Furthermore, the increased violence and social insecurity that drug trafficking activities engender have made the Nigerian society unattractive to direct foreign investment (FDI), hence denying the country of the possible positive benefits that would have resulted thereby.

5.4.3 Effectiveness of the Strategy of the Cooperation

The Nigeria-United States cooperation in general, and the Mutual Legal Assistance Treat (MLAT) in particular, was intended to foster joint efforts between the two countries in identifying or locating criminal offenders, sharing of relevant documents, examination of witnesses, search and seizure of assets, facilitation of the personal appearance of witnesses before an administrative panel, a court, a tribunal or similar proceedings, effecting temporary transfer of persons in custody to enable them appear as witnesses, securing the production of official or judicial records and tracing, seizing and forfeiting the proceeds of criminal activities. The mechanisms put in place to achieve above objectives include execution of training programs, provision of funds, provision of relevant aids and specialized gadgets, setting up of the Joint Task Force, and the undertaking of assets and financial investigations.

For the objective of training, there were successful training programs which improved the performance of Nigerian officials in drug interdiction at major air and sea ports in the country. This, together with the setting up of the Joint Task Force, has resulted in better and more effective coordination, planning and implementation of internal interdiction operations that led to several arrests and seizures, and regional interdiction operations in cooperation with other West African countries under the West African Joint Operation (WAJO) initiative. One direct positive impact of this is that Nigeria gained an improved international image through the securing of a

drug free certification for three consecutive years (2001-2003) and re-admission into the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs (UNCND), in addition to other international recognitions.

For the objective of funding, the United States government has funded several training projects and programs in Nigeria, including the National Drug Law Enforcement Agency for training at its Academy in Jos, the Police modernization program to train the trainers and officer cadets at the Officer Academy in Kano, and the expansion of basic recruit training to the Police College in Maiduguri, Enugu and Lagos. This has increased the resource persons that are involved in the aspect of combating drug trafficking in the country.

For the objective of providing aids and gadgets, sniffer-dogs and body scanners, and intelligence management have resulted in increased arrests of drug traffickers and more effective ways of identifying drugs, regardless of the complex methods employed by traffickers. Finally, for the objective of assets and financial investigation, drug-related judicial cases and proceedings have led to several forfeitures of properties, freezing of bank accounts, imprisonments and even tracing of other drug trafficking networks within and around the country.

The number of training programs, interdictions, arrests, seizures, legal proceedings, intelligence sharing, and joint operations credited to the bilateral agreement between Nigeria and the United States, compared to results from the mechanisms put in place by Nigerian government, gives credence to the effectiveness in its strategy in combating illicit drug activities.

5.4.4 Challenges Confronting the Cooperation between Nigeria and the United States

This study has found that there is a range of general problems that pose as challenges to the efforts of the two countries in the fight against drugs trafficking, namely the corruption and compromise among NDLEA officials; the declining interest of government administration in the drug fight particularly in the Nigerian Fourth Republic; suspicion and lack of trust of NDLEA officials by the United States DEA officials with respect to intelligence confidentiality and bringing the full weight of the law on offenders; the weakness of the West African Joint Operations (WAJO) initiative to tackle the problem from the regional angle; and the lack of uniform legal and penal framework between the two countries to ensure effectiveness on both sides.

More specific issues in this regard include the following. First, the bilateral agreement, although effective in its strategy that infused proactive measures to the drug war in Nigeria, has also placed the Nigerian drug control mechanism in a dependent status to the United States in handling a menace that affects Nigeria badly. This has the tendency to keep Nigeria perpetually dependent on the United States in order to record remarkable successes in the drug war, even within Nigeria's border. It therefore looks like the United States has assumed a position of an overlord imposing financial benefits, ideas and strategies on Nigeria to fight against the drug trafficking enterprise. The Nigerian national interest seems to have been relegated to background while the United States interest prevailed. The above mentioned weakness in the strategy adopted by the bilateral relationship has left Nigeria relatively helpless in helping herself in terms of curtailing the drug market building up within her borders, even though her performances are globally recognized in the effort at minimizing the flow of illicit drugs into the United States and other Western country. It is therefore safe to say that the bilateral agreement has brought more benefits to the United States than to Nigeria.

This, secondly, has created another problem: the strategies put in place by the bilateral agreement to practically curtail illicit drug activities concentrates efforts at points of interests to only the United States, in order to minimize the movement of the illicit substances into her borders through Nigeria. All other entry or exit points for illicit drugs in Nigeria are left unchecked, and so there remains a continuous inflow of illicit substances into Nigeria. This has gradually led to a buildup of a big market within Nigeria through entry points where Nigeria has proven to be virtually helpless to tackle, simply because they are not points of interest for the United States. The World Drugs Report 2014 (UNODC, 2014) attests to this fact concerning the increasing use of illicit drugs within Nigeria.

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 SUMMARY

This study examined the effectiveness of the bilateral cooperation between Nigeria and United State against illicit drug trafficking. To answer the question as well as to achieve the objectives, a qualitative methodology has been adopted: interviews were conducted with stakeholders in relevant agencies of the two countries responsible for the fight against illicit drug trafficking. The Nigeria's relationship with the United States in the drug war is a story of increased cooperation and political alignment, but it is not the story of a complete defeat against illicit drug trade. The United States has clearly demonstrated a preference for stopping drugs at transit routes that lead to her borders and also at the source countries. The United States has consistently advocated the policy of eradication, enforcement and interdiction in her relationship with Nigeria. Financially, as well, Nigeria has increased its level of commitment in the fight against drug trafficking. Nigeria has thus demonstrated its compliance to the United States counternarcotics strategies. Nigeria's interest has been served, either economically or politically, by publicly standing shoulder to shoulder with the United States. From military reign of Gen. Buhari through to the regime of Gen. Abacha, Nigeria's aggressiveness in pursuit of the drug war has been in direct proportion to the amount of pressure applied by the United States government.

Has the cooperation, with the strategies being employed, been effective? The mechanisms employed by the two countries since the implementation MLAT have yielded some levels of success. The findings (number of arrests, interceptions, etc.) reveal that whereas the

flow of illicit drugs into the United States and other European countries has been curtailed to some extent, more traffickers continue with their business, and drug abuse continues to increase in Nigeria. Also, the demand for illicit drugs is still strong in the world illicit drugs market generally, and particularly in the United States market. So the appreciable success in curtailing the flow of illicit drugs into the United States meant that a big market has been created in Nigeria, and other markets elsewhere are being patronized. The statistics (see Appendix II) on illicit drug seizures within various states of Nigeria as at 2010 confirms this assumption.

The dependent status of Nigeria in the bilateral relationship with the United States has proven to deny Nigeria as much benefits as accrue to the United States, since there is an appreciable record of reduced movement of drugs into the United States from Nigeria. However, Nigeria has remained weak in addressing aspects of the illicit drug activities that the United States has no interest in, and so the problem of drug consumption and trafficking still continues, though not mainly in the direction of the United States.

6.2 CONCLUSION

This study assessed the Nigeria-United States bilateral agreement against illicit drug trafficking to be quite practical and effective enough to reduce the movement of the banned substances into the United States, but not comprehensive enough to hinder the creation a large illicit drug market within Nigeria. This is because of an inherent weakness in the strategy adopted by the two countries, which focuses on specific points of interest for the United States, thus benefitting her by reducing inflow of drugs from/through Nigeria into her market. But the strategy does not provide checks for all other entry and exit points that the United States is not interested in, it has proven to be ineffective in curtailing the menace within Nigeria; therefore, a

big market is building up within Nigeria. This implies that the agreement benefits the United States more than Nigeria. This is one obvious conclusion that is drawn from the lessons learned about the Nigeria-United States bilateral cooperation against illicit drug trafficking.

Attacking the source of drugs from points of entry or exit en route the United States market, as desired by the United States government, has not entirely defeated the enemy in the war on drugs. So long as the United States does not deal with the demand signal from the United States market, and also implement a wholesome strategy to address the menace completely within Nigeria in order to ensure that the latter's society will cease to be a breeding ground for any illicit drug production and/or trafficking activities, it will render efforts at eradication, interdiction and enforcement ineffective.

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Bearing in mind the above conclusion, the following three policies recommendations are made:

1. First, the single most important policy change that could benefit both Nigeria and the United States would be for the United States to take legitimate actions against the problem of illicit drugs demand in the United States market; until the United States addresses problems with the huge demand for illicit drugs within her market, she cannot hope to successfully direct the efforts of others.
2. Secondly, the United States' allegation of corruption in Nigeria must not be allowed to threaten her cooperation with Nigeria. The United States can assist the Nigerian government's campaign against corruption by sharing relevant information and complaints about inefficiencies in Nigeria's drug control agencies, which can be

- addressed by providing the technical principles and intelligence to improve their performance. Nigeria must continually be considered a valuable ally within the West African sub-region that should not fail, or else the drug trade will remain an international disaster.
3. The United States should help Nigeria to implement comprehensive measures to tackle the drug menace generally. The needed technologies should be made available throughout Nigeria. For example, intelligence gathering and analysis which is at the heart of detection and interdiction requires the use of surveillance and secure data transmission. Another modern gadget that is needed is the latest container scanning equipment which allows detection of drugs and other illegal shipment with unopened containers; this is a powerful tool that can serve as a deterrent to would-be traffickers. Such equipment should be provided at strategic points throughout Nigeria, not only at points of interest for the United States.
 4. Finally, Nigeria should develop indigenous strategy for addressing drug-related problems within her borders, especially in areas replete with drug activities that are of little interest to the United States. This way, she can pull herself out of that dependent status vis-à-vis the United States, and be able to solve this problem and similar others that affect her society negatively. To this effect, the principles of participatory community policing – where local residents are trained and empowered participate in the process of watching to ensure that criminal activities do not take place within or around their communities – should be integrated into the indigenous strategy to be developed against illicit drug and other criminal activities.

REFERENCES

- “Fourteen Points.” Microsoft® Encarta® 2009 [DVD]. Redmond, WA: Microsoft Corporation, 2008.
- “Sir Norman Angell.” Microsoft® Encarta® 2009 [DVD]. Redmond, WA: Microsoft Corporation, 2008.
- Abdullah, S. (2009). “Drug Trafficking and Its Impact on West African.” A paper presented at the meeting of the Joint Committee on political Affairs, Peace and Security, NEPAD and Africa Peer Review Mechanism of the ECOWAS parliament, held in Katsina, Nigeria from 28th July to 1st August, 2009.
- Adelekan, M. (1999). *Rapid situation assessment of the drug situation at Ethin-Etiri, Ijebu North Local Government, Ogun State, Nigeria*. UNDCP
- Adesugba, S. (1990). Death Penalty: Myth or Reality. In A. Kalu and Y. Osinbajo (eds). *Narcotics Law and Policy in Nigeria*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Justice.
- Adewumi, W. (1996). “Economic and Social Impact of Money Laundering.” A paper presented at the seminar on the Money Laundering Decree 1995, held at Gateway Hotel, Ijebu-Ode 6th-14th May, 1996.
- Ahire, P.T (1990). Drug Abuse in Nigeria: Facts, Causes and Remedies. In A. Kalu and Y. Osinbajo (eds). *Narcotics Law and Policy in Nigeria*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Justice
- Akpeampong, E. (2005). Diaspora and drug trafficking in West Africa. A case study of Ghana. *African Affairs* 104, 416, 429-447.

- Alemika, E.E.O. (1990). Narcotic drug problems in Nigeria. In A. Kalu and Y. Osinbajo (eds) *Narcotics Law and Policy in Nigeria*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Justice.
- Amaechi, W. (1996). NDLEA has delivered. October-December Drug Salvation Force, Publication of the National Drug Law Enforcement Agency Lagos Vol. 2(4), 10-11.
- Arthur, K. K. (2012). *Drug invasion of West Africa*. Accra: Outskirt Press.
- Asuni, T. (1990). Treatment and rehabilitation of drug offenders and abusers. In A, Kalu and Y, Osinbajo (eds) *Narcotics Law and Policy in Nigeria*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Justice.
- Azinge, E. (1990). The death penalty: an effective deterrent to drug trafficking and abuse. In A. Kalu and Y. Osinbajo (eds) *Narcotics Law and Policy in Nigeria*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Justice.
- Baniyi, M. (2008). Paradigms, pathologies and practicalities - Policing organized crime in England and Wales.
- Brian, M., Del Bono, E., & Pudney, S. (2013). Drug-related crime. Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex.
- Buxton, J. (2008). The historical foundations of the narcotic drug control regime. Policy Research Working Paper, World Bank Group e-library. <http://elibrary.worldbank.org/doi/abs/10.1596/1813-9450-4553>.
- Buzan, B., & Weaver (1998). *Security: A new framework for analysis*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Reiner publisher.

- Caulkin, J.P., & Kleiman, M.A.R. (2004). How much crime is drug-related? History, limitations, and potential improvements of estimation methods. United States Department of Justice.
- Central Intelligence Agency (undated). World Factbook: Illicit drugs. Retrieved from www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ni.html.
- Chukkol, K. S. (1990). Towards A National Drug Control Strategy-A Blue Print. In A, Kalu and Y, Osinbajo (eds) *Narcotics Law and Policy in Nigeria*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Justice.
- Chukwurah, A. O. (1990). Bilateral and multi-lateral cooperation in the control of drug trafficking. In Awa U. K. and Osinbajo, Y. (eds). *Narcotics: Laws & Policy in Nigeria*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Justice.
- Cisse, L. (2006). *ECOWAS and the Daile event: The present realities of integration process within the sub-Region in Agenda 2006*. Accra: GJA & FES.
- Congressional Record (undated). Treaty with Nigeria on mutual legal assistance in criminal matters. www.congress.gov/treaty-document/102nd-congress/26/all-info.
- Drug Enforcement Administration (2017). *Drugs of abuse: A DEA resource guide*. United States Department of Justice. www.dea.gov.
- Emafo, P. (1990). Drug regulation and social policy. In A, Kalu and Y, Osinbajo (eds) *Narcotics Law and Policy in Nigeria*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Justice.
- Evans, G., & Newnham, J. (1998). *Penguin Dictionary of International relations*. London: Penguin Books.

- Federal Military Government of Nigeria (1984). Special Tribunal (Miscellaneous Offences) Decree No. 20 1984 Lagos.
- Federal Military Government of Nigeria, (1975). Indian Hemp (Amendment) Decree 1975 No. 34. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Information.
- Gillis, J. (1990). Narcotics abuse prevention programmes: What works? In A, Kalu and Y, Osinbajo (eds) *Narcotics Law and Policy in Nigeria*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Justice.
- Gyong, J. E., & Tanimu, B. (2010). A Sociological Assessment of the National Drug Law Enforcement Agency's strategies of arrest and detention. *Nigeria Journal of Social Sciences*.
- Hesse-Biber, S., & Levy, P. (2011). *The Practice of Qualitative Research* (2nd Ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Higdon, P. A. (1991). "Drug Trafficking and the Transnational Connection." Paper presented at the National Conference on Drug Abuse and Trafficking, sponsored by NIPSS, Jos, Nigeria Jan 20-24.
- Ibanga, A. K. J. (1997). "Epidemiologic Trends Drug Consumption in Nigeria." Paper presented at National Workshop on Demand Reduction Policy, Jointly organized by NIPSS, Jos and OSAHS DFC at NIPSS Auditorium, June 1-5.
- Iyamabo, J. A. (1990). *Perspective and strategies in the control of the traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances: The police view point in Nigeria*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Justice.

- Jelsma, M. (2011). The development of international drug control: Lessons learned and strategic challenges for the future. A working paper of Global Commission on Drug Policies, Geneva.
- Jelsma, M. (2014). Reforming the global drug-control system: The stakes for Washington. Transnational Institute. <http://www.undrugcontrol.info/en/weblog/item/5490-reforming-the-global-drug-control-system-the-stakes-for-washington>.
- Jenner, M. S. (2011). International drug trafficking: a global problem with a domestic solution. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 18(1), 901-927. retrieved from <http://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ijgls/vol18/iss2/10>.
- Juliet, K., & James, L. R. (2011). *Global Politics*. New York: Wadsworth Cengage.
- Keohane, R. O., & Martins, L. L. (1995). The promise of institutionalize theory. International security. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2539214>.
- Klein, A. (1999). Nigeria and the drug war. *Review of African Political Economy*.
- Levy, (1989). Domestic politics and war. In Robert I. R. & Theodore K. R. (Eds). *Origins and prevention of major wars*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mohammed, B. (1990). Perspectives and strategies in the control of the traffick in Narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances. In A, Kalu and Y, Osinbajo (eds) *Narcotics Law and Policy in Nigeria*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Justice.
- National Drug Intelligence Center (2011). *Impact of illicit drug use on American society*. United States Department of Justice.

- National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (1992). Drug Data Collection Division Ikoyi, Lagos.
- National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (1999). Enough of Hard Drug, Jan-March.
- National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (2010). Annual Report.
- National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (2015). *National drug control master plan (MDCMP)*. Lagos: NDLEA.
- New York City Bar (2012). The international drug control treaties: How important are they to US drug reform? Committee on Drugs and the Law. http://www2.nycbar.org/pdf/report/uploads/3_20072283-InternationalDrugControlTreaties.pdf.
- Obekpa, E. E. (2017). Mental health communication: an assessment of the approaches of Dawanau Psychiatric Hospital, Kano State. (Unpublished M.A. Dissertation, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria)
- Odejide, A. O. (1993). "Control of Drug Trafficking and Abuse. The NDLEA Perspective." A paper presented at NDLEA/ NIPSS National Conference.
- Odejide, A.O. (1980). Problems of drug abuse in Nigeria: A review of the existing literature and suggestions on preventive measures. *Nigerian Medical Journal*, 10(1&2), 5-11.
- Odekunle (1986). The legal order, crime and crime-control in Nigeria: Demystification of false appearance. *Nigerian Journal of Policy and Strategy*, 1(1), 78-100.
- Office of National Drug Control Policy (2012). *National drug control strategy*. Executive Office of the President of the United States.

- Okagbue, I. (1990). Death penalty as an effective deterrent to drug abuse and drug trafficking. In A, Kalu and Y, Osinbajo (eds) *Narcotics Law and Policy in Nigeria*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Justice.
- Okonkwo, C. O. (1990). Death Penalty: Myth or Reality. In A, Kalu and Y, Osinbajo (eds). *Narcotics Law and Policy in Nigeria*, Lagos: Federal Ministry of Justice.
- Okpalakunne, N. (2006). Human Trafficking: Women, Children, most vulnerable. *Idemudia Daily Champion*.
- Omoluabi, P. (1984). What are the consequences of drug addiction? *Daily Times* 25 January.
- Onwubiko, E. (2004). Is Nigeria Winning The Drug War? *The Guardian*.
- Osinbajo, Y. (1990). The legal and institutional framework for the eradication of drug trafficking in Nigeria. In A, Kalu and Y, Osinbajo (eds) *Narcotics Law and Policy in Nigeria*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Justice.
- Oyakilome, F. E. (1990). Key note address delivered at Conference on Narcotics, Law and policy in Nigeria. In A, Kalu and Y. Osinbajo (eds). *Narcotics law and policy in Nigeria*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Justice.
- Perl, R. F. (2006). International drug trade and US foreign policy. Congressional Research Service Report. <http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/crs/r133582.pdf>.
- Rosen, L. W. (2015). International drug control policy: Background and US responses. Congressional Research Service Report.

- Spies, M., & Fallow, D. (2000). Drug Policy Information Clearinghouse Factsheet. Executive Office of the President, Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP).
- Udama, R. A. (2013). The National Drug Law Enforcement Agency. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 6(4), 354-366.
- United Nations (1974). Summary of Reports on illicit Transactions and Seizures of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, Geneva.
- United Nations Drug Control Program (1994). Drugs and Development: Discussion Paper for the World Summit for Social Development, Vienna.
- United Nations Drug Control Program (1995). The Social Impact of Drug Abuse. A position Paper for Social Development, Copenhagen March 6-12.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2003). *Global illicit drug trends 2003*. New York: United Nations Publications.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2008). Drug trafficking as a security threat in West Africa.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2014). *World drug report 2014*. New York: United Nations Publications.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2017). Drug trafficking patterns to and from Eastern Africa. www.unodc.org/easternafrika/en/illicit-drug/drug-trafficking-patterns.html.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (undated). Drug policy provisions from the international drug control conventions. Prepared as part of the preparations for the high

level review on the implementation by Member States of the Political Declaration and Plan of Action on International Cooperation towards an Integrated and Balanced Strategy to Counter the World Drug Problem.
https://www.unodc.org/documents/hlr/Drug_policy_provisions_from_the_international_drug_control_Conventions.pdf.

United States (2000). Department of Health and Human Services.

United States Drug Enforcement Administration (2016). Federal Trafficking Penalties: Chart One. <http://www.dea.gov/druginfo/ftp3.shtml>.

Walt, S. (1998). International relations: One world, many theories. *Foreign Policy*, 32.
www.unodc.org/pdf/technicalseries1995-3-01. Accessed 04-05-2015.

Yeh, Brian T. (2015). Drug offenses: Maximum fines and terms of imprisonment for violation of the federal controlled substance acts and related laws. Congressional Research Service Report.

APPENDIX I

INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. What is your background controlling drug trafficking through the air port, border and seaport?
2. What are the major ways Nigeria and US cooperate against drug trafficking?
3. What general trends have you seen in drug trafficking and smuggling since the establishment of NDLEA?
4. What changes have you seen in smuggling techniques by drug traffickers?
5. What categories of the Nigerian society are involved in drug trafficking?
6. What are the socio-economic consequences of drug trafficking to society?
7. Why is it in Nigeria interest to cooperate with the US in drug war?
8. What are the challenges faced by the two countries against drug trafficking?
9. How closely do you work with other sister enforcement agencies?
10. Who else would you suggest I contact for this research?

APPENDIX II

SEIZURES IN KILOGRAMMES IN VARIOUS STATES

State	Cocaine	Heroin	Cannabis	Others	Total
Ondo	Nil	Nil	67,979.80	Nil	67,979.80
Edo	0.002	0.004	39,501.00	Nil	39,501.06
Delta	0.073	0.031	10,096.4	Nil	10,096.5

			4		48
Oyo	Nil	0.026	7,494.43	Nil	7,494.46
Lagos	1.66	0.125	5,433.81	Nil	5,435.59
					7
Osun	Nil	Nil	5,433.18	Nil	5,433.18
Kaduna	0.009	Nil	3,385.20	15.436	3,400.64
					2
Kano	0.171	0.021	3,254.05	Nil	3,254.24
					6
Ekiti	Nil	Nil	2,900.46	84.545	2,985.00
					1
Ogun	0.124	0.021	2,693.21	Nil	2,693.35
					5
Kogi	Nil	Nil	2,672.30	1.53	2,673.83
					2
FCT	0.113	0.089	2,650.12	0.0532	2,650.37
					42
Sokoto	Nil	Nil	194.57	2,090.27	2,010.94
					8
Anambra	0.487	0.022	1,981.24	Nil	2,284.83
					5
Rivers	0.098	0.059	2,010.44	Nil	1,981
					.401

Niger	Nil	Nil	1,804.07	Nil	1,804.06
					6
Benue	Nil	Nil	1,620.69	Nil	1,422809
Dogi	3.608	4.959	1,573	7.697	1,620.69
Kebbi	Nil	Nil	1,456.18	39916	1,589.58
					4
Borno	Nil	0006	1,38289	Nil	1,456.17
					6
Taraba	Nil	Nil	1,211.77	9.275	1,221.04
					8
Abia	0.354	1.19	1,006.72	1	1,009.26
					1
Enugu	0.127	Nil	1,004.65	Nil	1,004.77
					7
Nassaraw	Nil	Nil	1,000.91	Nil	1,000.91
a					
Kwara	Nil	Nil	617.786	0.15	617.936
Adamaw	0.108	Nil	551.32	54.682	606.11
a					
Jtf	450.79	144.98	Nil	Nil	595.771
Bauchi	Nil	Nil	548.815	2.97	551.785
Katsina	Nil	Nil	505.965	12.073	518.038

	Seme	2.834	4.182	436.996	50.8	494.812
river	Cross	0.049	Nil	463.46	Nil	463.509
	Yobe	Nil	0.002	374.282	33.898	408.182
	Mmia	237.479	44.907	42.05	74.995	399.431
	Zamfara	Nil	Nil	358.56	1.54	360.1
	Imo	0.072	0.04	217.175	0.211	217.498
	Bayelsa	0.082	-	195.834	0.027	195.943
	Akwa	0.01	0.009	160.61	Nil	160.629
ibom	Ebonyi	Nil	Nil	158.527	Nil	158.527
	Plateau	0.002	Nil	109.436	0.362	109.8
	Jigawa	Nil	Nil	49.786	49.786	99.572
	Gombe	Nil	Nil	88.75	7.885	96.635
	Idroko	Nil	Nil	31.792	-	31.792
	Ph port	0.003	Nil	5.1	11.5	16.603
	Makia	4.3	Nil	Nil	Nil	4.3
	Naia	2.85	Nil	0.001	Nil	2.851
	Phia	1.001	1.408	Nil	0.026	2.435
	Apapa	Nil	Nil	1.65	Nil	1.65

Tincan	0.018	Nil	1.5	Nil	1.518
Met	0.008	Nil	0.75	Nil	0.758
Total	706.433	202.08	174,661.	2,550.62	178,120.
			59	2	73

Source: National Drug Law Enforcement Agency 2010 Annual Report.

APPENDIX III

LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

1. Aminu Shehu – Director of Investigation, NDLEA
2. Oloruntoba E. – Director of Prosecution, NDLEA
3. Jones Ogodo – JTF Officer-In-Charge
4. Adoro Umar – Head, Internal Affairs, NDLEA
5. Hamza Umar – Commander, Murtala Mohammed International Airport, NDLEA
6. Ewelike Anthony – Officer-In-Charge, Seme Border, NDLEA
7. Yusuf Jatau – Officer-In-Charge, Tincan Island Port, NDLEA
8. Bala Yahaya – Officer-In-Charge, Apapa Wharf, NDLEA
9. Simon Denton – United States DEA agent, American Embassy