

**THE IMPLICATION OF UNITED STATES HEGEMONY ON NIGERIA
FOREIGN POLICY (1999 – 2015)**

BY

**NDASULE ,MAJI PETERX
PHD/SOC-SCIE/08853/2006-07 and P16SSPS9271**

**Department of Political Science
Faculty of Social Sciences
Ahmadu Bello University,
Zaria, Nigeria**

January, 2020

**THE IMPLICATION OF UNITED STATES HEGEMONY ON NIGERIA
FOREIGN POLICY (1999 – 2015)**

BY

**NDASULE, MAJI PETERX
PHD/SOC-SCIE/08853/2006-07 and P16SSPS9271**

**A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL,
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,
ZARIA, NIGERIA**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIRMENTS FOR THE
AWARD**

**OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN
POLITICAL SCIENCE**

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

JANUARY, 2020

DECLARATION

I declare that this dissertation entitled: “The Implication of United States Hegemony on Nigeria Foreign Policy (1999 – 2015)” was conducted by me in the Department of Political Science, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria under the supervision of Prof P.P.Izah, Prof R. A. Dunmoye and Prof E. A. Unobe. All information derived from the literature has been duly acknowledged in form of reference. No part of this dissertation was previously presented for the award of another degree or diploma at any university.

NDASULE, Maji Peterx

Date

CERTIFICATION

This dissertation entitled: “The Implication of United States Hegemony on Nigeria Foreign Policy (1999 – 2015)” by NDASULE, Maji Peterx meets the regulations governing the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Political Science, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

. **Professor P. P. Izah**
Chairman, Supervisory Committee

Date

. **Professor R. A. Dunmoye**
Member, Supervisory Committee

Date

. **Professor E. A. Unobe**
Member, Supervisory Committee

Date

. **Dr Aliyu Yahaya**
Head of Department

Date

. **Professor S. Z Abubakar**
Dean, Postgraduate School

Date

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to the NDASULE'S both Living and Dead

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am grateful to God Almighty for keeping me alive all through these years and making this dream of mine come true. My sincere appreciation goes to my supervisory committee chairman Prof P.P. Izah and members Prof R.A. Dunmoye and Prof E.A. Unobe for creating time out of their very busy schedule to read the earlier drafts and submissions of this study. I am grateful still to Dr Lawal Tafida and Dr Edgar Agubamah for their comments and observation during the internal defense of this study. I also wish to thank Prof Kayode Omojuwa and Dr David Moveh for their advice and encouragement throughout the course of this study, not forgetting other members of staff of the Department of Political Science, Ahmadu Belo University, Zaria for their comments and contributions in several ways in the course of this study.

I also wish to thank individuals who created time and granted me interview like Dr. Hakeem Baba-Ahmed formerly of the Department of Political Science, Usman Danfodio University Sokoto and one time Permanent Secretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ambassador Joe Keshi former Nigerian Consular General in Atlanta, USA and Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Alhaji Dalhatu Isa of the Foreign Affairs Ministry, Mallam Adamu Jibirilla of the Presidency, Miss Chinasa Ude of the Nigerian Institute of International affairs, Victoria Island, Lagos, Mr John Simon of the National Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies, Kuru, Dr Wayne Vaught, University of Missouri, Kansas City, Mary Johnson of the embassy of the United States, Abuja, Vansin Dokken, of the States Department, Washington DC.

My sincere appreciation also goes to my wife (Tessy) and Kids (Derriel, Darren and Darina) for their love, patience and support through the journey.

Finally, I wish to honour the memories of my parent (Dn Samuel Ndasule Edih and Dcns Comfort Ndasule Edih) and my siblings (Israel, Lydia, Moses, Sheriff, John, Nas, Maade, Kamza) and their families for their contributions in several ways. Not forgetting Grazyna Bonati, Emma Zwahu and the Gusim's for their interest and prayers through the course of this study.

ABSTRACT

This study is an assessment of the impact of the present power transition in the international system and the implication it portends for Nigeria foreign policy formulation and implementation. The study is conducted against the backdrop of Nigeria's hitherto non-aligned foreign policy position and the challenges inherent in such stance with the collapse of bipolarity. Power theory in international relations is adopted as the theoretical framework of this study; the arguments of the power theorists rests upon the fact that international politics is an intense struggle for power and that even though there may be international laws and institutions like the United Nations and its affiliate agencies, their impacts may not be felt as in the long run every state will have to look out for itself. Power is indispensable when prestige and positions of nations are at stake thus in assessing the behavior of nations in the international system Power theory gives a better perspective for assessment. The study identified three propositions, first is there is a change in Nigerian foreign policy since the end of the cold war. Secondly, the present power relations in the new world order have an effect on Nigeria foreign relations and thirdly, United States hegemony in the international system plays a role in Nigerian Foreign policy formulation and implementation. Interview was utilized as the main source of primary data and other documentary sources were used as secondary source of data to supplement the interviews. The interviews were transcribed and analyzed and the findings indicate that the position of the United States as a hegemon in the international system did affect Nigeria foreign policy implementation. Furthermore, the collapse of bipolarity did not affect Nigeria's non-aligned foreign policy position as there is an expanded bilateral relationship between Nigeria and China on growing trade and strategic cooperation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Cover Page.....	i
Title Page	ii
Declaration	iii
Certification	iv
Dedication	v
Acknowledgement	vi
Abstract	vii
Table of Contents	viii
Acronyms	xii

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 General Background to the Study	1
1.2 Statement of Research Problem	7
1.3 Research Question	8
1.4 Objectives of Study	8
1.5 Significance of Study	9
1.6 Research Proposition	9
1.7 Scope and Limitation	10

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction.....	13
2.2 Foreign Policy: A Conceptual Discourse	13
2.2.1 Determinants of Foreign Policy	15
2.2.1.1 External Determinants	18
2.2.1.2 Internal Determinants	20
2.3 The International System	25
2.4 The Evolution of the International System	27
2.4.1 The Secular Principles	28
2.4.2 The Fragmentation Principles	29
2.5 Transition and Development in the International System.....	30
2.5.1 The New World Order (1990 – Present)	32

2.6 Unipolarism or Multipolarism	34
2.7 Intra State Crises	36
2.8 Hegemony	36
2.9 Hegemony in International Relations	38
2.10 United States Hegemony	40
2.11 Nigeria Foreign Policy	50
2.11.1 Psychological and Idiosyncratic Factor	51
2.11.2 Internal Characteristics of Nation States	52
2.11.3 Economic and Military Factor	53
2.12 Theoretical Framework	62

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction.....	65
3.2 Research Design	65
3.3 Population of the Study	66
3.4 Sources of Data	66
3.5 Instrument of Data Collection	66
3.5.1 Interviews	67
3.6 Method of Data Presentation	68
3.6.1 Data Transcription and Analysis Technique (DTAT)	68

CHAPTER FOUR: UNITED STATES HEGEMONY AND NIGERIA FOREIGN POLICY: A BACKGROUND ASSESSMENT

4.1 Introduction	70
4.2 Elements of United States Hegemony in Global Power Relation	70
4.2.1 Values	73
4.2.2 Instruments	75
4.3 A Brief History of Nigeria Foreign Policy	78
4.3.1 A Dependent Hegemon	84

**CHAPTER FIVE: UNITED STATES HEGEMONY AND NIGERIA FOREIGN
POLICY**

5.1 Introduction 91

5.2 Motivation Underlying United States and Nigeria Relations 91

5.3 Tensions Regarding External Assistance for African Democratization 95

5.4 Issues Regarding United States Assistance for Nigerian Democratization 98

5.5 The United States Interest in Relations with Nigeria 101

5.6 Nigeria’s Interest in Relations with United States 103

5.6.1 Primary National Interest 103

5.7 Complications Relating to Internal Tension 104

5.8 United States Hegemony and Nigeria Foreign Policy 106

5.9 United States Hegemony and Nigeria Foreign Policy in the Context of Globalization ... 109

5.10 Finding Common Ground 111

**CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND
RECOMMENDATION**

6.1 Summary of Findings..... 114

6.2 Conclusion 117

6.3 Recommendation 120

References 123

Appendix I 138

Appendix II 139

Appendix III 140

Appendix IV..... 141

Appendix V 145

Appendix VI 149

Appendix VII	152
Appendix VIII	156
Appendix IX	160
Appendix X	163
Appendix XI	166
Appendix XII	168

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACP	- African Caribbean and Pacific
AGOA	- African Growth and Opportunity Act
AU	- African Union
DTAT	- Data Transcription and Analysis Technique
ECOMOG	- ECOWAS Monitoring Group
ECOWAS	- Economic Community Of West African States
EEC	- European Economic Community
EU	- European Union
FNLA	- National Front for the Liberation of Angola
GATT	- General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GNP	- Gross National Product
GWOT	- Global War On Terrorism
IPI	- Iran Pakistan India
IR	- International Relations
MNC	- Multi National Corporations
MOSOP	- Movement for the Survival of Ogoni People
MPLA	- Peoples Movement for the Liberation of Angola
NAFTA	- North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement
NATO	- North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NIPSS	- National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies
OAU	- Organization of African Unity
OPEC	- Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries
SADC	- Southern African Development Community
SALT	- Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty
SAP	- Structural Adjustment Programme
TAPI	- Turkmenistan-Afghanistan-Pakistan-India

UCE	- United Christian Europe
UDHR	- Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UMKC	- University of Missouri Kansas City
UNITA	- National Union for the Total Independence of Angola
UNO/UN	- United Nations Organization/ United Nations
USA/US	- United States of America/ United States
USAID	- United States Agency for International Development
USSR	- Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
WWII	- World War II/ Second World War
WPO	- World Public Opinion
WTO	- World Trade Organization
9-11	- September Eleven/ September 11

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

The world today is considered a global system because all political and social units of the world are somehow connected. There is no region or part that is completely isolated from or independent of the rest. States and actors in the global system all mutually interact though in an asymmetric manner. This asymmetric relationship stems from the fact that states are not equally endowed; that is while some are rich and powerful others are dependent on the rich for their subsistence (Holsti, 1993). Therefore decisions made in some places in the world have repercussions on others. This has been the character of the international system at all time.

The contemporary global system has always been subjected to changes over time; changes that were brought about by the quest for power, prestige, status and influence by individual states or groups of states. The power structure in contemporary global system has been dynamic. The period leading to the outbreak of the Second World War saw the division of the world into camps and alliances; power was spread among Great Britain, France, Germany, the United States, Soviet Union and so on. All held sway in their respective regions and on some world issues.

Subsequently, with the outbreak of the Second World War and consequent defeat of some European countries, two blocs emerged as the most dominant; the United States and Soviet Union. That heralded the Cold War, an ideological conflict between capitalism practiced by some states championed by the United States led West and Socialism practiced by others and led by the Soviet Union in what was known as the Eastern bloc. With this, power was concentrated

in these two blocs. The United States and the Soviet Union emerged from the travail of the World War II as the superpowers, and were viewing each other with doubts and suspicion.

The Cold War consequently became a salient feature of international relations. Western Europe was still in disarray not having recovered from the physical and psychological shocks of World War II. Germany and Japan were occupied countries, bereft of their former sovereign status. The newly emerging nations of south and south East Asia and the Middle East were just beginning to face their problems of national unity, survival, development, and international status. The era of African independence was still in the future. The organization of American States had not yet given more definite form to the movement for inter- American cooperation and the alliances for progress was not even a dream (Norman and Parking, 2001). Therefore suffice to note that other continents were preoccupied with their domestic problems while the two superpowers were consolidating their power bases.

However, with the subsequent collapse of the Socialist ideology in Eastern Europe, the liberal ideology of capitalism and liberal democracy upheld by the United States gained prominence. The situation ushered in the new world order a period during which the United States is pushing to use its position of dominance to impose the liberalist principle on the nations of the world. Put differently the end of the Cold War which was the curtain fall for bi-polarity did not automatically usher in a uni-polar global system. The emergence of nations with different areas of strength made it very difficult for a classified explanation of the global system. The collapse of the Soviet Union heralded the strength of the United States and it marked the beginning of a New World Order.

The latest global transfiguration that brought an end to the post 1945 international order is an enigma whose origin, character and consequences have raised grave concerns and uncertainties about the emerging structure of regional and global order. And because it is just emerging the development leaves us with no clear implication as to the future of the Post-Cold War international order as it concern power relations and neither has there been and agreed framework for its appreciation.

More than half a century today since World War II the description and the reality is different, the international system is in a hoax that description and definition is a reflection of individuals' perceived ideology. Much of international relations in the period since world War II has centered around the search for a new international system to replace the old order that was shattered in two world wars and to work out a new pattern of relationships in a world formerly dominated by two superpowers, divided between communist and non-communists and between haves and have not nations and altered beyond recognition by the emergence of many new states and by the technological changes consequent upon the nuclear and space age.

It is argued that in consideration of foreign policy there is a set of factors considered central to a nation's foreign policy whether the state is small or big, weak or strong, rich or poor. All states are interested in self-preservation, national security as well as stability of the system. Furthermore nation states are interested in economic wellbeing, economic stability, fight against inflation, unemployment, exploitation and unfavorable trade relations with others. Thirdly nations are interested in prestige and power which implies that every nation no matter how weak or poor wants to have some degree of prestige among the committee of nations. Each state wants to be powerful or maximize whatever power it has. Each state aspires to have some prestige, some dignity and wants to earn respect from other states (Adeniran, 2007).

Therefore the foreign policy thrust of the United States (US) today revolves around seeking and supporting the growth of democratic movements and institutions in all nations with the succinct but ultimate goal of ensuring United States dominance in world affairs (Foreign Policy Agenda, September, 2006). Rice (2006) describes the US' actions in the international realm as pursuing a Transformational Diplomacy which goal is to work with other states to build and sustain democratic, well governed states that will respond to the needs of their people and conduct themselves responsibly in the international system. The US therefore seeks to use its position of dominance in the globe to influence the foreign policy of nations in a manner that suits its national interest.

Furthermore there is a subtle insistence by the United States for countries of the world to embrace the liberal principle of democracy and capitalism. According to Madeleine Albright (2000), former United States Secretary of State, the United States favours or preaches democracy not because democratic elections always produce good leaders or because free people always use their vote wisely, or because free economies always generate prosperity or because democracy is efficient. She acknowledged that democracy can be maddening, messy and muddled, however, she maintained that (in the argument of Winston Churchill), as a system of government, democracy is miles ahead of whatever is in second place. She opined that; democracy is the hard rock upon which America's world leadership is built, that is why it still attracts the world's best in all fields to its shore.

The New World order has witnessed the arrogation of tremendous economic power to the United States (before the rise of China) and it has the finest armed forces in the world which it is proud of. But as powerful as the United States became, it still needs the help and cooperation of

other countries if it is to protect its security, prosperity and values. To this end, the United States began a campaign around the globe for nations and governments to act in support of democratic governance as a way of not just aiding their interests but indirectly America's.

From the 1990s, issues of democracy and human rights began to dominate the United States' interest in Africa, Asia, Middle East and other parts of the world where its interests lie. The reason is largely due to the capitalist revolution in Eastern Europe and the demise of the Cold War. The long, dramatic and largely successful democratic struggles that took place after the breakup of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) convinced the United States in particular that liberal democracy is feasible everywhere. It appears that the United States is more interested in economic policy reformation than in democracy and it promotes Structural Adjustments in ways that tend to reinforce political authoritarianism. Even if the United States is interested in spreading democracy, it promotes the kind of democracy whose relevance to other parts of the world like Africa and the Middle East is problematic and is prone to engender contradictions that tend to derail or trivialize the kind of democracy the world at large desires or yearns for.

As a furtherance of its goal of ensuring that democracy is accepted especially by the countries where its economic interests are at stake, the United States started insisting on the enthronement of democratic governance as a precondition for economic aid. For instance, United States humanitarian assistance through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to Nigeria started declining from 1992 due to the continued stay of the military in the corridor of power and the United States insisted on cutting down economic aid to Nigeria until democracy is enthroned (Abbah, 2000). However, consequently upon the enthronement of democracy in Nigeria, Benin, Mali, Tanzania etc, and subsequent opening up of

their economies, the United States President Bill Clinton in 1999 announced that 120 million dollars educational initiative to link schools in Africa to schools in the United States, 30 million to protect food security in Africa and so on (Corey, 1999).

This announcement reveals the importance the United States attached to the existence of its principles not just in Africa but also in countries around the globe. The United States further posits that the more democratic countries of the world are, the more will the United States be able to cement ties and allow countries of the world to assume their natural role on issues of mutual interest in the international scene (Twaddle, 2000). Apart from Africa, where the United States has interests to pursue and protect, its attention has also long been focused on the Middle East. Having tremendous deposits of oil which will serve United States energy needs and considering the fact that the entire region has been engulfed in crisis for many years, crisis which if left unresolved might constitute a hindrance to United States' interest in the region's oil, the United States after the Cold War proceeded to diagnose democracy as solution to the region's multifaceted and multidimensional problems and the US pushed the position in the guise of democracy and human rights in the region but only to countries it can subdue without jeopardizing its interest and position and relationship with the neighbors.

Since her political independence from the British in 1960, Nigeria foreign policy has been mostly consistent (with exception of the Murtala and Abacha regimes). However with the return to democratic governance in 1999, the United States has demonstrated more interest in developments in Nigeria. Nigeria was like the proverbial beautiful bride which nations (especially Western countries) are interested in courting in view of her enormous human and natural resources. The extent to which the United States hegemony has impacted on the country's foreign policy therefore informed this research.

1.2 STATEMENT OF RESEARCH PROBLEM

The United States has always been committed to the spread of its liberalist principles of democracy, respect for human rights, free market economy and so on but due to the existence at then of opposing force; a super power capable of challenging United States position in the previous world order, this objective could not be realized. However, the collapse of socialism in Eastern Europe in 1989/1990 brought hope to the United States as its chief antagonist the Soviet Union banned the communist party and adopted capitalism and democracy as the basis of the economic and political systems of the former Soviet states. In other parts of the world it also appeared that the United States' principles held sway. As history indicates, the United States conducts its activities without due consideration to the internal dynamics of the countries concerned. The collapse of the Soviet Union which heralded the end of bipolarity saw the emergence of the United States as a global police dictating the pulse of the international system and conduct of nations without much of a hindrance.

This study therefore assesses the impact of the United States hegemony in the international system with a focus on the conduct of Nigerian Foreign policy. To this end questions of focus include how has the sharp change in the structure of the international system from the bipolar global divide to United States hegemony affected Nigerian foreign policy?, How has the United States propagation of the value of democracy, human rights, free market and so on affected Nigerian foreign policy formulation?, How has the change in the structure of the International system and the emerging strength of globalization influenced Nigerian foreign policy? And to what extent is Nigerian foreign policy a continuation of internal politics and interest irrespective of the dictates of the international environment?

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The questions of interest would include:

- i. How have the changes in the structure of the international system from the bipolar global divide to the United States hegemony affected Nigerian foreign policy?
- ii. How has the United States propagation of the values of democracy, human rights and free market affected Nigerian foreign policy formulation?
- iii. How has the change in the structure of the International system and the emerging strength of globalization influenced Nigerian foreign policy?
- iv. To what extent is Nigerian foreign policy a continuation of internal politics and interest irrespective of the dictates of the international environment?

1.4 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this study are:

- i. To examine how the change in the structure of the international system from the bipolar global divide to United States hegemony affected Nigerian foreign policy.
- ii. To examine how the United States propagation of the value of democracy, human rights and free market affected Nigerian foreign policy formulation.
- iii. To discuss how the change in the structure of the International system and the emerging strength of globalization influences Nigerian foreign policy
- iv. To investigate the extent to which Nigerian foreign policy is a continuation of internal politics and interest irrespective of the dictates of the international environment.

1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This research assesses United States hegemony in the global system and the implications it has for Nigerian foreign policy. Since the end of bi-polarity there has been a lot of discourse and arguments about the power tilt in the global system; is it unipolarity or multipolarity? Most of the discourse does not give credence to a hegemon in the international system; the conversation and analysis are always on the premise that the end of bipolarity did not usher in a Unipolar world rather a Multipolar global system. This research attempts an assessment of the global power position with the aim of evaluating its implication on Nigeria's foreign within the global context with United States as a hegemon.

1.6 RESEARCH PROPOSITIONS

This study is designed to verify the following propositions:

1. There is a change in Nigerian foreign policy since the end of the cold war.
2. Globalization and the present power relations in the new world order have an effect on Nigeria foreign relations.
3. United States hegemony in the international system plays a role in Nigerian Foreign policy formulation and implementation.

1.7 SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

The international system is in a state of constant transition, positions that are relevant today as it concerns nations can become very irrelevant the next day with a slight change in the global configuration. At independence Nigeria was birthed into an international system defined by ideologies and influenced by two super powers; the United States and the Soviet Union and it has remained very consistent across regimes both under the different military and civil rules but that is not the reality today. The collapse of the Soviet Union created a vacuum and opened up the debate on the balance of power. Most analyst will argued that the collapse of the Soviet Union did not usher us into a Unipolar world as the United States is not seen as the all-powerful nation but the hegemonic position of the United States in the International system cannot be questioned. This research assesses Nigerian Foreign policy at the collapse of bipolarity and under civilian regimes from 1999-2015.

A study of foreign policy is simply a study of the world community in transition". It might not be as often as some will envisage or as drastic as some will imagine but overtime there is a shift and a change. This lends weight to Walter Lippman's assertion that the word revolution carries with it today a far deeper meaning than it did when many of us were young. Foreign policy is said to be largely a projection of domestic policies or politics (Anglin, 1981) but not independent of the existing reality of the international arena. Like Izah (1991) said foreign policy in Africa or indeed anywhere is not formulated in a vacuum. There are various domestic factors which no doubt might differ from one country to another and external factors which all combine to shape a nations foreign policy.

Foreign policy is decision making resting largely on the pillar of national interest. Although, foreign policy is assumed to be a work and decision of a few referred to as the foreign policy elite, political elites or decision making elites, it cannot be completely unaffected by domestic policies and pressure. Foreign policy like decision making is a process ending in an act of will usually on the part of a person or groups of persons. One of the problems connected with decision making is the point in the process one can say a decision has been made. For analytical purposes, it is better to assume that a decision has been made when the highest echelon of a decision making pyramid has ratified the proposals of the subordinate segments. This is however subject to the proviso that minor decisions may be made at lower levels on the basis of the known preferences of the higher level of the decision-making pyramid. In the process it is assumed that there usually are alternative courses of action possible of which one could be selected.

The process of decision making is to be seen not only in terms of selecting one from many alternative courses of action and arriving as a decision called “policy” but it also embraces designing measures that would guarantee the successful implementation of the course of action selected. Such measures pertain more to the style of managing the policy than the mere formulation. At times, the style of management may be so pervasive that it overshadows its substance. Therefore the totality of a policy is more meaningful if this distinction is emphasized by the students of decision making theory. Political decision making is a modality of decision making in general whether economic or business transactions. Foreign policy making, in turn, is a modality of political decision making (Ajibola, 1978).

The correctness of the shifting balance thesis is the most critically relevant fact in world affairs today. The favorable correlation of world forces is a reality and is the basis for all foreign

policy decision making. It provides general conceptual framework for determining broad foreign policy lines. Foreign policy of every nation is influenced and affected by world forces irrespective of domestic desires and national interest. Determining broad foreign policy lines in time with the reality of international area is the most essential element in the entire foreign policy process thus this study looks at the impact of United States hegemony on Nigerian Foreign Policy;

Nigeria gained her independence on 1st October, 1960 and was born into a world divided into ideological blocs of capitalism and Socialism. Nigeria took the position of Non-alignment maintaining that she will not be aligned with any ideological bloc as a matter of routine. The end of the Cold War marked the end or fall for bi-polarity. Hitherto Nigeria's foreign policy was more consistent than changing. Thus assessing the impact if any of the transiting world order under United States hegemony on Nigerian foreign policy is the scope of this study.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter shall present various views on foreign policy, determinants of nations' foreign policies and Nigeria foreign policy. It further examines the history of the global system up to the current dispensation when the United States looms as a hegemon in global socio-economic and political affairs. It also presents views on the hegemony of the United States. The essence is to put the analysis contained in this study in proper perspective. Lastly the theoretical framework of the study is presented.

2.2 FOREIGN POLICY: A CONCEPTUAL DISCOURSE

Foreign policy is one of the wheels with which the process of international politics operates. Foreign policy is not separate from the national policy, rather it is a part of it. It consists of national interests that are to be furthered in relation to other states. Almost all the states determine the course of their foreign policies within the limits of their strengths and the realities of the external environment. The nonpolitical relations also fall in the scope of foreign policy.

A country's foreign policy, also called the foreign relations policy, consists of self-interest strategies chosen by the state to safeguard its national interests and to achieve its goals within international relations milieu. The approaches are strategically employed to interact with other countries. In recent times, due to the deepening level of globalization and transnational

activities, the states will also have to interact with non-state actors. The aforementioned interaction is evaluated and monitored in attempts to maximize benefits of multilateral international cooperation. Since the national interests are paramount, foreign policies are designed by the government through high-level decision making processes.

Furthermore foreign policy, also called the international relations policy, is a set of goals outlining how the country will interact with other countries economically, politically, socially and militarily, and to a lesser extent, how the country will interact with non-state actors. Foreign policy is primarily concerned with the boundaries between the external environment outside of the nation state and the internal or domestic environment, with its variety of sub-national sources of influence. Foreign policies are designed to help protect a country's national interests, national security, ideological goals, and economic prosperity. This can occur as a result of peaceful cooperation with other nations, or through exploitation.

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

of international morality. The whole essence of this prelude is that the term foreign policy cannot be studied in isolation from the factors that determine it.

Foreign policy is the key element in the process by which a state translates its broadly conceived goals and interests into concrete course of action to attain these objectives and preserve interests. Therefore foreign policy is the bundle of principles and practices that regulate the relationship of a state vis-à-vis other states. Through foreign policy a state seeks to achieve a variety of objectives. The objectives sought to be attained by a state are of different types and categories, yet there are certain objectives which are uniformly pursued by all states i.e. Political independence and territorial integrity, economic wellbeing and, prestige and status of a nation. They have been classified into short range, middle range and long-range objectives.

2.2.1 Determinants of Foreign Policy

Those factors that influence and determine the foreign policy of a country are its determinants. Some of these factors are static or of unchanging nature whereas others are in a state of flux and their dynamics are continually adjusted to the changing circumstances. The determinants of foreign policy are broadly categorized into External and Internal determinants.

2.2.1.1 External Determinants

Power Structure

The modern state system has been in existence since 1648 Treaty of Westphalia. The modern state system includes major, middle and small powers. All states conduct their own foreign policies. One primary objective of each country's foreign policy is to maintain its own

political independence and security. In the traditional multi-polar system, it was easier for states to switch sides and gain maximum gains from all sides. Thus Italy used this skill deftly and switched sides during the height of World War I to gain its share in the post war colonial arrangement (Morgenthau, 1967).

During the bipolar world system, however, the ideological fault lines were more clearly marked, and it was not easy for states to switch sides frequently. Thus during the cold war, the countries of the Eastern Europe under the security umbrella of the Warsaw Pact were under the direct influence of the former Soviet Union. And the countries of the Western Europe together with the US and Canada entered into an alliance known as North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) (Hill, 2003). The states were faithfully wedded to their respective alliances, and any signs of freedom were strictly checked by the two superpowers. The demise of the Soviet Union and the advent of a global system not clearly defined but the power of the US not in doubt in the world has its own system dynamics. Bush's 'either with us or against us' sort of declaration made many states from the margins of the system to come forward and play effective roles in the so-called Global War on Terrorism (GWOT). Pakistan was to take a smart strategic U-turn in order to be able to take advantage from the changed international structure. Every type of power structure at international level has its own particular dynamics and that has its impact on the foreign policies of the states (Morgenthau, 1967).

International Organizations

The role and importance of international institutions as instruments of states' foreign policies, and the political, military, functional, economic and humanitarian roles played principally by the United Nations in international relations cannot be overestimated. These

international organizations to varying degrees serve as modifiers of state behaviour and as independent actors in their own right. They have profound impact on the determination of the foreign policy of a state (Smith, Hadley and Dunne, 2008). No state can decide and conduct its policy arbitrarily to the detriment of other states. United Nations and other multilateral forums come to the rescue of the aggressed state. Usually sanctions are imposed which in some cases become very effective provided the international community imposes them sincerely.

Reaction of other states

Likewise the system of states is fast transforming into a society of states, where each and every individual state has regard for the rights of other states. Being sensible to the sensibilities of other states, no state can adopt a unilateral policy. It has to take into account, and accommodate, if possible, the interests of the other stake-holders as well. India and the US have to take stock of Pakistani interests in Afghanistan. They are also cognizant of the fact that no plan for Afghanistan can work until and unless Pakistan is taken aboard in this regard. In 1939, Hitler embarked upon the course of aggression vis-à-vis Poland and didn't assess and anticipate British reaction to such a misadventure (Smith, Hadley and Dunne, 2008). This led to disastrous consequents for Germany and the Global system generally speaking. Pakistan though not fully comfortable with being a willing partner in the Global War on Terror, has to be committed to the same owing to international concerns and being apprehensive of international backlash.

World Public Opinion

Similarly the state, while formulating its foreign policy has to take into account the world public opinion. World public opinion is more effective when it is supported by the domestic public opinion of the given state. Israel usually flouts agreements of international law with a least

regard for them, but in the process it has lost international goodwill. Power is not about military hardware or nukes and ammunitions; an equally important component is a state's prestige known as 'soft power' (Morgenthau, 1967). It is well known that the US administration was made to effect changes in its Vietnam policy largely due to hostile world public opinion.

Alliances

Alliances concluded by various states also influence their foreign policy. The states /parties to the alliances have to respond to the requests and demands of their allies and refrain from formulating policies or taking actions which are offensive to the alliance partners (Modelski, 1962). During the decade of fifties when Pakistan was known as the most allied ally of the United States, Pakistan had to exercise its vote against the People's Republic of China blocking its entry into the world forum. China on its part did understand Pakistan's compulsions and didnot entertain any ill-will against Pakistan. During the height of cold war, neither the member of the 'Warsaw Pact' nor those of 'NATO' could pursue any independent foreign policy.

2.2.1.2 Internal Determinants

Historical Influence

The foreign policy of a country is to a large extent the legacy of its history. Each country possesses an individuality of its own, which is the outcome of its historical and geographical configuration. The cultural and historical traditions go a long way in molding the foreign policy of a state (Modelski, 1962). To a large extent the approach of a nation to the foreign problems is determined by its traditional values and beliefs which have emerged on a period of history.

Though the leadership can make modifications in these values and beliefs, yet it cannot go very far.

Size and Geography

The geopolitical location of a state is one of the external determinants on its foreign policy. It matters where on the globe a country is located. It matters whether the country has natural frontiers: that is whether it is protected by oceans, high mountains, or deserts. It matters who one's neighbors are and whether a given country is territorially large, populous, affluent, and well-governed. Geographical factors exercise a permanent and paramount influence on the foreign policy of a country (Northedge, 1968).

It may, however, be noted that when we speak of the impact of geography on the foreign policy of a country, we keep in mind the extent of its territory, its general configuration, the texture of the soil, climatic conditions, rainfall, waterways and location of the country vis-à-vis the other powers. Geographical location has exercised a great impact on the foreign policy of Britain. Similarly USA could follow a policy of complete isolation mainly because of her geographical location. The foreign policy of France has been determined by the presence of Germany on her border, while that of Nepal by its proximity to India and People's Republic of China. It has been contended by some of the theorists that the development of modern means of communication and the invention of sophisticated weaponry have rendered the importance of geographical factor obsolete (Hill, 2003). This view, however, cannot be fully subscribed to. Even today the vast size of states like China and Russia renders the talk of their conquest problematic.

Natural Resources

The natural resources of a country also profoundly influence the determination of a foreign policy. The natural resources apart from minerals, gas and water resources also include the food grain. During the present century, food has tended to be an important factor in the determination of a country's foreign policy. It is said that during the Second World War the foreign and military policy of Germany was to a large extent, determined by her limited food reserves. She resorted to massive action because she was to win a quick victory in view of the danger of starvation faced by the German army. In the post World War II, Oil diplomacy in the Middle East has greatly determined foreign policy not only of the states of the region, but also of the entire world. The attitude of the super powers during the cold war, towards the region of the Middle East in particular, was to a large extent, dictated by their desire to access the oil (Hill, 2003).

We can say that the natural resources and raw material exercise considerable influence upon the foreign policy of a country. In the absence of a sound industrial complex, they can make a state vulnerable to foreign intervention, but with their domestic consumption and indigenous input, they can be a real boon for any country. In such a case, the state would pursue its foreign policy more confidently and assertively.

Economic Development

The level of economic development attained by a country has deep impact on the foreign policy of the state. One of the middle range objectives of the foreign policy of a state is to expand, diversify and strengthen its economic relations with the external world. An increased economic activity warrants that the surplus goods, raw material and services of the country have

markets outside the country and that the state may ensure the procurement of the needed products, raw material and services at economical rates (Frankel, 1968). Pakistan and India are energy deficient countries. This deficiency on the part of these countries in particular and the rest of the world in general has been one of the important determinants of their foreign policies.

Pakistan and India are bargaining with Iran for the Iran-Pakistan-India (IPI) gas pipeline and with Turkmenistan for the Turkmenistan-Afghanistan-Pakistan-India (TAPI) gas pipeline project. Besides a proposal for exporting gas from Qatar is also under consideration. India has received a big boost in this regard with the coming into force of the US-India deal on the peaceful nuclear technology. This has virtually legitimized Indian nuclear programme much to the chagrin of Pakistan which has since been strenuously lobbying for getting the same status. However, owing to Pakistani track record on the AQ Khan saga, the response from the US and the West has been lukewarm in this regard. However, People's Republic of China has been amenable to Pakistani requests on this count. Similarly Pakistan is always concerned about securing markets for its raw material, cotton, rice, leather products, sportswear and cotton products. The level of economic development has a direct relationship with the life standard of the citizens of the given country.

Industrial Development

The industrial development of a state also plays an important role in determining its foreign policy. This is evident from the fact that industrially developed countries like USA, Russia, Japan, Germany, France and England are able to exercise great influence in the international affairs. Realizing the importance of this factor in adding to the strength and prestige of a country even the underdeveloped and agricultural countries are keen to get industrialized as

quickly as possible. A country possessing rich natural resources has to depend on the advanced countries for capital and technical assistance, so that these resources are exploited to the maximum level. A naturally gifted state devoid of effective infrastructure is almost as poor and backward as any resourceless state can be. So development of a sound infrastructure is a sine qua non in order to enable the naturally gifted state to fully capitalize on its natural resources, and utilize them in their industrial complex (Gibson, 1994).

Industrial development, though dependent upon the natural resources and raw materials at home, is sometimes not limited to the scarcity or absence of them. Just to refer to one of the industrial giants i.e. Japan, it doesn't have the indigenous resources to satiate the ever-increasing needs and requirements of its industry; it has to import most of them. However this limitation on its part has not incapacitated it; rather it has prompted its policy maker to come up with new techniques and planning strategies and become an industrial leader (Gibson, 1994).

Military Power

Besides all the preceding factors, the military strength of a country also determines the effectiveness of its foreign policy. A state possessing sufficient military strength has greater initiative and bargaining power in the international arena. The case of Israel can be quoted as an example. She continues her precarious existence despite the combined opposition of the Allied nations; she has power to maintain an assertive foreign policy. Unlike geographical and natural resources, the military capacity is not a static factor. It keeps on changing. The states try to impress about their military superiority in a number of ways, such as nuclear tests, mobilization of army, periodical display of military forces, devices and techniques (Appadorai, 1981).

Military strength of a country is closely linked to its resourcefulness and the development of its industry. A developed civil industry can be made to manufacture military hardware during the time of wars and crises.

Population

The human force constitutes another determinant of foreign policy. The strength of a nation depends upon the quality and quantity of its human factor. The enormous population of China enabled it to pursue a forceful foreign policy. On the other hand the falling birth rate in France compelled her to toe a weak foreign policy during the inter-war period. Qualitatively, the population should be healthy, educated and prosperous. It should also possess technical know-how. It is however, to be noted that the population of a country has to be evaluated in relation to its other attributes. If the resources of a country are not sufficient to meet the requirements of the large population, the latter may pose a serious challenge to the very existence of the state. But if there are sufficient resources to meet the requirements of a large population, then it certainly adds to the power of the state, as this may enable it to mold its foreign policy accordingly (Appadorai, 1981). Instances from USA and the defunct Soviet Union's history can be quoted to substantiate this point. On the other side if the state possesses sufficient natural resources but less population, then it may not be able to assert it. The example of Canada can be quoted in this respect. Canada has been pursuing a liberal Immigration Policy to overcome this deficiency.

Good Governance and Leadership

The government and the leadership play an important role in determining the role of their country, which it is going to play in the international field. In fact, it is government and leadership, which convert the potential power of a state into actual power. The quality of

government depends upon a number of factors, such as support extended to it by the population, the organization of the government, the quality of persons serving the government, willingness of the government to take the aspirations of the general people into account etc. The quality of a government to a large extent depends upon the type of leadership available to it. Leaders like Hitler, Mussolini, Ball Thackeray, and Nrindra Modi could easily disturb the forward and steady movement of the nation; they jeopardize international peace and security as well. Whereas leaders like George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Winston Churchill, Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah, Jawaharlal Nehru, Kenneth Kaunda, Marshal Tito would serve the nation most efficiently and steer the nation's ship safely from the troubled waters to the safe shores (Hill, 2003).

Quality of Diplomacy

The quality of diplomacy of a country exercises profound influence upon the foreign policy of that country. History of inter-state relations is full of examples where the countries succeeded in attaining their objectives through wise diplomacy, even though they lack other elements of power for example Prussian success against France in 1870 under Prince Ottowan Bismarck. Likewise certain very powerful states failed to attain their goals owing to ineffective and weak diplomacy (Hendel, 1973). A good diplomat must have a clear concept and perception of the national goals and the will of their attainment. Plus he should be skillful enough to use the tools of statecraft for the realization of the national objectives. Bhutto while launching campaign against President Ayub claimed that the President actually lost what Pakistan had won in the battlefield while referring to the Tashkent Agreement between Pakistan and India brokered by the former Soviet Union. Here Indian diplomacy was equal to the task. But a few years later in

the wake of the dismemberment of Pakistan, it was none other than Bhutto himself who excelled in diplomatic skills at Simla.

Political Organization

Political organizations and institutions of the country also determine the foreign policy of country. Usually, democracies are not very prone to war, at least within themselves. There is some evidence to suggest that democracies do not usually go to war against each other. As the world in general becomes more democratic, it is hoped that war will be replaced with peaceful methods of conflict resolution. However, dictatorships faced with the problem of legitimacy at home and abroad usually create issues out of non-issues in order to justify the continuation of their illegal rule. Hitler and Mussolini embarked upon the path of international conquests because they were to deliver to the masses very quickly otherwise their citizens would have been disillusioned. Saddam Hussain failing to arrest problems inside the country had to lay claims on Kuwait in 1990 (Gibson, 1994).

Role of Media and Think-tanks

In modern times the role of media in determining the Foreign Policy of a state cannot be underestimated. Media has to faithfully highlight the issues of public concern; doing so it serves both as a corrective machine as well as a guide for the policy makers. Usually former diplomats, strategists, and military generals take part in productive discussion on media. The Government and Foreign Office have to take the input from media and think-tanks very seriously. In fact, in the US, the think-tanks and media play a very significant role in the orientation of its foreign policy.

2.3 THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM

International system is made up of component parts or units called nation-states. These states whether advanced or underdeveloped reflect the existence of different groups such as religious, racial, social, economic, and political groups. Jervis defined a system as "a set of units or elements that is interconnected so that changes in some elements or their relations produce changes in other parts of the system" (Jervis, 1997). For a fuller understanding of the international system, which is infinitely more complex, he argued, it requires an analysis of the state and other actors in interacting (and often colliding) with each other.

The analysis of the international system requires information about many variables; because such variables exert a great deal of influence. Any system is defined by the features of its interacting units; the number and relative size of the state actors is the primary indicator of the structure of the system (Russett, Starr and Kinsella, 2009). It is very important to note that understanding the international system is more than just the structure. The nature of the interactions between states and non-state actors is also important. These are the official government to government relations as well as transactions across societies. The transactions could be in form of trade, investment, movements of person (by tourism, migration and student exchanges) and communication (mass media).

Morgenthau (1985) identified three (3) main perspectives on international political system. The first perspective is called politics of "power and security". This was dominant in the 1930s and 1940s when international relations was studied by concentrating on power and international security. This was the period of the World War II and the rise of two most

powerful men in the world - Adolph Hitler and Benito Mussolini. It was also a period that Japan came into global reckoning. Peaceful settlement of disputes suffered a setback as countries resolved conflicts with force. The period was characterized by how to get power, contain power and how to maintain security.

The second perspective is the one that deals with the interdependence and international cooperation. Starkey, Mark and Jonathan (1999) argued that diplomatic persuasion occurs in world politics more often. International interactions achieve more influence, particularly in a world of growing inter-dependence among states. This is in direct contravention of the realist assumptions of the likes of Morgenthau. The process of bargaining as states interdepend could be tacit, whereby interactions are demonstrated through behaviour rather than direct communication or through explicit negotiations. Sometimes, states negotiate simply to keep contact with the other side and as both are talking; neither will resort to armed conflict. A classical example being the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) between Soviet Union and United States of America. This negotiation and bargaining perspective has been further analyzed by Hass (1986) citing the United Nations involvement in high intensity crisis; where Russia and the USA (former cold war adversaries) cooperated in solving through negotiation and interdependence on oil nations, example the first Gulf war 1990- 1991.

The third perspective sees international system as been dominated and dependent. The emphasis here is that the economic motivation of states becomes a foreign policy priority. Rapoport (1986) concluded after a study of the Napoleonic wars that "war is a mere continuation of foreign policy by other means ... not merely a political act, but also a

real political instrument, a continuation of political commerce, a carrying out of the same by other means".

2.4 THE EVOLUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM

Northedge in his book *The International Political System*(1976) says that the evolution or origin of the contemporary international system can be found in ancient empires like Renaissance Italy and the Greek city states. In this ancient system we can find the characteristics of the modern international systems, for example the question of having permanent diplomatic missions. He said the above example started in these old systems.

The modern international system emerged when two of its characteristics took place. One of these characteristics is the secular principle of *raison d'état*. This was established in the thinking minds of men around the 16th and 17th centuries. Second one is the fragmentation principle of the waning of idea of United Christian Europe. He said this started in the 19th century. Northedge (1976) further explains if we want to give a specific date for the origin of the modern international system, we take the secular principle but if we use the fragmentation principle, then we can say it started in the 19th century.

2.4.1 The Secular Principle

There, have been large-scale political organizations for 7,000 years beginning with the city states of Greek and empires of Tigris and Euphrates and so on. However, the state or nation state in its present form is relatively new. Scholars like Barraclough date the modern nation-state from the 1648 and the Treaty of Westphalia. In the 16th century with the

consolidation of the old monarchical empires in Europe was accepted that by sovereignty, it was meant freedom from all external restraints whether moral, legal or religious. Before this secular principle was established it was believed that leaders were representatives of God on earth. But with the waning down of the idea of United Christian Europe, this belief vanished when it was felt that the state would represent its interests instead of God's representatives. Under Sovereignty, the state had its obligations specifically to do while citizens had to obey certain laws.

The major states' obligations were providing security and preventing external attacks. If a king was unable to perform these obligations, he was to be removed and replaced. This principle said that a state should not only consider its own interests but also how the other states exist in the international system and must recognize their interest. The principles also affirmed the right to exist in the international system; and that there should be the principle of noninterference in the internal affairs of other states. The secular principle also recognized that war should be the last resort in pursuing a state's interest. This should be when all other means failed (Kegley and Raymond, 2002).

2.4.2 The Fragmentation Principle

In the case of fragmentation principle, its greatest proponent is F. H. Hinsley in a book called *Power and the Pursuit of Peace*. For him, the international system originated in the 19th century. He argued that the fragmentation principle took root with the end of the Turkish threat on western people. He said the consolidation of the waning of the idea of United Christian Europe was completed with the defeat of Napoleon in 1815. He examined

this further by using three levels. One is the level of writers about international affairs, the second level is of international law and thirdly, the level of diplomatic practice.

On the idea of United Christian Europe, Rosseau (1969) emphasized the idea of sovereignty and the balance of power. At the level of international law, he said that he noticed a transformation from natural law to positivistic law. At the level of diplomatic practice, the treaty that shot the last blow to the idea of a United Christian Europe was the Treaty of Utrecht 1713. After this treaty, writers made reference to sovereignty of each state instead of collectivity of states in Europe.

If one takes a critical look at the Westphalian state as we have it today (even though it has undergone some modifications), religion created the opportunity for the final collapse of the church dominated system. In 1517, Martin Luther challenged the spiritual authority of the Pope and the Church of Rome. Luther's challenge was followed up by other German Princes and spread across much of central Europe resulting to serious religious conflicts culminating in the thirty years war. This war more than any other laid the foundations for the rule that continue to shape international relation today (Kegley, 2002).

The war began in 1618 when Ferdinand II, a member of the catholic Hapsburg dynasty of Austria and sitting Holy Roman Emperor, sent imperial forces into Belgium to quash a challenge to his authority by protestant princes. With the help from Philip IV of Spain, also a Hapsburg, the first phase of the war saw the reimposition of Catholicism. Later, Denmark, Sweden and France entered the war on the side of protesting German Princes. After three decades of destructive warfare, the Hapsburg dynasty of the Catholic Church was defeated. The war ended with the "Peace of Westphalia" in 1648, and it is with this event that

we usually date the birth of the modern state system. Indeed, we often say ours is the Westphalian state system.

2.5 TRANSITIONS AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM

The International System as we see it today has been through different stages of transition and growth to what we have today. At each stage there is a change from different actors to meet an emerging challenge or threat, from the Classical Period which started with the signing of the treaty of Westphalia which brought to an end the 30 years war between Catholics and Protestants in Europe in the 17th Century, to the French revolution that was Pre first world war to the Second World war. Another phase is the Post Second World War which heralded the Bipolar international system, this phase also witnessed a high increase of nationalist activities craving for independence, especially with the fact that before the end of the war Winston Churchill (UK), Joseph Stalin (USSR) and Franklin Roosevelt (USA) met and signed the Atlantic Charter in 1941 which affirmed the rights of colonized people for self-determination. Leaders of Britain, USA, USSR and Nationalist China held a conference in Moscow in November 1943 and declared as follows:

The necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization based on the principle of sovereign, equality of all peace loving states and open to membership by all such states, large or small for the maintenance of international peace and security". The above resolution and the anti-colonial stand of USA and USSR began the decolonization process in the colonized territories. By around 1970, most of the colonized

people were given at least political independence by the European colonizers. The breakdown of colonial empires in Africa led to the rise in number of new emerging states seeking membership of the United Nations.

It is important to note that the end of World War II gave rise to the division of the world into two opposing blocs. The bipolar system with two super powers-USA led capitalist states and the USSR led socialist/communist states. This is what political scientists and other behavioral scientists called cold war. Alliances were formed headed by these blocs. North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and Warsaw Treaty Organization (Warsaw Pact) in 1949 and 1955 respectively (Rourke and Boyer, 2003). Both are urging for allies in the developing world and their arms and money flowed to various governments and rebel groups against each other. Proxy wars were fought by these two super powers from North Korea (1950-1953) to Cuba (1962) to Vietnam (1965-1975) etc.

By the start of 1970s and end of 1980s, relations amongst these blocs began to improve. At the coming to power of Mikhail Gorbachev in 1985, he moved to restructure the Soviet economic bureaucracy and end political oppression in the state. He also sought better relation in areas of trade; and with the re-unification of Germany in October 1990, the other communist governments in the regime also fell, the Warsaw pact was dissolved in 1991, ending the period in international politics called Cold War (Rourke and Boyer, 2003).

One important economic change in the international system that has gained acceptance since World War II is the growth of economic interdependence. The trade in goods and services during 2000 exceeded \$7.6 billion. Americans alone own more than \$7.1 trillion in assets (companies, property, stocks, bonds) located in other countries and

foreigners owns more than \$8.7 trillion in US assets, the flow of currencies among Nations now exceeded \$1.5 billion every day, he stated further that to deal with this interdependence, several financial and economic based organizations were created to strengthened global and regional economic activities. These include the World Bank, IMF, ASEAN, EU, WTO and so on, however it is worth noting that the road to the present level of inter dependence, has not been smooth.

2.5.1 The New World Order (1990-Present)

Between 1990 and today the international system saw the establishment of European Union 1992 and NAFTA-1993. These are economic organizations basically to improve their regional trade and economic growth. The status of OPEC dominated by the third world states has also increased. As the world depends on oil for its economic growth, producers have increased their position in the interdependence of nations. No state is self-sufficient and therefore need others for interdependent, coexist and relate in the system.

Globalization has firmly taken root through the instrument of Multi National Corporations (MNCs). The global "mega corporations" is transforming the world economy through its increasing control over three fundamental resources of economic life: the technology of production, finance capital and marketing (Russet, 2004). He further contended that the technological advances that have accompanied and promoted global capitalist development have been effectively used by opponents of globalization to make their voices heard. The anti World Trade Organization (WTO) "Battle in Seattle" in 1999 took many by surprise because of its spontaneity and forceful message.

The anti globalization movement has sought to draw attention to the downside of globalization.

Chan and Weiner (1998) argued that the Twentieth century world system emerged at a time of momentous and rapid global change compared to earlier pace of social, political and technological evolution. At the start of the twentieth century, there were no airplanes, monarchies were ruling Russia, Germany, Italy, etc; no global organizations (Rourke and Boyer, 2003), population about 1.5 billion, uranium little known as a metallic element, etc. At the end of the century, human could rocket into space and deliver weapon by intercontinental ballistic missile, monarchies collapsed as Democracy triumphed; the formation of UNO, World Bank, WTO and so on came to play important roles in international relations. Technology has been the prime mover of this rapid change. The century saw the emergence of radio, television and internet communications, nuclear power, computer, air space travel, intercontinental ballistic missile, effective birth control to mention a few.

It appears that the world is evolving much faster than ever before. Science and technology are both creating and solving problems. Whether the positive or negative results predominate depends in part on our ability to address the issues in a politically responsible way. But with the rapid pace of change, there is no time for a leisurely evolutionary search for answers. The present international system like the other before now calls for some rules for the harmonious co-existence of nation-states. These rules are to regulate the behaviour of nation-states as they interact in different areas. Ofegbu (1980), opines that international law exists and performs the sacred duty of introducing order into the relationship that exists among nation - states. Specifically, the role of international law can be itemized as follows: -

- a. Settle disputes among actors within the international system
- b. Encourage and enhance relationship, especially cooperative interactions amongst states.
- c. Regulate states behaviours through emphasizing the responsibility on the part of states to respect the territorial integrity of sovereign states.
- d. Eliminate or at least minimize conflict and confrontational tendencies amongst states by making sure that every state knows her rights and limitations.
- e. Contribute tremendously towards the primary objective of promoting international peace and security which is the ultimate motive behind international organization.

To fulfill the above obligations to the international system therefore, certain international legal bodies have been created to serve the system in resolving disputes that emerge in these complex relationships.

2.6 UNIPOLARISM OR MULTIPOLARISM

Perhaps the most important theoretical concepts for classifying international systems concern the number of major actors, or "poles", in the system (Russet, 2004). Each is assumed to act with significant independence from other major actors, it is its own master with a wide selection of possible behaviour. On one extreme is the system with only a single state that dominates all the smaller states. Never in the previous centuries has there been a true unipolar global system though a world empire would probably take such a form. Krauthammer (1981) posited that hegemonic systems of less than global extent have been known in the past; like China in the Far East; in the sense that major power may be called a "pole" if it possesses a

combination of significant economic, political, military and diplomatic assets to be a decisive player in any conflict in whatever part of the world it chooses to involve itself. The collapse of Soviet Union in the early 1990s, considerably changed the structure of the international system and United States stands strong in the comity of nations. While others argue that the strength of the United States that it show cased all through the cold war era and the eminent victory it emerged with from the ideological war did not bestow on the United States the stance of Unipolar world power (Unipolarity) but it undoubtedly takes the position of a hegemon.

On the other hand others argue that it is a multipolar system that have existed in the past. It is the existence of multiple centers of power. Krauthammer, assert that during the Eighteenth to Twentieth centuries, an unstable multipolar system of many great powers existed in Europe. In almost all the international systems we can identify, polarization is the phenomenon, whereby a multipolar system transformed by alliance formation into one with perhaps only two or opposing power groupings. He defined polarization as the tendency for actors to cluster around the system's most powerful states. The closely they cluster, the more polarized, or tight, the system has become.

2.7 INTRA-STATE CRISES

Many conflicts in contemporary international politics arise from threats (or perceived threats) to group identity and loyalty (Russet, 2004). One problem is that states and nations may not coincide on the same territory. The separate nationalisms of the different ethnic groups may threaten to tear a state apart, as the former Yugoslavia. He says that states have fought intense civil wars over unity or separation. The Igbo rebellion and their attempt to establish Biafra was defeated by the Nigerian government in a war that lasted from May 1967-

January, 1970. In contrast, the Bengali secession from Pakistan was successful. India is another country that has been wracked by racial, religious, linguistic, regional conflict. The violence involving the Sikhis a clear example, these type of intra state crises affects the nations influence and relation in the International system.

2.8 HEGEMONY

The term hegemony was brought into international relations literature by Robert Keohane - deriving from the Greek word *hegemonia*, which translates to dominance or leadership. Conventionally understood in politics, the term usually refers to actor`s national role and certain international system (Mowle and Sacko, 2007).

Usually described as domination or leadership, it is a highly debatable concept throughout the literature of International Relation, especially when the two descriptions differ in their very essence. Put simply, hegemon is understood as an actor holding the most power. However, there are two types of power to distinguish between: direct and indirect (hard and soft). The first could be understood in terms of coercive force use and domination. The latter is focused on hegemon`s influence and leadership - soft power.

Hegemony in terms of domination by scholars is understood as “predominance of one state over its peers” (Wayne and Kendall, 2009), “dominance of one state over the others” (Cox, 1993) or “preponderance of military and economic capabilities (Ikenberry and Kupchan, 1990). Dominance`s focus is then laid on actors` aggregate resources within the international system that offer wide range of capabilities and it is all subject to the degree of concentration of those resources within the international system. This understanding is not limited to the actor`s capabilities, but through its` interests as well: hegemonic power is then conceptualized as a powerful enough actor to establish international rule and has a will to make others

follow (Keohane, 1989). Then hegemony is conditional on two factors: actor's ability to hold sufficient power and willingness to exercise it.

Hegemony understood as leadership is a bit harder to grasp. Bruce Russett and John O'Neal (1997) observes that for a successful hegemonic rule to last, the direct power of a hegemon is not playing a crucial role. Typically ignored, as Russett and O'Neal argues, cultural hegemony plays a crucial role in the successful exercise of hegemonic power. This cultural leadership, or soft power, represents an intangible aspect of control through the hegemon's ability to establish preferences and transfer an ideology that is accepted by other states. Brilmayer presents a view where hegemony creates a need for 'political morality' – if the essential expectation of actors that they should all be treated equally is violated, then political morality emerges. Hegemony (or leadership) can be easily established only if political morality exists (Brilmayer, 1994). Here the focus of hegemony shifts from the hegemon itself towards other actors in International Relations. Leadership in this perspective is not focused on the hegemon, but rather on international society's view towards the hegemon. This view then holds that capabilities and willingness of an actor are not sufficient to emerge as a hegemon. It is worth noting how here the focus shifts from a hegemon and its interests towards the interests of the rest. At this point, different schools of International Relation claim different interests of actors.

Both types of power (direct and indirect), present aspects of the hegemon's ability to influence actors to achieve desirable outcomes. The difference lies in the nature of its behavior and tangibility of the resources. While direct power refers to the hegemon's use of tangible assets such as military to place coercive power, or using economic resources to obtain influence and so on., indirect power, in contrast, cannot be measured as it represents intangible assets such as the

ability to attract actors by using the hegemon`s presented ideas and even influence to transform the ideas into everyone's preference.

2.9 HEGEMONY IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The concept of hegemony gained theoretical significance with Antonio Gramsci and his work of *Prison Notebooks*. Before him, hegemony was used as a reference to asymmetrical power relations. Since then, the term gained popularity within various academic disciplines and is being incorporated into various levels. It has gained popularity in fields like anthropology, sociolinguistics, literary and cultural studies, and colonial and neo-colonial studies. The International relations field is not an exception and the term is used across different theories, ranging from cultural to global hegemony. (Fontana and Frey 2005)

Much of today's press and scholarly work in International Relation is focused on the United States hegemony. Although it seems that the US power and influence in international system is apparent for the majority, contemporary opinion holds that the US hegemony has been declining over the years (Brown and Ainley, 2005). This further presents a contradiction between scholars, while some say that the US hegemony is here to stay and will continue to do so, others claim that it is declining and will not last.

For the first point political scientists, historians, and policymakers such as Gilford John Ikenberry state that from the end of the Cold War, the US has emerged as an unmatched and unprecedented global superpower. He also says that in modern history there was not a single state to loom so large over the rest of the world (Ikenberry, 2003). Historian Paul Kennedy also maintains that it would be difficult for a statistician to compile lists of the fields in which the US is leading and that for him there is no point in the Europeans or Chinese wringing their hands about US predominance, while wishing for it to go away. Former secretary of state Henry

Kissinger considers that the US is having superiority unrivaled by even the most powerful empires of the past. He also claims that the US has an unparalleled ascendancy around the globe in fields such as weaponry, entrepreneurship, science, technology, higher education and popular culture (Putnam, 2001).

A number of analysts consider that American hegemony is continuing. Strange (1982) uses the following name for the title in her article, *Still an Extraordinary Power: America's Role in a Global Monetary System* which makes her opinion clear. In another article, *The Persistent Myth of Lost Hegemony*, Strange considers the suggestion that American hegemony is at an end 'a destructive myth' that can induce only pessimism, despair, and the conviction that in these circumstances, the only course of action is to ignore everyone else and look after your own individual interest (Strange (1987). Bruce M. Russett, in his article *The Mysterious Case of Vanishing Hegemony; or, Is Mark Twain Really Dead?* dismissed any conclusion that the US has lost its hegemonic leadership capacity by considering it premature (Russet, 1985).

In the book, *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*, Joseph Nye negates the fact any fundamental change has occurred in American power (Nye, 1990). According to Nye, American power in the 1970's only went back to its 1932 hegemonic position from the dominance it had during the immediate postwar period, which, as a direct result of the war, was going to correct itself at some point anyway. In his book *The Myth of America's Decline: Leading the World Economy into the 1990s*, Henry R. Nau considers that the continuity in American hegemony is underlying the expansion of political and economic liberalism during the 1980s. He considers that the search for democratic freedom and market values in the Ex-Communist Eastern Europe is an indication of the ongoing domination of American cultural hegemony (Nau, 1992).

The classical schools of thought in International Relation all seem to have a common feature when conceptualizing hegemony – theories seem to agree that a hegemon exercises a certain degree of power or influence among other states, but it always excludes the hegemon`s direct control of other states, such as colonialism. However, despite this understanding of hegemony, schools of International Relation remain fragmented when constituting hegemony. The neo-liberal approach of hegemony places the focus on the mechanisms of operation and conditions of hegemony, instead of focusing on hegemon as a subject (as the conventional approach does). The neo-Gramscian approach, for instance, suggests looking at hegemony from a different perspective, shifting from a state-centric towards a social constructivist approach. The radical approach to hegemony, inspired by post-structuralism, is individual centric, as opposed to the realist approach (Dirzauskaite and Ilinca, 2017).

2.10 UNITED STATES HEGEMONY

According to Holsti (1993) the collapse of communist regimes in Eastern Europe in the late 1980s ushered in a new era in global politics as Bipolarity of power changed to Unipolarity. The liberal ideology that is Capitalism and democracy championed and pioneered by the United States, gained prominence and popularity.

Holsti went on to describe the contemporary global system as being under the close supervision of the United States, to him on most security and commercial issues, the United States has the capacity to lead, coerce and persuade. He added that an Arms control agreement without America participating would mean little.

In Alkali's (2003) view, the last decades of the twenty first century will go down in history as a period in which a number of changes took place in the international system, changes which have affected the structure of power in the world. These changes to him started in 1990s, when the Soviet Union collapsed, the Eastern Socialist regimes also capitulated thereby leading to the decline of Socialism as leading contending ideology in interstate relations. He asserted furthermore that the collapse of the Soviet empire and the end of Cold War politics was accompanied with the emergence of the United States of America as the single most important superpower. He views the United States as standing behind the United Nations Organization today as a guard and has transformed the world-body from a peacemaker to a combatant, constantly fighting on the side of the United States.

In his opinion, the collapse of the Soviet Union weakened the essence and effectiveness of major regional and continental powers and also gave America and European powers opportunity to consolidate their economic, political and military establishments to further their interest. He posited that the campaign by the United States to fight against terrorism since the events of September 11, 2001 clearly exposed how far the United States would go to achieve its objectives on a world scale.

For Walt (1999), the end of the Cold War left the United States in a position of preponderance unsurpassed since the Roman Empire. America is said to have the world's largest and most advanced economy and its military forces now dwarf those of any other country. In other words the collapse of the Soviet Union left the United States without a major rival. To him, this extraordinary position of power however does not guarantee that the United States can achieve its foreign policy objectives but wherever one looks across the globe, there is abundant evidence of the limits of United States influence.

In Walt's view being bigger and stronger gives a state more influence in the sense that strong states can do more to weaker states than weaker states can do to them. Thus, the United States has a larger overall impact on world affairs than smaller states. Moreover, a powerful country like the United States can pursue a more ambitious range of goals than weaker states and it will be better equipped to deal with unforeseen events. However, recent events in the world like United States inability to properly handle the September 11, 2001 attacks, its inability to prove Iran's and Iraq's production of weapons of mass destruction and its inability to amicably resolve the Israeli – Arab conflicts, puts limits on United States hegemony.

For Huntington (1996), the New World Order is an era in which culture and cultural identities, which at the broadest level are civilization identities, are shaping the patterns of cohesion, disintegration and conflict in the post –Cold War world. He argued that the post Cold War world is multi-polar and multi-dimensional.

He looked into history beginning from about 1500, when global politics assumed a multi polar pattern. During that period, the nation states of the West constituted a multi polar international system within Western civilization and interacted, competed and fought wars with each other and at the same time conquered, colonized and influenced every other civilization.

He went further to analyze the cold war era describing it as tri-polar and that the world was divided into three parts. A group of mostly wealthy and democratic societies led by the United States. This group was engaged in a competition with another group of poorer communist societies that were associated with and led by the Soviet Union. This conflict occurred in the Third World outside the two camps and composed of countries which were poor, lacked political stability, and claimed a non-aligned position.

In his argument, with the collapse of the Communist world and the end of the Cold War, the most important distinctions among peoples are not ideological, political or economic, to him they are rather cultural. He posited that people now define themselves in terms of ancestry, religion, language, history, values, customs and institutions and identify themselves at the broadest level, civilizations. In this era, Huntington maintained that people use politics not just to advance their interests but also to define their identity. Though he agreed that states remain the principal actors in world affairs, he added that the most important groupings of states are no longer the three blocs of the Cold War but rather the world's seven or eight major civilizations:

- (i) Western
- (ii) Latin American
- (iii) African
- (iv) Islamic
- (v) Sinic
- (vi) Hindu
- (vii) Orthodox
- (viii) Buddhist, and
- (ix) Japanese.

His obvious reason for this argument is that non-western societies, particularly in East Asia are developing their economic wealth and creating the basis for enhanced military power and political influence. Furthermore, his argument rests on Henry Kissinger's assertion that the

“international system of the 21st century will contain at least six major powers – The United States, Europe, China, Japan,

Russia, and probably India as well as a multiplicity of medium sized and smaller countries”.

In addition to Kissinger's six major powers, Huntington added Islamic States whose strategic locations, large populations and oil resources make them influential in world affairs.

As far as Huntington is concerned, in the new world, local politics is the politics of ethnicity, while global politics is the politics of civilization where the rivalry of the super powers is replaced by the clash of civilizations because power is seen to be shifting from the long predominant West to non- Western civilization. Global politics he maintained is now multi polar and multi civilizational.

In his argument, Saliu (1999), posited that the new emerging world order appears to have made its own demand on the international system because of the failure of the United Nations to implement the principle of collective security during the Cold War. He opined that the new world order which to him enjoys the United States dominance, places emphasis on those values dear to the West. Thus issues such as democracy, free market economy and so on are promoted by the West in most cases through their controlled international agencies. However he added that as the West is prescribing the same set of solutions to all countries in most cases, the internal dynamics of non-Western countries, have combined with the Western imposed values to initiate a period of crisis which its magnitude clearly shows that the euphoria about the end of the Cold War is misplaced.

Furthermore, Saliu opined that crisis ignited and sustained by ethnic, regional and religious motivations have continued to ravage the world. Even though Saliu agreed that the

world power structure is now uni-polar, yet his argument conforms with Huntington as they both speak of a crisis or clash between countries and groups of countries in the new world order.

Abidde (2006) also consent to the argument that the United States of America is the world's preeminent power in the new world order, a hegemon in every sense of the word. To him, this has been the case especially since the end of the Cold War when communism as an ideology largely collapsed and there was a sudden fragmentation of the Soviet Union, consequently moving the world from a bi-polar system to a uni-polar system. In his view the Cold War was mostly a period of political uncertainties. In other words, both the United States and the Soviet Union kept their allies and proxies in check. No missiles were fired and there were no direct outright wars, but wars of attrition.

Furthermore, Abidde asserted that since the end of the Cold War, the world changed. To him this change is characterized by episodes of uncertainties as the world now witnesses a number of intra and interstate skirmishes for instance between ethno-nationalists and central governments or between competing ethnic groups.

Abidde's arguments above is explained by Friedman's (2001) assertion that some nations are resented and seen as bullies due to the way and manner they pursue their national interests. America is now largely resented because of partisan position in favour of some states.

Friedman (2001), while analyzing the contemporary global system asserted that every Nation has a foreign policy to ensure that its needs are represented in the global community. During the Cold War, and throughout history, he maintained that power was used in the international scene to push forward national interests and agendas, oftentimes without any regard to the nations and people they may directly and indirectly affect. To him, this sometimes led to

resentment against some of these nations who are seen as bullies, getting away with many acts of hypocrisy. In the increasingly smaller global community, national interests do not necessarily mean that they are good for the international community.

Therefore in the early 1990s and thereafter, the United States set itself three objectives which it deems as its national interests: first is to maintain the global balance resulting from the end of the Cold War, two is to ensure its technological lead and military supremacy and third is to create an economic environment favourable to its own interests. As far as Friedman is concerned, for the most part, these objectives have been achieved as no country or group of countries in the contemporary global system appears to be able to constitute a political counterweight to the United States let alone call into question, its primacy in the hierarchy of nations.

In Friedman's opinion: In the globalization system, the United States is now the sole and dominant super power and all other nations are subordinates to it to one degree or another.

In other words, states in the contemporary world order ought to accept America's "benevolent global hegemony".

Ferguson (2004) in a rather unique way, argued against some writers like Paul Kennedy (1987) who asserted that like all past empires, the United States would inevitably succumb to overstretch and its place would soon be usurped by the rising powers of China and Japan, both of which are still unencumbered by the dead weight of imperial military commitments. Ferguson also disagreed with Mearsheimer (2001) who similarly argued that if the United States fails to succumb to overstretch and survives the German and Japanese challenges, it must brace for the

ascent of new rivals, he asserted that: A rising China is the most dangerous potential threat to the United States in the early twenty first century.

He added that China is not the only threat to United States hegemony, that the European Union too has the potential to become “a formidable rival”. At this juncture, Mearsheimer concluded that power is not a natural monopoly and that the struggle for mastery is both perennial and universal. He maintained that the uni-polarity of the world power structure cannot last much longer for the simple reason that history hates a hyper-power. Therefore, sooner or later challengers will emerge and the world will revert to a multi-polar or multi-power system.

Ferguson therefore opined that in the history of world politics, someone is always the hegemon or bidding to become the hegemon. To him, today it is United States, a century ago it was the United Kingdom, before that it was France, Spain etc. Furthermore, he adds that contrary to those who argued that new powers will subsequently challenge and outrun the United States, the world may be heading for a period where there is no hegemon, an era which he termed “apolarity”. He argues further; So, anyone who dislikes United States hegemony should bear in mind that, rather than a multi-polar world of competing great powers, a world with no hegemon at all may be the real alternative to United States primacy, a period which could turn out to mean an anarchic new Dark Age, an era of waning empires and religious fanaticism, of endemic plunder and pillage in the world’s forgotten regions, of economic stagnation and civilization’s retreat into a few fortified enclaves.

Ferguson’s reasons for arguing that the world is heading for a period of power vacuum are that, first the United States though a world super power, yet suffers from at least three structural deficits that will limit the effectiveness and duration of its quasi-imperial role in the

world. The first problem is United States growing dependence on foreign capital to finance excessive private and public consumption, to him no nation in the past endured for long after being dependent on lending from abroad. The second factor relates to troop levels, that the United States is a net importer of people and cannot therefore underpin its hegemonic aspirations with true colonization. At the same time, its relatively small volunteer army is already spread very thin as a result of major and ongoing military interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq. Finally, he maintained that the United States suffers from what he called an attention deficit. Its republican institutions and political traditions make it difficult to establish a consensus for long term nation building projects.

Lastly, Ferguson insists that contrary to predictions about China's succession over the United States, China is heading for an economic crisis that will prevent it from ascending to become a world power. His reason is that a fundamental incompatibility exists between the free markets economy, based inevitably on private property and the rule of law, and the communist monopoly on power which to him breeds corruption and impedes the creation of transparent fiscal, monetary and regulatory institutions. He added that production is running far ahead of domestic consumption thus making the economy heavily dependent on exports and far ahead of domestic financial development. These factors in his opinion will culminate into the crashing of China's economy in the long run.

He concluded his argument on this subject by asserting that in short, each of the potential hegemonies of the 21st century-the United States, Europe and China – seems to contain within it, the seeds of decline.

According to Gimba (2002), it was the former Soviet Union which was the counter veining force that could ensure the American government's good behaviour to other nations in the world. However, now that the United States has emerged the dominant world power, the new Empire, the observation that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely, holds true, this time not for individuals but for nations as well. In his opinion, the American government since the early 1990s especially under the Republican Party Leadership have displayed so much disdain, disregard and indecent unrestraint towards smaller and weaker nations which they disagree with in a manner not dissimilar to the conduct of the 18th and 19th century's autocratic empires.

To him, America is about principles. He hinged this point on his argument that the ingenious, visionary and courageous founding fathers of the United States of America built the nation on a foundation of principles which were informed or reinforced by strong moral convictions of religion. Again he stated that the United States constitution and the national pledge in their contexts are salutary attributes and evidence of the commitment to principles. He lamented that since the United States became the only super power, there has been a growing tendency to confuse American interest and wishes with the principles on which the country is founded. He tried to remind the Americans that it is these principles of founding fathers that gave America its present greatness but rather than appreciate this fact recent policies and actions of the United States government in certain areas violate the very principles the country has been selling to the world and indeed which have endeared the country to many other nations.

2.11 NIGERIAN FOREIGN POLICY

Foreign policy in Africa or indeed anywhere is not formulated in a vacuum. There are various domestic factors which no doubt might differ from one country to another and external factors which all combine to shape a nation's foreign policy (Izah, 1991). Nigerian Foreign policy is not independent of these factors and forces. Gambari (1980) explains that disagreement on foreign policy issues affected Nigeria's external behavior on selected foreign policy issues, Such as relations with Israel, the Congo crisis and the power blocs.

When foreign policy is mentioned, it is referred in the most general sense of the behavior that may be observed in a state's relation with other states and global actors. The analysis of foreign policy is thus composed of efforts to understand the ways states behave in the world arena and the reasons they take the actions they do. Foreign policy analysis attempt, therefore, to describe and explain the contribution that various factors make to precipitating certain kinds of foreign –policy behavior, as well as to prescribe the kinds of behavior the analyst thinks states ought to adopt.

In attempting to conduct foreign policy analysis, scholars focus on myriad aspects of that behavior from a variety of perspectives. This is because many components of the behavior crossing national boundaries are amenable to description and explanation, while it is difficult to classify the various types of foreign policy analysis with a meaningful category system, one way of differentiating the different types of that analysis is in terms of the kinds of factors the analyst regards as particularly potent in determining or causing the observed behavior, from this perspective, foreign policy may be analyzed in terms of:

- i. Psychological and idiosyncratic factors related to the decision making of governmental officials responsible for the formulation and conduct of foreign policy.
- ii. The internal characteristics of nation states, including the attributes of the domestic political system within which foreign policy is made and executed.
- iii. The economic and military factors bearing on the conduct of external behavior; and
- iv. The international context of foreign policy formation, including the situational and circumstantial condition in which the nation finds itself in its relations with others at the time of foreign policy initiation while certainly not exhaustive or mutually exclusive, these four categories serve to differentiate the major perspectives from which foreign policy tends to be analyzed (Coplin and Kegley 1980).

2.11.1 Psychological and Idiosyncratic Factors

When the analyst concentrates his attention on the individual foreign policy decision – maker, he acknowledges that, ultimately, the behavior of nations is a product of the behavior of discrete individuals, and that the individual person is the primary actor in international relations. That is to say. “Nations” are not actors, but people are; and thus, unless we are willing to deify and personify the state, we must investigate the behavior of those who act on behalf of the state if we are to study realistically the foreign conduct of nations. The unit of observation, then, becomes those responsible for making foreign policy, under the assumption that the behavior of those actors is most important in accounting for the national behavior of the societies of which they are a part.

From this perspective foreign policy analysis consist of studying the actions of a collectivity (i.e. the nation) by investigating characteristics of the people composing it. Most analyst have implicitly assumed that foreign policy decision making is and can be conform to a rational process, rather than viewing the process of making foreign policy decisions as a product of the interaction of psychological, personality and organizational forces within the domestic and international environments (Coplin and Kegley, 1980).

2.11.2 Internal Characteristics of Nation States

From another perspective, many analyst attempt to study foreign policy by examining the internal characteristics of a nation - from its domestic political and social structure to its, foreign predicament - in terms of the relation of those characteristics to its external behavior. The assumption here, is that such factors as a nation's size, wealth and types of; political system (e.g. totalitarian vis –a-vis democratic) go far in determining the kind of behavior the nation will tend to initiate toward others in the international system. As initiatively pleasing and attractive as this focus is, most of the literature that employs it is weak. This is because there has been, until recently, a paucity of work attempting to attack the problem by developing and applying a theoretical framework as a basis of comparison. Most of the previous work has been in the form of case studies, which tell us what happened at a particular time, in particular place and under particular conditions but which do not provide us with generalizations to enable us to discover the impact that various internal factors exert on foreign policy output behavior (Coplin and Kegley, 1980).

2.11.3 Economic and military factors

Traditionally, scholars have attempted to explain the nature of international politics by looking at the power possessed by the states that make up the international system. This approach to explanation has implicitly assumed that relative economic strength and military capacity have a substantial bearing on a states conduct of its foreign affairs. Since power is usually conceived as the ability of a state to:

- i. Achieve its objectives
- ii. Force its adversaries to do what they would not otherwise do.
- iii. Prevail in conflict or
- iv. Influence others to agree with its purposes, it was natural to assume that economic and military capability was the most crucial factor determining the power of states.

They were considered the most effective means by which one state was able to coerce another state to act in a manner the first state desired. Hence, this conception of power suggested an economic and military ordering of states in the world that would often enable the more powerful to get the less powerful to conform to the former's wishes. The power politics school of thoughts has sought to explain how states influence each other's behavior by identifying the various elements of national power that contribute to the states capacity to control the behavior of others. This has involved initiative speculation about the relative impact of economic and military aspects of power.

While it is obvious that some nations are more powerful than others {they are able to get what they want from others in the international system}, it has become questionable whether

these analysis provide a good predictor of which nations possess that power. States that are more “powerful” according to other analysis sometimes are unable to achieve their objectives, when dealing with weaker states; example the failure of the United State to get its way with Cuba and of the Soviet Union to influence Tito’s Yugoslavia. Hence, the so called sources or determinants of power often have failed to predict the successful exercise of influence (Coplin and Kegley, 1980).

Nigeria’s foreign policy like any other countries foreign policy is to a large extent a product of many domestic factors and forces. These factors and forces taken together not only place certain limits upon the action or choices of individual makers of Nigeria foreign policy. But also set the framework within which the domestic political contest over foreign policy issues must be fought (Idang, 1973).

Prior to 1st October 1960, it can be said that Nigerian has no foreign policy because it was not a sovereign state. At independence Nigeria was a federation of three main regions. “There was much hope that she would play a significant role in international affairs particularly in African issues because of her human and natural resources. But the challenges of maintaining unity among diverse people and largely autonomous regions seem to have forced the leaders to pay more attention to domestic problems.

The primary concern of Nigerian leaders since independence has been with domestic rather than external affairs. Even when stable and peaceful internal conditions permitted them to take some part in international affairs as during the period from January 1970 to July 1975, it was – and is-Africa that has been given priority by the key decision makers (Aluko, 1981).

Nigeria at independence met a world divided into power blocs: the West and East, this nature of the international system placed certain limitation on the nation's international relations. Nigeria declared the Prime Minister would follow an independent policy, which would be "founded on Nigeria's interest" and would be "consistent with the moral and democratic principles upon which our constitution is based" (Idang, 1973).

Although there were agitations for Nigeria to establish relations with both the west and east, Nigeria's foreign policy at independence although hinged on the principles of non-alignment is mostly adjudged to be more pro west. Infact at the pre-independence elections most of the political parties especially the Action Group (AG) wanted closer cooperation with the west. Even the NCNC (National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroon and later National Council of Nigeria Citizens) which talked of non – alignment in her foreign policy was optimistic about maintaining good relations with the west (Izah, 1991). This was during the bi-polar global divide thus with the end of bi-polarity and the international environment undefined as to power tilt (either unipolar or multipolar) the factors and issues that make up Nigerian foreign policy are being tested.

Nigerian foreign policy as it relates to the cold war era and its non-aligned position can simply bedescribed that the foundations on which the Nigerian foreign policy is built is based on the historical experience which also determines how policy makers perceive reality. Phillips added 'that there is no doubt that the common English language between Nigeria and the united states has facilitated the relationship between Nigeria and the western nations, this factor also helps explain the ease with which America and other commonwealth citizens come to Nigeria. Also it can be added that in many ways Nigeria is to a large extent western as opposed to soviet or 'eastern', its national history, its political institutions, its economic structure, its official

language are 'western', its educated elites were trained overwhelmingly in the west, its internal school system is British and its money was tied to the sterling bloc (Philips, 1963).

Gambari (1980) stressed that Nigeria's foreign policy position changed considerably since the Nigerian civil war, as Nigeria moved towards national association and relation among the ethnic regional and ideological groups (Gambari, 1980). The Nigerian civil war according to Aluko (1981) provided the real opportunity to test Nigeria's professed 'non-aligned' foreign policy which was reflected in the military's ability to diversify the source of support for the federal government among the pro-soviet socialist countries and diplomatically within Africa. During the cold war, third world countries like Nigeria many a times successfully play the super powers against each other to get what they want (like Nigeria did during the civil war) nations use the cold war situation to their advantage because the super power are always in the need of winning other nations to their camp but with the end of the cold war the prevailing global system does not create room for such trends. Even the nature of internal civil unrest and wars has been effected because there is no longer two power blocs always antagonizing each other and thus in order to win support of nations on position of global issues; will hide their interest and position on internal issues, there are no two power blocs always in opposite camps thus how nations will react to others in terms of internal crises too has been affected; the present global situation and happening leaves a lot to our imagination in reaction to internal unrest and respect for sovereignty.

The international political system has continually witnessed transformation right from ancient times, with the latest noticeable swing been the change from the bi polar cold war system (the war characterized by the elevation of the capitalist and socialist ideology to prominence. This development did not only thwart the value consensus of the international system but

accentuate inter bloc rivalry and intra bloc rigidity. It caused the fragmentation of international system into antagonistic and irreconcilable blocs dominated politically, economically and militarily by the then super powers) and the breakdown of the cold war heralded the emergence of a “New world order”. This development (the emergence of a new world orders that came with the breakdown of the cold war system) brought with it a lot of changes on the international environment and this development can affect the foreign policy of nations like Nigeria.

The latest global transfiguration that has brought an end to the post 1945 international order is an enigma whose origin, character and consequence have raised grave concerns and uncertainties about the emerging structure of regional and global order. This development leaves us with no clear indication as to the future of the post cold war international order and neither has there been any agreed framework for the appreciation. This leaves a lot of countries and decision makers wondering as to what the nature and character of the New World orders will be and thus for countries of the third world to make an impact in the prevailing international system, their foreign policy is bound to be more focused, economically and politically purposeful.

One equilibrium is however striking: the world order has to change and it is indeed changing. Signposted by the collapse of the Soviet Union, and of communist regimes in Eastern Europe, the world has lost its essential bi-polar character, now the United States looms large as a power of reckon the world over. There is a strong move towards the globalization of the American values beyond the inclination of the United States to want to call the shots in global power relations, liberal democracy, free market enterprises obsessive consumerism and other American cultures are been exported to even the remotest corners of the globe except for China and Cuba the contemporary value of communism seems to have died with the old world (Gambari, 1997). The emerging system is bound to have significant effect on the nature of

international relations and international politics the world over. The likely effect this evolving trend is going to have on the international relation of developing countries is of grave concern.

Blanks and Shaw (1991) are of the view that the international order of the twenty first centuries will be radically different from that which we knew between 1945 and 1990. In place of the bi-polar world a new regime of states and international institution is being forged. The outline of this world is only partially visible in the upheavals of the early 1990's. the soviet union the then second supper power which until the end of the cold war constituted one pole of the old "post war order" has disintegrated before the eyes of its former adversaries. The cold war division of Europe has gone. Eastern Europe undergoes economic and political fragmentation, while the west unites in the European community (Blanks and Shaw, 1991).

This new situation poses a major challenge to the ways in which we have learnt to understand the international order. Clearly the end of the cold war is above all the result of the explosion of the Soviet Union. This epoch making crisis cannot be attributed not even in timing solely or mainly to the pressure of the arms race generating contradictory effect on the soviet system; at the same time as it presented an increasingly intolerable economic pressure, it also provide much of the rational for the regime. Indeed one of the most fundamental reasons for the crises of the soviet system and the "triumph" of the west was clearly the much greater impact of society on western states, compared to the apparent insulation of the Stalinist regime from societal influence. Equally important was the impact which society's influence on Western States had on international relations. The question that we should ask in analyzing any world order is what does the world order hold for developing nations? How will it impact the international relation of developing nations? How will it affect the foreign policies of less stronger nations?" Akinyemi (1993) counsels that rather than prognosticate about what a new world order holds in

stock for us we in this part of the under privileged world would profit more by directing attention to the degree of justice and fairness that the global order (be it new or old) upholds.

What should be understood is that; is there anything different in the new order from what it used to be? Owoeye (1995) is of the view that the new order should rather be analyzed to see if it holds a brighter future for African nations (or the third world nations in general) what do they stand to benefit else it will only confirm Noam Chomsky's view that the new world order is "old wine in a new bottle" thus if our chance of brightening our prospect is not fulfilled then the shift for a really new world order should continue unabated.

In the field of foreign affairs, the objective function to be maximized is the promotion and the protection of the national interest of the state, where "national interest" is taken to mean the protection of the territorial integrity of nation from physical and cultural incursions. This simply means that governments take all measures that would best achieve the maintenance of the geographical boundaries of a state; make sure that the culture of the people is not adversely affected by external influence in a way that a dissonance is created between the existing political structures and the political culture, and promote the state's economic values at home and in other countries. Foreign policies should be designed in such a way that, given the states relationship with other similarly organized human collectivities, the economic base of the society continues to be maximized (Ajibola, 1978).

Foreign policy making shares all the attributes of domestic political decision making. In addition it faces some constraints which have their sources within and without each country from the domestic environment, policy making may be constrained by the nature of the political institutional structure in the country, public opinion (which may be generated by mass media,

pressure groups and parliament), the nature of the country's economic structure on the other hand, constraints from the external environment include the difficulty of collecting information and the reliability value of such information the attitude of other government, international organizations and the direction of world opinion. The salience of "public opinion" on the decision makers may be different not only between America and the Soviet Union but also between America and Britain.

The interest of states and their power to pursue their claims are of course immutable for any given historical period only in the sense that they set broad limits within which choices in foreign policy are made. They set the framework within which the domestic political contest over external policies must be waged. In the same way that no German political party at then can afford to ignore the sometimes latent but ever – present demand for German reunification, no America government can take steps that would compromise the security of the western hemisphere. It is obvious that both power and interest can be made responsive to the forces of change. For example a so-called peace loving nation, can translate its resources into military power, its influence into foreign bases and real estate, and its industrial and military potential into forces in being. This has in effect been the trend of postwar American foreign policy or a state may suffer a loss of power, as Britain did in World War II, with the consequent need for revising its estimate of national interest. Technology can require continuing reappraisal of national security and of the means of preserving it, and may lead to changes in the ranking of the great powers. Britain may have fallen in the hierarchy of powers as other nations belatedly experienced the industrial revolution, but it may recapture at least some of its vaunted supremacy.

Gambari (1997) explains that the collapse of bi-polarity illustrates that ideology has stopped being the dominant compass for navigating the complex terrain of economic, social and political issues confronting nation states. Each country must fashion a unique mix of options to deal with problem and challenges. He added that “it is important to note however, that the new world order poses serious challenges to the development of developing countries, especially Africa. First, the strategic ground appears to have been cut under their feet. They are no longer the “beautiful bride” of the big powers. Second, the new world still retains the essential grains that the old world had. The ascent and globalization of American values, the ownership and virtual monopoly of new technologies and world media, the emergence of economic union and new grants rather than chase away the threat of marginalization and domination of third world, it makes them more susceptible (Gambari, 1997).

More so, regionalism especially in the economic sphere is becoming the norm and avenue for expanding economy of scale, with the way shown by a growing unification of Europe. Furthermore, in addition to China and Japan, Asian Tigers such as Taiwan, South Korea, Hong-Kong, Malaysia and Indonesia are more likely to become vital economic forces, because of the advantages they have over other third world nations, further relegating Africa’s position in influential economic area to the shadowy backgrounds. Thus to play an active role in the new order and to ensure development, Nigeria and the whole of Africa must put themselves in a position of strength (Gambari, 1997).

The discourse on Hegemony in the International System is still on going as scholars are articulating perspectives for Unipolarity or Multipolarity, arguing that the collapse of bipolarity and the disintegration of the Soviet Union did not automatically herald the United States as the single dominant power considering the Asian tigers and their emerging economic and

technological power thus most literatures and researches that abound tend to focus in the line of Unipolarity or Multipolarity and not bestowing the position of a hegemon on the United States despite it possesses the attributes. With the collapse of bi-polarity and the emergence of the new system with an obvious United State's hegemony what is the implication on foreign policy of nations like Nigeria?

2.12 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This work employs the Power Theory of international politics. This approach to the study of international politics has its evolution from the demerits or weakness of the idealist school of thought of the pre-world war II era and its subsequent inability to prevent the outbreak of World War II (Ikelelegbe, 1995).

The centrality of Power to issues in Social Sciences cannot be questioned especially in defining relationships between individuals, organizations and states as actors in the International system. The modern thinking about power begins with the writings of Nicollo Machiavelli (*The Prince*, early 16th Century) and Thomas Hobbes (*Leviathan*, mid- 17th Century). Their books are considered classics of political writing, and the contrast between them represents the two main routes along which thought about power has continued to this day (Clegg, 1989). Machiavelli represents the strategic and decentralized thinking about power and organization. He sees power as a means, not a resource, and seeks strategic advantages, such as military ones, between his prince and others. Hobbes represents the causal thinking about power as a hegemony. Power, in Hobbes, is centralized and focused on sovereignty. According to Hobbes' basic premise, there exists a total political community, the embodiment of which is the state, or the community, or the

society. This is a single unit, ordered according to a uniform principle, possessing a continuity of time and place, from which the power stems. According to Machiavelli, total power is a desirable final end, which is achieved only rarely.

It is the failure on the part of the idealist school of thought that gave way to the realist school, which emphasized the centrality of power and national interest in international politics. Although the realist/power school of thought gained acceptance toward the end of world war II, its origin is always traced to Niccolo Machiavelli in the 16th century who introduced “the ends justifies the means” philosophy for rulers. In this Machiavelli recognized the values of greatness, power and fame as being over and above material wellbeing. As far as he was concerned what is important to the individual seeking to attain these ends is getting there, how he gets there or what method he employed whether legal or illegal is immaterial.

Building on this, the power theorists who include Hans J. Morgenthau, Kanna, Henry Kissinger and so on maintained that the pursuit of national power/interest is natural and therefore accepted development in the global system, that power occupies a central position in the international arena and that in this scheme of things as advocated by Machiavelli, the idea of power predominates or overshadows the idea of right, that is there is no morality, nations are free to employ whatever means or resources at their disposal to achieve their goals. Therefore the predominant disposition of the United States in the global system gives credence to the argument of the power theorists.

Summarily put, the arguments of the power theorists rests upon the fact that international politics is an intense struggle for power and that even though there may be international laws and institutions like the United Nations and its affiliate agencies, their impacts may not be felt as in

the long run every state will have to look out for itself (Morgenthau, 1973). It is perhaps the ability and will to make things happen or determine the course of events which power is, that tends to make power theorists relate most activities in international politics to the struggle for power. Morgenthau (1973) indeed saw politics as the struggle for power. He went as far as to make such an all-inclusive suggestion that power may comprise anything that establishes and maintains control of man over man, covers all social relationship which serves that end from physical violence to the most subtle psychological ties by which one mind controls another.

From the foregoing it is evident that nation states need power in order to win wars, make peace or ensure justice. They also need power in order to make progress or prevent others from making progress. It is also clear that the basic components of power are resources, capacity and capabilities, and the willingness to employ them in order to control the behavior of others. This could be a way of bestowing rewards or punishment.

It therefore should be noted that power is not and should not be viewed as static one way relationship or a onetime phenomenon. It is dynamic, with some feedback relationships. The continuous process that it entails is reflected in the fact that power relationships between two countries may vary from time to time and on an issue by issue basis. It was power which enabled the Europeans to colonize Africa. It was power which enabled the white minority regime in South Africa to maintain the apartheid system for so long and it is power which ensures the presence of the United States in different parts of the world in different capacities.

In coming years as in the past, tangible elements of power as territory, population, natural resources, military strength and mobility, technical know-how and industrial base as well as such intangible elements as the quality of government, leadership and organization, bureaucratic

efficiency, domestic stability and external support or influence will continue to play crucial roles in determining the power position of states.

This theory will be a useful in this work as it can be used to analyze fully events in the world right from the Cold War era, the collapse of the Socialist empire and the contemporary global order. It will also aid readers of this work in understanding America's interest in the new World Order and the implication the United States hegemonic position has on Nigerian foreign policy formulation and implementation.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents and discusses the various procedures adopted in conducting this research including the various steps adopted during the field work. It presents the type of research, research design, population of the study, method of data collection and method of data analysis.

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

The study employs the survey design and is descriptive in nature. It is that which describes a particular state of affairs at a particular period. It adopts the use of questionnaires and interviews for collecting data from a population based on appropriate sampling techniques. It presents information which can generate further research. It further comprises of a definite statement of research problem, collection of relevant and adequate data, concise analysis and interpreting of data. The influence of the US on states' foreign policies is an issue which has been a subject of intellectual discourse. Based on the controversial and sensitive nature of the situation it is needful for further analytical research hence the adoption of the survey research method to obtain relevant data. Furthermore by adopting the survey research, the researcher is able to sample views from relevant actors and analysts. These stakeholders and analysts will include members of the academia, career civil servants especially in the foreign affairs ministry etc.

3.3 POPULATION OF THE STUDY

Study in foreign policy is largely an elite affair for this reason our main population in the study are those individuals that are knowledgeable about international relations but more specifically those available individuals that are knowledgeable about US/Nigeria bilateral relations and United States role in international affairs generally. These people can be found in Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Nigerian Institute of International affairs, Lagos, National Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies, Kuru, US States Department, Government of the United States, Washington DC, Embassy of the United States of America, Abuja and Academics. (See Appendix 1).

3.4 SOURCES OF DATA

Both primary and secondary are used. The primary data was generated through open ended interviews. The interviews were transcribed to form the basic primary data.

The secondary data was generated from various sources; journals magazines, newspapers relevant books, internet and so on. A systematic qualitative content analysis was applied to all these sources in order to extract relevant information to help answer our research questions and build an argument as to the impact of United States hegemony on Nigeria foreign policy.

3.5 INSTRUMENT OF DATA COLLECTION

The collection of data was from secondary and primary sources. The secondary sources of data include textbooks, journals, newspapers, magazines. These were obtained from the libraries at the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, University of Jos, University of Missouri,

Kansas City, National Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS) and personally acquired materials. The primary sources were obtained through interview. This study therefore employed the document analysis to obtain data from the secondary sources and interviews to obtain data from the primary sources.

3.5.1 Interviews

This study employs the use of qualitative data based on the quality of information and not necessarily mass data. As such, a structured In-Depth Interview (IDI) guide was designed in order to obtain qualitative information from the respondents. As such, principal officers like Dr. Hakeem Baba-Ahmed formerly of the Department of Political Science, Usman Danfodio University Sokoto and one time Permanent Secretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ambassador Joe Keshi former Nigerian Consular General in Atlanta, USA and Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Alhaji Dalhatu Isa of the Foreign Affairs Ministry, Mallam Adamu Jibirilla of the Presidency, Miss Chinasa Ude of the Nigerian Institute of International affairs, Victoria Island, Lagos, Mr John Simon of the National Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies, Kuru, Dr Wayne Vaught, University of Missouri, Kansas City, Mary Johnson of the embassy of the United States, Abuja, Vansin Dokken, of the States Department, Washington DC were assessed (Transcripts of the Interview Sessions are attached in the Appendix). The rationale for the choice of these categories of officials is predicated on the fact that the nature of the study requires that data should be generated from relatively informed individuals who are conversant with the formulation and implementation of Nigerian foreign policy. These interviews were conducted at different times and locations between April 2012 – July 2013 in Kaduna, Abuja, Lagos, Jos Washington DC and Kansas City Missouri.

3.6 METHOD OF DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Data analysis refers to the strategies and effort to categorize, summarize and seek patterns and relationships within the relevant information gathered. Since the primary data was generated through open ended interviews they were first transcribed then used to build an argument.

3.6.1 Data Transcription and Analysis Technique (DTAT)

The essence of the DTAT is to transcribe the raw data generated into an instrument for analysis. For the IDI, it is instructive to note that before interviews are conducted, the interviewees would be contacted and informed about the research with the detailed overview. Meetings were scheduled by prior notice of the interviewees and each interview lasted between 40 minutes to 1 hour depending on the individuals and response to the issue under investigation. Responses from the interviewees were either tape-recorded in some cases on the permission of the respondents or jotted, which were later transcribed/ developed into notes.

The transcription process began with a careful reading of the transcribed notes in order to gain overall familiarity with the data from the interviews. The second reading was conducted in order to identify the salient themes in the data in line with research problem under investigation and research objectives. The last reading was to establish emerging themes and to place relevant quotes within the different identified themes.

A triangulation method was adopted for the analysis of the data generated. This is informed by the nature of the phenomenon under investigation in which documentary surveys, and interviews were used. These methods were adopted so that one would complement the other and ultimately strengthen the research findings. In a nutshell, the data generated from the In-Depth Interview was analyzed using triangulation method with all the relevant issues such as

research problem, research questions and research objectives listed in form of themes and sub-themes. Inferences were later drawn from the documentary records and interviews to explain these issues under investigation for the purpose of validity and reliability.

CHAPTER FOUR

UNITED STATES HEGEMONY AND NIGERIAN FOREIGN POLICY: A

BACKGROUND ASSESSMENT

4.1 INTRODUCTION

A discussion on predisposing factors is necessary in Social Science research. In view of this, this chapter examines some elements of United States hegemony which are reflected in the country's foreign policy objectives. Thereafter a brief history of Nigerian foreign policy is embarked upon. The essence of this background is necessary to lay a solid foundation upon which the next chapter shall rest.

4.2 ELEMENTS OF UNITED STATES HEGEMONY IN GLOBAL POWER RELATIONS

In the context of United States history, their foreign policy connotes the goals the nation's officials seek to attain abroad, the values that give rise to those objectives, and the means or instruments used to pursue them (Ayoob, 1998). This definition has three essential elements with linkages among them. Moreover, it draws attention to the facts that United States foreign policy has historically exhibited change over time in each of these elements, and that their relationships with one another have also varied across different periods. If diplomatic and military historians could reach agreement on the nature of changes in U.S. foreign policy so defined, the task of tracing this history would be relatively simple.

But the challenge is difficult, because controversies over U.S. foreign policy goals, values, and instruments abound. Rather than attempting to resolve these controversies, it is more useful to clarify the three major categories within which debate has been conducted. In the first

instance, in modifying the goals of foreign policy, the major issue confronting U.S. leaders has been reconciling the advantages and disadvantages of isolationism and internationalism. At certain times, American leaders and public opinion have sought U.S. withdrawal from international affairs, practicing disengagement and non-entanglement in order to isolate the country from the perils of international dependence and foreign wars (Buzan, 1988).

At other times, American foreign policy has swung in the opposite direction, toward active engagement with other nations on the issues at the moment. In fact, U.S. foreign policy exhibits over time an ambivalent “approach-avoidance” syndrome. What is more, a cycle in these periodic oscillations between isolationism and internationalism is observable, alternating rather every twenty to twenty-five years. As Frank Klingberg documents, an “introvert” foreign policy (isolationism) has been pronounced in the periods 1776–98, 1824–44, 1871–91, 1919–40, and 1967–86, and an “extrovert” foreign policy (internationalism) in the periods 1798–1824, 1844–71, 1891–1919, and 1940–66 (with a resurgent globalist phase underway, predictably, once again since 1986) (David, 1991).

At its core, internationalism expresses a desire for American leadership in world affairs. It springs from the motivation for the United States to head the world, to set America apart from others, and to forge a “new world order” compatible with U.S. ideals and interests. “Unilateralism”—a self-assertive effort to be self-reliant—represents one approach to internationalism, and speaks to the quest popular at times for the United States not to act in concert with others and to avoid dependence upon them. “Globalism”—the preference to become a hegemonic world leader—is another (David, 1991).

At the extreme, internationalism reflects the desire for the United States to act as an agent of international reform to bring justice and order to world affairs, perhaps through imperialism and interventionism abroad, and at others more passively by serving as a model for countries to emulate. This penchant has not been without its critics. For example, John Quincy Adams counseled (4 July 1821) that a crusading, excessive U.S. involvement in world affairs dedicated to reforming the world in America's image could lead to the prostitution of the very ideals Americans hold most dear; liberty abroad and at home. Unrestrained U.S. international leadership also has been pursued as a goal, however, as seen, for example, in John F. Kennedy's 1961 pledge that the United States would “pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty” (Downs, Rocke and Barsoom, 1996). This goal is sometimes termed liberal internationalism because it refers to what political scientist Gardner (1970) calls “the intellectual and political tradition that believes in the necessity of leadership by liberal democracies in the construction of a peaceful world order.”

In contrast, isolationist goals speak to the U.S. foreign policy preference to sever the country from the corrupting influences of international engagement and despotic foreign governments. George Washington enshrined the reasoning rationalizing withdrawal when he warned the nation in his farewell address to “steer clear of entangling alliances with any portion of the foreign world” (Downs, Rocke and Barsoom, 1996). The Monroe Doctrine (1823) stemmed from the same logic and preference, as later did the Neutrality Acts in the 1930s. Detachment and withdrawal are also deeply instilled goals in the American diplomatic tradition, and they have periodically resurfaced as the defining characteristic of U.S. foreign policy (Fearon, 1994).

4.2.1 Values

The push for two seemingly incompatible foreign policy goals springs from the political beliefs in which U.S. foreign policy is rooted. The values that give rise to fluctuations and alternating cycles in defining U.S. goals and postures include two quite different world views—idealism and realism—both of which at various times have dominated the thinking of U.S. leaders and shaped their foreign policies (Fearon, 1994). The two value systems stem from very divergent beliefs about the ways to best reconcile the tension between ideals and interests, between principle and power, and between moral purpose and military primacy.

At the core of idealism is the belief that American foreign policy should be guided by its fundamental liberal values—what may be called the “ideology” of American foreign policy. But throughout U.S. history, Americans have often differed about the relative importance of particular liberal ideals. Still, underlying idealism has been the fundamental belief that the United States has a special mission to use power for moral purposes (Glasser, 1995). Jordan, (2003) stated this “exceptionalist” version of America's international purpose, for example, when he argued that “America is much more than a geographical fact. It is a political and moral fact.” Similarly, Woodrow Wilson (Jordan, 2003) proclaimed that “America was established not to create wealth but to realize a vision, to realize an ideal—to discover and maintain liberty among men.”

At the risk of sounding simplistic and selective, the idealist-liberal tradition may be said to stress the Enlightenment's faith in reason, progress, the essential goodness of human nature, popular sovereignty, and the benefits of equal access to opportunity. Idealism counsels the search for international cooperation through U.S. support for international law, international institutions

and organizations (such as the League of Nations and now the United Nations), a liberal trade regime, arms control and disarmament, and the promotion of democratic governance, collective security, and multilateral approaches to international peace (Jordan, 2003).

This liberal-idealist conception of a transcendent national purpose differs from the realist conception with which it is often juxtaposed. To this alternate frame of mind—whose roots are equally deep—*raison d'état* and national interest are, necessarily, primary goals, and in a contest between principle and power, power must be paramount (Morgenthau, 1973). To the realist tradition, it is prudent for the United States to acquire military capabilities and use them not only for defense but also to exercise influence abroad and to compete with other states in the international struggle for power. To advocates of *realpolitik*, the U.S. goal should be to put the military means to American prosperity, privilege, power, and position ahead of a drive to exalt liberty or any other grand ideal.

Like internationalism and isolationism, the history of American diplomacy also can be largely written in terms of cyclical swings between idealism and realism. In general, idealist moods have been particularly dominant in the immediate aftermath of America's major war experiences and in times of optimism and prosperity, when hopes for successful American reform of international practices have risen—for example, during and after World War I when Woodrow Wilson championed an idealist American foreign policy dedicated to building “a world safe for democracy” under a rule of law, managed by an international organization (the League of Nations) (Mearsheimer, 2001). But, instructively, the idealist program was promptly repudiated, and values based on realist assumptions again prevailed in the thinking of United States policymakers. This reversal illustrates the general tendency for a realist mood to capture

the thinking of policymakers prudently concerned more with core national interests such as defense than with ideals when war scares have been perceived to threaten United States security (as, for example, during the Cold War).

4.2.2 Instruments

Identifying the most effective means to the ends of foreign policy (consistent with the values that inspire choices about goals) has always been a challenge. The most difficult decisions facing leaders are often not about definitions of national interests and foreign policy priorities, but about the instruments to serve them. Whereas there are observable patterns and periodicities in the goals and values underlying U.S. foreign policy, the record with respect to choices about instruments is more erratic and episodic, depending on different leaders' perceived needs and their estimates about the probable efficacy of different tactical tools (Moravcsik, 1997).

Salient in the U.S. experience are military instruments. Here a basic choice involves the desired level of military preparedness to deter an attack on the United States or to project power abroad and, potentially, to deploy U.S. military might overseas. Both military expenditures (as a percentage of the national budget) and force levels have exhibited short-term perturbations and long-term trends, as seen in the framers' rejection of a large standing army and in just that kind of massive military commitment after World War II to enforce America's contest with the Soviet Union during the Cold War. The actual U.S. use of armed force abroad has displayed more repetition and regularity (Holsti, 1998). Military engagement has ranged from large-scale protracted involvements like those in World Wars I and II to frequent practice low-scale intervention overseas. Nearly every U.S. administration has used coercive diplomacy on

numerous occasions, but especially when internationalist goals shaped by realpolitik have been pursued (Wallerstein, 1979).

The “strategies” guiding military methods of foreign policy, for both deterrence and compellence, comprise a related dimension. These have been defined by the various doctrines specifying the purposes for which military might should be put. Also related to overt military instruments of foreign policy are a cluster of other, less blatant tools such as covert operations, clandestine intelligence activities, so-called public diplomacy designed to disseminate information abroad to bolster the United States and influence public opinion, and so-called gunboat diplomacy relying on shows of force abroad to signal U.S. resolve and commitments (Walt, 1979).

A second subcategory of instruments may loosely be defined as political, inasmuch as they refer to tools on which U.S. decision makers sometimes rely to exercise influence over other nations to get them to do things they might not otherwise do. Alliances are key here, as the recruitment of allies (and prevention of states' alignment with adversaries) comprises the primary method by which leaders seek to maintain a favorable international balance of power. Foreign assistance and foreign military sales add to the arsenal of policy tools by which political influence can be exercised; for the United States, these were particularly popular during the Cold War (Klingberg, 1983). So, too, was the creation of international organizations, such as the United Nations, constructed less for idealistic reasons than as mechanisms through which the United States could shape international events in directions compatible with its national interests.

A third basic subcategory of foreign policy instruments is economic. To serve the goal of increasing U.S. prosperity, leaders have depended on a range of divergent strategies. At one end

of the philosophical spectrum are mercantilist approaches, which seek American power through trade protectionism, tariff walls, export and import controls, and, at the extreme, colonialism and imperialist expansionism. Alexander Hamilton's national industrialization policies to develop "infant industries" and the "open door" policies with respect to China in the 1890s reflected this approach, which sought to expand American power and territory at the expense of others; this drive is colored in realpolitik (Gardner,1990).

At the other extreme, shaped heavily by liberal-idealism, are policies designed to lower barriers to free trade of the sort advocated in Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points address. This approach was successfully pursued by the United States after World War II, when the United States led in the promulgation of the liberal international economic order that, through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) culminated in creation of the World Trade Organization (Weiband, 1973). Between these positions lie a variety of less controversial economic practices, such as embargoes and sanctions, that has been used as policy instruments to influence relations with foreign targets.

The analysis in the foregoing are ample evidence to buttress the fact that US hegemonic influence in global affairs is rooted in its foreign policy objectives as has been evolving over the years. It may also suffice to add that it can be deciphered that successive leaders of the US have always sought to play a hegemonic role in global affairs. Having said that the next section of this chapter provides the history of Nigerian foreign policy which is also central to this study.

4.3 A Brief History of Nigerian Foreign Policy

In the initial years after independence, the Nigerian government pursued modest foreign policy aims. Leaders were primarily concerned with internal consolidation of the new federal

state. Prime Minister Balewa's foreign policy was limited to upholding the principles inscribed in the Organization of African Unity's (OAU) 1963 Charter: non-interference, the legal equality of states, and boundary inviolability (Ogunbadejo, 1979). All of these interests were encompassed by the broader Nigerian policy preference for "good-neighborliness." Regionally, the country was overshadowed by Ghana, governed by the charismatic president, Kwame Nkrumah (Ihonvbere, 1991). Nigeria was also resisting French encirclement; all of Nigeria's geographic neighbors are francophone states, which were strongly influenced by their former colonisers, even after they achieved formal independence. Nigeria's efforts to secure local influence were limited to the creation of cooperative multilateral governing bodies, such as the Lake Chad Basin Commission and the River Niger Commission (Aluko, 1973).

Increased efforts to achieve a more prominent regional leadership role slowed during the civil war (1967-70). In addition to being challenged by violent domestic separatists, the Nigerian state was actively opposed by France, Côte d'Ivoire, Portugal and South Africa. The civil war revealed the dangers of continued European involvement on the continent, as well as the importance of securing sub-regional allies. The Federal Government, which, in spite of Nigeria's nominally non-aligned status, had previously demonstrated a solidly pro-western orientation, now began to court more active engagement with the USSR and China (Gambari, 1975). Post-war leaders also went to greater lengths to reduce France's local influence and to reconcile with other states in the sub-region, including civil war enemies, such as Côte d'Ivoire, and earlier rivals, like Ghana (Ihonvbere, 1991). Nigeria needed to be less isolated. Good neighborliness had become a security concern, as well as a normative principle (Aluko, 1981).

Efforts to reconcile with geographic neighbors and achieve a sub-regional leadership role were facilitated by Nigeria's oil boom. The state had struck oil in 1956, near the inland city of

Oloibiri. This discovery was soon augmented by large finds in the Delta region. By 1973, Nigeria was the world's ninth largest oil exporter (Aluko, 1973) and the United States' second largest international oil supplier (Gambari, 1975). The petroleum price increases of the early 1970s and the Arab energy embargo of 1973 generated an enormous rise in Nigerian state revenue. At the same time, Nigeria was attracting increased foreign direct investment. The Federal Government used this new income to pursue a more ambitious sub-regional foreign policy. Nigeria provided financial assistance to its neighbors, with the aim of weaning them off dependence on France. In 1974, the state announced that it would sell oil at concessionary prices to its energy-poor neighbors (Aluko, 1981).

Nigeria also used regional economic integration as a means of advancing its leadership and reducing local French influence. The Head of State, General Gowon (1967-75) promoted bilateral trading pacts, the Organization of African Unity's (OAU) economic bodies, and the establishment of a new international institution for regional integration: the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). Local francophone states initially hesitated to participate in a Nigerian-led organization. However, Gowon decided to move forward with the scheme by starting with Anglophone states like Togo. He gained greater francophone confidence by leading negotiations for the African, Caribbean, and Pacific (ACP) countries to gain observer status with the European Economic Community (EEC) (Abegunrin, 2003; DeLancy, 1983). The resultant Lomé Convention was signed on February 28, 1975. ECOWAS came into existence three months later.

On July 29, 1975, General Gowon was overthrown in a military coup. His two successors, Murtala Mohammed (1975-76) and Olusegun Obasanjo (1976-79) advanced a more assertive, activist foreign policy. They were less concerned with Nigeria's immediate geographic

neighbors. ECOWAS languished, as did Nigerian commitments to the OAU. Instead, Murtala and Obasanjo implemented a more militant pan-African foreign policy that, in particular, aimed to challenge the minority rule regimes of Southern Africa (Aluko, 1976). The new leaders were more verbally anti-Western than their predecessor and more prone to dramatic gestures. Nigeria intervened in the Angolan civil war, supporting the MPLA against the US-supported FNLA and UNITA (Abegunrin, 2003). In 1976, leaders encouraged other African states to boycott the Montreal Olympic games, in order to protest New Zealand's interactions with apartheid South Africa (DeLancy, 1983). In 1978, the state gained a rotating seat in the United Nations Security Council, giving it another platform for its anti-apartheid sentiment (Bach, 1983). In contrast to Gowon's modest international ambitions, Murtala and Obasanjo wanted Nigeria to obtain a higher profile on the continent, more befitting to the state's new economic power.

Yet, the "golden age" of Nigerian foreign policy was short-lived. Under the democratically elected President, Shagari (1979-83), oil revenue peaked, then dramatically declined (Shaw, 1987). Like Gowon, Shagari pursued a modest foreign policy. Activist aims were abandoned and ECOWAS continued to stumble (Shaw, 1983). In 1980 and 1982, the northern cities of Kano and Kaduna witnessed religious riots. In January 1983, the Nigerian government responded to the economic downturn by expelling illegal immigrants. This was the state's "worst international crisis since the civil war" (Abegunrin, 2003). It antagonized Nigeria's neighbors and further undermined sub-regional integration (Gambari, 1989).

The same malaise continued under Shagari's successor, Buhari (1983-85). He began his military rule with overtures to Nigeria's neighbors. However, after further religious riots in Yola in 1984, he closed the state's boundaries as a means of containing international migration (Gambari, 1989). The protectionist move was lambasted within the sub-region. At an April 1986

All-Nigeria Conference on Foreign Policy (the Kuru Conference), participants averred that they wished to maintain a sub-regional leadership role by promoting development and economic integration, supporting the OAU, and continuing to reduce France's local influence (Akindele and Ate, 1986). However, given the state's dependence on petroleum revenue, as oil prices continued to decline, Nigerian leaders possessed limited means of achieving these foreign policy goals. From 1986-88, Babangida's new government was forced to respond to the economic crisis by implementing a structural adjustment program (Sesay and Ukeje, 1997).

By the end of the 1980s, retrenchment enabled Nigeria to regain a bit of its prior regional standing. In 1990, Nigeria led West Africa's Anglophone states in establishing ECOMOG (the ECOWAS Monitoring Group), which intervened in Liberia following the overthrow of leader Samuel Doe. The move was partly personal—Doe and Babangida were friends—but was also aimed at preventing outside military forces from intervening in the region (Abegunrin, 2003; Yoroms, 1993). This effort was facilitated by a secular decline in French engagement in the area that had occurred by 1990 (Adebajo, 2000). Nonetheless, sub-regional concerns arose over Nigeria's apparent willingness to violate its longstanding principle of non-interference in other African states' internal affairs. Some West African countries suspected that Nigeria was taking advantage of the Liberian conflict to advance a local "Pax Nigeriana" (Saliu, 2000; Yoroms, 1993). Mistrust was exacerbated by Babangida's domestic political ruthlessness and the repeated postponements of Nigeria's transition back to civilian rule (Sesay and Ukeje, 1997).

Nigeria's international reputation degraded further following a major electoral controversy in 1993. After the June 12th victory of popular presidential candidate Moshood Abiola, Babangida annulled the national election results. Nigerians erupted in protest and the EU and US threatened sanctions. These responses were only partially effective. Although Babangida

was removed from office, democracy was not restored. Following a brief period of interim governance by Ernest Shonekan, Sani Abacha seized power in another military coup. A month after the regime change, Abacha rattled the region by invading the Bakassi Peninsula, a purportedly oil-rich territory disputed with Cameroon. In March 1995, Abacha accused a large swath of the policy elite of a coup plot. The courts handed down over thirty death sentences. Following international condemnation and threats of increased sanctions, these were reduced to prison terms (Mahmud, 2001). However, Abacha's clemency was short-lived. In November 1995, he executed nine leaders of the Movement for the Survival of the Ogoni People (MOSOP), including Ken Saro-Wiwa.

The US and EU responded to the new provocation by imposing broad sanctions. However, US sanctions did not include oil (Abegunrin, 2003; Mahmud, 2001). This omission weakened the effectiveness of external calls for democratization (Sesay and Ukeje, 1997). In addition, Abacha was somewhat successful in spinning the sanctions locally as an anti-imperial struggle (Mahmud, 2001). Internationally, Nigeria's reputation was marginally rehabilitated in 1998, when Abacha initiated an ECOMOG intervention to restore democracy in Sierra Leone. The Great Powers' failure to intervene effectively in Somalia and Rwanda in the early 1990s had increased the attraction of regional peacekeeping efforts, particular since, after the end of the Cold War, there was little strategic reason for superpower engagement in the region (Adebajo and Landsberg, 2003). Domestically, however, Abacha's democratizing intervention was condemned for its hypocrisy and expense (Adebajo, 2000).

Nigeria's return to democratic rule was finally facilitated by Abacha's death in office in 1998. His successor, Abubakar, oversaw a transitional government before former military leader, Obasanjo again assumed political leadership: this time, through a popular election. Obasanjo's

top foreign policy priority was to restore Nigeria's international reputation. Soon after he took power, Nigeria was readmitted to the Commonwealth of Nations. Sanctions were lifted. In 1999, Nigeria began pulling out of Sierra Leona, to cut costs and redirect resources to the Niger Delta, where the local security situation had deteriorated (Adebajo, 2000). In the West African sub-region, Obasanjo presented himself as a peacekeeper. When the International Court of Justice ruled in 2002 that the contested Bakassi Peninsula belonged to Cameroon, Obasanjo contained intense Nigerian opposition to the verdict and initiated implementation efforts (Meierding, 2010). Obasanjo also reiterated Nigeria's support for ECOWAS and his desire to pursue more extensive regional integration (Kaplan, 2006).

Obasanjo's affection for economic integration and international institutions attracted some domestic criticism (Adebajo & Landsberg, 2003). His continued engagement of Nigerian troops in multilateral peacekeeping operations in areas such as the Sudan also generated internal resistance. The record of his successor, Yar'Adua, has been mixed. Nigeria continues to rank high on international corruption indexes. A cease-fire has been brokered with the Delta insurgents, but inter-confessional instability had increased in the north. Most recently, Nigeria has appeared on international terrorists watch lists, in the wake of the thwarted 2009 "Christmas Day bombing" in Detroit. Nonetheless, the state's international reputation has improved significantly since the 1990s, in part because of the successful democratic power transition in 2007. The next section of the paper analyzes these five decades of Nigerian foreign policy, identifying recurrent themes and assessing their implications for mainstream International Relation theory.

4.3.1 A Dependent Regional Hegemon

Nigeria occupies an odd position in the international system. Through most of its independent political history, it has been the leading state in its sub-region and aspired to continental relevance. Yet, Nigeria is also an economically less developed state, dependent on primary commodity production for the majority of its domestic revenue and almost all of its foreign exchange earnings. Nigeria is not a Great Power, but nor is it precisely a dependent state, especially since the primary commodity it produces, petroleum, is so strongly desired by the developed world and highly geographically concentrated. The United State's demand for Nigerian oil precluded tough sanctioning of the Abacha regime. Yet, Nigeria is also constrained by its petroleum industry. The need for foreign markets limits leaders' ability to wield oil as a political weapon (Ihonvbere, 1991). Nigeria is neither entirely dependent nor entirely autonomous (Shaw, 1983).

Similarly, the state is both empowered and constrained by its military capabilities. Nigeria's population dwarfs that of its immediate neighbors. Its armed forces are also unrivaled; in sub-Saharan Africa, only South Africa stands as a potential challenger to Nigerian military hegemony. Yet, throughout the state's post-independence history, Nigerian leaders have refrained from using the military as a major instrument of foreign policy (Wright, 1983). Nigeria has participated in sub-regional and distant peacekeeping operations. However, with the exception of Abacha's 1993 attack on the Bakassi Peninsula, the Nigerian military has not been engaged in bilateral conflicts. Even the Bakassi dispute failed to spread geographically or develop into an interstate war. Moreover, the aggression was not motivated by expansionist interests; Abacha's primary reason for launching the assault was to divert domestic opposition from his recent coup and the June 1993 election debacle (Meierding, 2010).

Nigeria has exhibited little ability to employ its sizeable latent military capacity to influence neighboring states' domestic politics (Wright, 1983). Nigeria's physical might has also failed to deter boundary violations by its much weaker neighbors. On various occasions, Chad, Benin, and Cameroon have perpetrated minor territorial incursions. Nigeria's failure to respond assertively to these provocations arises partly from France's regional presence; the metropolitan power has defense agreements with many of its former colonies and Nigerian leaders are loath to initiate any action that might encourage European intervention on the continent (Aluko, 1977; Yoroms, 1993). However, the French factor should not be overstated (Garba, 1987). Although the European power possessed historical ties to francophone West African states, it also developed strong economic ties to Nigeria (Ogunbadejo, 1976). France has no wish to endanger its oil companies' access to the region's extensive petroleum reserves.

The primary reason for Nigeria's regional reticence is concern about intimidating weaker West African states. Since the early 1970s, when oil wealth began to elevate Nigeria's continental profile, leaders have recognized that their state's overwhelming economic and military strength might frighten its neighbors (Sesay and Ukeje, 1997). Local fear would undermine Nigeria's sub-regional leadership aspirations. It would provoke resistance to Nigerian-initiated economic or political projects. These concerns were particularly pronounced for the sub-region's francophone states. Different colonial experiences, combined with widely divergent contemporary political systems increased the potential for suspicion, hostility and conflict. Nigeria needed to reassure its neighbors. It had to lead through "quiet diplomacy," rather than military force (Garba, 1987). As Clement Isong, the governor of Cross Rivers state, asserted in 1981, when Nigeria refrained from responding militarily to a Cameroonian boundary violation: "Nigeria should not be a bully, but a cautious older brother" (Okolo, 1988).

This attitude was both pragmatic and normative. Nigeria's initial commitment to good-neighborliness, a stance that included respecting the sovereignty independence of all states, emerged from the shared experience of colonization. Nigeria's post-colonial leaders were determined to avoid the accusation that they were using their power to implement a neo-imperial order in West Africa. Although they wanted to lead, they did not want to dominate. As former Nigerian Foreign Minister Sule Lamido stated: "It is important that while you are playing Big Brother, you have to recognize that the countries you are dealing with are sovereign nations. You have to know this and recognize this psychological feeling of independence" (Adebajo, 2000). If Nigeria fails to respect other states sovereignty and territorial integrity, "she may scare away other African countries which are smaller, weaker, and poorer in human and natural resources" (Aluko, 1973).

Although aspiring to regional hegemony, Nigeria has historically eschewed territorial expansion as a means of increasing national power. Instead, Nigerian leaders have extended their influence through international institutions. The Lake Chad Basin Commission and River Niger Commission were reactivated in 1972, as Nigeria's economic power was expanding. Associate status with the EEC held little economic appeal for Nigeria but, as former foreign minister Joseph Garba (1987) observed: "We are told that our participation reassures our Francophone partners in the Economic Community of West African States; if that is true, it may be a worthwhile sacrifice." ECOWAS itself was aimed at increasing Nigeria's regional influence in a manner that would not threaten other local states. Most observers agree that Nigeria had little to gain economically from integration (Aluko, 1981; Ojo, 1980). The state's GNP was greater than those of all other member states combined and regional economies were competitive, not

complementary. Nigeria established the organization to consolidate its leadership in a way that reassured neighbors of its benign—or even positive—intentions (Wright, 1983).

In the military realm, Nigeria has endeavored to portray its regional military interventions as multilateral actions: again, to diminish perceptions of regional dominance and aggression (Adebajo and Landsberg, 2003; Saliu, 2000). Multiple Nigerian leaders have proposed the establishment of an OAU dispute settlement mechanism to respond to regional insecurity and violence (Garba, 1987). During his second turn as president, Obasanjo advocated strengthening security partnerships between ECOWAS and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) (Kaplan, 2006). These framings have not been entirely effective in swaying regional public opinion; local leaders still suspect that Nigeria possesses hegemonic ambitions. However, they are indicative of Nigeria's continuing concern with its international reputation and of its preference for leading through persuasion, rather than intimidation.

These foreign policy behaviors are highly consistent with one branch of mainstream International Relations (IR) theory: Liberal Institutionalism. Nigeria's efforts to reassure neighbors of its benign intentions while maintaining a leadership role parallel John Ikenberry's (2001) description of American behavior following World War II. In that case, the system hegemon was faced with the conundrum of how to maintain its power following a period of international upheaval. The United States could choose to "dominate" the system, "abandon" its leadership role, or "transform" the old order, using a system of "strategic restraint." This last and most effective option involved "self-binding" through international institutions. Although the hegemon might not maximize its power in the short run, the order created through this practice would be much more durable in the long run than any system that emerged from the two other

approaches; international institutions inspire limited interstate resistance and are difficult to overturn.

Since the end of the civil war, Nigeria has pursued a regional self-binding strategy. Rather than maximizing national power through traditional means, such as greater physical control of territory or material capabilities (Mearsheimer, 2001), leaders have restrained their local ambitions and used international institutions to achieve and reinforce the state's sub-regional preeminence. This foreign policy strategy has persisted across regime types. It has also prevailed in widely varying domestic conditions. Nigerian leaders have practiced strategic restraint in periods of relative economic weakness and economic strength and during periods of greater and lesser internal cohesion. Although the ambitiousness and intensity of foreign activities decline when the state is economically weak or internally unstable (Shaw, 1987), the overall character has remained a constant.

The significance of domestic factors as a determinant of foreign activity levels suggests an additional affinity between Nigerian international relations and Liberal IR theory. Liberalism ascribes great importance to domestic conditions as causes of international behaviors (Moravcsik, 1997). In the Nigerian case, understanding foreign policy requires consideration of prevailing economic conditions. The state has pursued a far more active foreign policy in periods of prosperity, such as the 1970s, than during recessions, such as in the 1980s (Ogunbadejo, 1979). To a lesser degree, International Relations analysts should also consider the personal preferences of the leader in power. Murtala adopted a far more aggressive approach to international relations than did his predecessor, General Gowon, in spite of both regimes possessing similar economic and governance capacities. Explaining policy variation requires consideration of leaders' individual characters.

In addition to being conditioned by leaders' personal preferences and by domestic political circumstances, Nigerian foreign policy has also been consistently influenced by prevailing dynamics in the international system. While Nigeria possesses greater power than its sub-regional peers, it lacks the military might to guarantee deterrence of Great Power aggression. The state's economic dependence also renders it vulnerable to international punishment. These constraints impact foreign policy decision making. Contrary to the predictions of Neorealism, however, structural imperatives have been limited. Nigeria's foreign policy was not impacted significantly by the existence and collapse of the US-Soviet superpower rivalry; it has looked similar in bilateral, unilateral, and multilateral systems. Instead, the state's international activities are more consistent with the theoretical precepts of Constructivism. Nigerian foreign policy has been highly attentive to international norms.

The state's post-colonial commitment to good-neighborliness is consistent with the internationally recognized "territorial integrity norm," which discourages infringements on the sovereignty and physical boundaries of independent states (Zacher, 2001). Nigeria's longstanding reluctance to employ unilateral military force to achieve foreign policy goals aligns with prevailing norms against international aggression. More recently, the state's willingness to participate in the international judicial process and implement the ICJ's unpopular ruling on the Bakassi Peninsula demonstrates a commitment to international law and peaceful conflict resolution mechanisms. It is difficult to determine whether Nigeria's foreign behaviors reflect internalization and acceptance of these systemic norms or if they are merely a pragmatic performance of the modern, liberal state, aimed at improving Nigeria's reputation and securing international diplomatic and economic support. However, regardless of the causal mechanism at work, norms are influencing Nigerian foreign policy.

Nigerian leaders' possess a Neorealist, rational choice view of the international system. The world is anarchic and states survive through self-help. Countries aspire to hegemonic status, at the global or regional level. Yet Neo-realism cannot explain *how* Nigeria has pursued these goals. To be fair, Waltz (1979) acknowledged that Neo-realism does not offer a theory of foreign policy. And Neo-realists have suggested amendments that would make their theory more consistent with observed Nigerian foreign policy. Some have recognized that rational states will refrain from aggressive international action when the costs are too high (Glaser, 1994). Others are willing to accept that states adhere to international norms and legal commitments when it is in their pragmatic interest to do so (Downs, Rocke and Barsoom, 1996). Realists have even acknowledged the centrality of domestic politics as a determinant of international behavior (Snyder, 1991). If all of these adjustments are made, Nigerian foreign policy is not incompatible with Neo-realism. However, given that Liberalism and Constructivism explain Nigeria's behaviors equally well, with fewer caveats, one is forced to ask: what is Neo-realism's additional, independent explanatory value?

This theoretical critique is not limited to the particular case of Nigeria. Rather than being a third world anomaly, Nigeria is representative of broader problems with Neo-realism. The theory has limited utility in the current international system. The world currently looks more Liberal and Constructivist. States rarely attack their neighbors. They care about norms. They are constrained by domestic conditions and international opinion. Consequently, while states may think like Neo-realists, they rarely act like them. This observation holds in the developing and developed worlds.

CHAPTER FIVE

IMPACT OF UNITED STATES HEGEMONY ON NIGERIAN FOREIGN POLICY

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In a fast globalizing world of today, with nations pushing to retain and expand their share in the global economy. New alliances are forming and developing nations like Nigeria are negotiating ways to deal with trade and investment barriers, improve infrastructure through foreign investments, and expand access to financial services to strengthen global and regional trade amongst others. This chapter therefore examines the conduct of Nigerian foreign policy in an International System under United States hegemony. In order to understand the impact of United States hegemony on Nigerian foreign policy, it is instructive to first examine the impact on domestic policy.

5.2 MOTIVATIONS UNDERLYING UNITED STATES-NIGERIAN RELATIONS

In order to fully develop and evaluate the nature of United States hegemony in relation to Nigeria, this study begins by bringing certain underlying tensions and motivations to light. This section addresses critics' fundamental concerns about external support of African democratization efforts, both generally and with particular attention to the United States and Nigeria. It also discusses the economic and social interests at stake for both countries and the consequences of this reciprocity.

The United States' primary interest in relation to Nigeria originally is oil. As a voracious consumer of the country's low-sulfur petroleum, America recognizes Nigeria's worth as the largest oil producer in Africa and the fifth largest in the OPEC. Since 1974, Nigeria has been one

of the largest exporters of crude oil to the United States. Securing the United States' supply of Nigerian oil was one of the bases for then-Vice President George Bush's visit to Nigeria in 1982. American companies such as ExxonMobil, and Chevron have substantial investments in the lucrative Nigerian oil industry, which, along with other Western oil companies, they dominate.

Another of the United States' interests in Nigeria is to maintain ties with the nation described as "the most populous Black Nation" in the world. Nigeria is rich in both human and natural resources, despite the fact that these are poorly managed. The country also plays a leadership role in Africa, particularly in West Africa, that can be used to advance other United State interests. The United States pushes its foreign policy values in promoting relationship with nations, in this light the United States shows significant interest to help Nigeria combat public health shortcomings and to promote its value of democracy and influence globalization contributes directly to good governance, societal stability, and economic growth. The United States is also supporting Nigeria to develop inclusive, transparent, and effective institutions of democratic governance. United States assistance helps rebuild basic mechanisms of democratic governance to make elected officials accountable to constituents through free and fair elections, strong government institutions, and well-organized, informed citizens who demand performance.

United States is partnering with Nigeria in its 'Drug epidemic'. The United States has suffered social challenges associated with the drug culture especially among people of color and immigrant communities and quite a number of Nigerians are involved in this illicit trade. The 1997 report on international drug trafficking, the State Department noted that "Nigeria is the hub of African narcotics trafficking, and Nigerian poly-crime organizations continue to expand their role in narcotics trafficking worldwide. "American agencies look to Nigerian political and

law enforcement authorities in helping to ameliorate the nation's drug problem". Nigerian-U.S. cooperation on drug trafficking dates back to 1987 when the two countries signed a mutual law enforcement agreement followed by a special anti-drug Memorandum of Understanding. Nigeria internal anti-drug policies and laws are influenced by this collaborations.

From Nigeria's perspective: Nigeria sees in the United States a steady buyer of its oil. Although Nigeria's share of the United States market has fluctuated over the years, the United States remains a primary purchaser of Nigerian crude oil. Nigeria values political ties with United States and this has influenced Nigeria's political system of government preference different from the system inherited at independence which heralded our first political experience in the first republic from 1960 - 1966. The United States is one of the most powerful countries in the world, and the two countries share similar demographic features such as ethnic diversities, economic, and religious complexities. Nigeria relies on these political connections as it experiments with a presidential style of government. Like many developing countries, Nigeria seeks to tap into American "technological capabilities" for its manpower development needs. Tens of thousands of Nigerians have flocked to the United States in search of higher education, particularly during the 1970s and 1980s. Recently, the number of Nigerians seeking United States educations has decreased dramatically, due to a mixture of economic difficulties and stringent immigration and governmental policy.

Nigeria has series of internal challenges to confront; the internationalization of terrorism and terrorist groups (like Boko Haram), problems of governance, Niger-Delta militancy, tribal conflict in Nigeria's middle-belt, poverty gap, corruption amongst other things makes the duty of establishing quality foreign relation mechanisms enormous. With these factors as determinants in

foreign policy development, Henry Ajumogobia (one time Foreign Affairs Minister of Nigeria) decided to propose an independent foreign policy for Nigeria that reflected minimal ideological position. Nigeria in 2012, as a developing middle power despite internal divisions, started to shape assertive foreign policy founded on our sub-region political and military influence coupled with our oil and natural gas reserves.

Under President Obasanjo's administration, Nigeria's foreign policy made effort to pursue strong multilateral diplomacy with struggles not to undermine bilateral relationships and agreements. While the independent foreign policy is also creating space for us within the United Nations reforms (Security Council). Nigeria's foreign policy has improved within the international system, our foreign policy implementation are gradually focusing on results. Going back to the concept conceived in the 1960 based on our hegemonic influence (in Africa), current leadership have made impacts and strategic moves in various international organizations. Nigeria is now focused on partnership with nations important to our manpower needs and encouraging investments. This is a shift towards international relations that will drive economic growth diverting from our old afro-centric principles. New principles have taken into consideration the new economic powers outside Euro-America, adapting to new international political economy and arrangements.

Nigerian government is also reaching out to the large Nigerian diaspora communities to return and contribute towards growth and development in the nation and to reverse the trend of brain drain. Many Nigerians who go to America for education continue to reside in the country rather than return to unfavorable political and economic conditions in their home country. These emigrant Nigerian-Americans are making giant strides in their chosen careers, they include

Philip Emeagwali, whose mathematical genius President Clinton praised during his address to a joint assembly of the Nigerian National Assembly on August 26, 2000. Immigration policies such as the visa lottery compound this “brain drain” since many of the Nigerians who win these lotteries are educated individuals whose talents the country needs. A more balanced relationship between the United States and Nigeria would help stabilize this situation. As former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Leonard H. Robinson Jr. noted on the eve of President Clinton’s 2000 visit to Nigeria, “one of the most important things the United States can do is to help the Obasanjo government reverse the trend that has sent the best and brightest Nigerians fleeing to the United States and elsewhere.”

5.3 TENSIONS REGARDING EXTERNAL ASSISTANCE FOR AFRICAN DEMOCRATIZATION

Nations must develop themselves or will not be developed at all. As one African proverb goes, no serious traveler depends entirely on the legs of another person for his journey. Critics of international support for African and Nigerian democratization efforts are primarily concerned about entrusting a critical stage of the country’s political development to foreign nations. These critics urge that Africans cannot depend solely or heavily on external actors, particularly the United States and other western countries, to realize their aspirations.

While such thinking has some merit, it incorrectly characterizes external support. Foreign support could be seen to reinforce rather than to detract or compromise self-development (Richter, 2009). The African proverb warns only about depending solely on others’ legs. Countries have ultimate ownership and responsibility for their own self-development, but external assistance is not necessarily contrary to this goal. As Obasanjo argued during a spring

2001 interview, although Nigerian democracy “is essentially our own,” “development partners” such as the United States can contribute to bringing about the “democracy dividend” that will make Nigerian democracy more firm. Obasanjo characterized the “democracy dividend” as an opportunity for “getting resources to improve quality and life enhancement in our own society” (The Guardian, August, 9, 2009). This position connotes the usefulness of external support given that, as is often the case in Africa, the resources needed to enhance quality of life cannot be entirely generated at home.

Fledgling democracies are fragile constructs that have difficulty surviving in a “hostile environment.” external support can minimize such fragility along with the internal conflict and violence that threaten these political systems. It is in due recognition of this fact that the literature regarding consolidation of the latest wave of democracy in the world routinely integrates a discussion of the issue of international support. Thirdly, even the very meaning of foreign policy connotes the idea of assisting rather than co-opting another nation’s democracy building. These policies entail the pursuit of vital domestic interests beyond [a country’s] own boundaries and can both reflect and magnify domestic policies (Med and Goldstein, 2007). Through foreign policy, African states are able to engage important external actors in the search for solutions to domestic problems. Foreign policy is only effective if it can both anticipate and minimize possible negative consequences of exerting external force on domestic programs.

Other opinions are that externally assisted democratization cannot be reconciled with the doctrine of sovereignty, which asserts that every country, regardless of its size, is the unquestioned master of its internal affairs and forbids other countries from interfering with those affairs (Hoffman, 2008). As Hoffman inquired, “is international intrusion on African domestic

affairs a new form of imperialism or the harbinger of new conflict between Africa and the West?" This article contends that it need be neither one. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) stipulates that every individual has the right to "social security" realized "through national effort and international cooperation" (Deutsch, 2007). Efforts to promote democratization exemplify the kind of international cooperation that contributes to this feeling of social security within one's own country. The generous package of assistance extended to western European countries under the Marshall Plan after World War II rehabilitated their war-torn economies and helped build rather than inhibit the progress of democracy. Africa received no such help even though its devastation and deprivation rival that which Europe experienced as a result of World War II. At a minimum, international assistance is justified in that it enables democratizing "countries to address and mitigate discontinuities that [prior] external pressures for reform may have helped to exacerbate." Indeed, international assistance "opens new opportunities for partnership in the search for development, social justice, and peaceful resolution of conflict in Africa." Nevertheless, rather than pose an interventionist dilemma, properly implemented external support can advance democratization and lead to a more peaceful world. Nigeria's fear springs from this discourse; is the external support for democratization another form of imperialism or domination but outright refusal from western nations support for democratization especially United States might be misunderstood as not accepting the internationalization of the values of good governance and democracy, and it will affect relationship with the United States especially when issues of abuse and violation of human rights are reported in the process of elections.

5.4 ISSUES REGARDING UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE FOR NIGERIAN DEMOCRATIZATION

Those who object to U.S. support for Nigerian democratization efforts do so on two discernible grounds. First, to point out the United States' record with respect to its past support for democracy in Africa. This suggest that America may be engaging in its same old "cynical calculations," advancing national interest under the guise of promoting democracy. Given this history, Nigerians or other Africans blatantly delude themselves in relying on the United States to help them realize democracy in their countries. Although Nigerians have no way to be certain of what may truly motivate the United States to support democratization in Nigeria, scholars such as Larry Diamond (1999), rightly commented that U.S. foreign policy of the past and at present is separated by markedly different eras. The United States' inconsistent record of democracy building during the Cold War does not necessarily indicate that it will pay the same lip service to democracy in the post-Cold War era.

The second objection to U.S. interference in Nigeria relates to what they consider the shallow nature of U.S. democracy when transferred to other nations. Democracy is not simply about, for example, elections and "protection of free markets."The worry is that the United States will only be able to export a minimal, election-happy construct of democracy, when what Nigeria and other African countries need is an enriched, more meaningful system that responds to African conditions and is sensitive to the needs of various groups in the society. Nigeria needs, they contend, a democracy that goes beyond ritualistic symbols such as free and fair elections that, while important, by themselves amount to little change. These fears appear to be ill founded, however, because no major nation in our time has developed a democracy without

adapting it to suit local circumstances. Democracy, if and when it finally develops in Nigeria and other African countries, will be homegrown and responsive to the needs of each country or else the system will not survive.

Although individual countries may be under no moral obligation to follow through with the articulated goals of their foreign policies, those that do keep their promises project an aura of credibility in their dealings with other nations. The United States has long demonstrated a desire to win the “hearts and minds” of Third World peoples, Africans included, with offers of economic assistance. American leaders, such as President Kennedy, have asserted that this policy has been developed not out of self-interest, but “because it is right.” U.S. sincerity is also bolstered by the fact that American leaders consistently espouse that promoting democracy suppresses violence between nations, which is good for both the United States and the world at large. The proliferation of democracy engenders certainty and predictability in an exceedingly complex and sometimes chaotic world, which also facilitates the conduct of American foreign policy. As one State Department official remarked, the growth of democratic systems is both idealpolitik and realpolitik with respect to the United States. Former U.S. Secretary of State Magdelene Albright stated that “America has a profound security and economic interest in helping to build an Africa that is stable, democratic and increasingly prosperous,” and Nigeria, as a “regional partner,” is a “‘bellwether’ nation.” Mallam Dalhatu Isa of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Abuja submits that Nigeria needs the support and goodwill of United States to weigh its influence as the giant of Africa. He posited that United States is not a sole super power but has tremendous influence in the comity of nations and decisions in the United Nations (UN) even Russia recognizes that, he added that the United States single handedly refused Boutros Boutros Ghali a second term as the UN Secretary General.

Additionally, U.S. foreign policy demonstrates a preference for political stability in any form. For instance, policymakers stuck with Zaire's General Mobutu Sese Seko almost to the very end because the country was obsessed with a fear that [his fall] would bring the consequent disintegration of Zaire into unstable segments open to radical penetration. Similar concerns underlay the Reagan administration's "constructive engagement" policy toward South Africa and its collaboration with the apartheid regime in that country. Turning to Nigeria, some scholars have pointed out that one reason the United States failed to move decisively against the Abacha regime (by for example, boycotting Nigerian oil) was the multi-ethnic patchwork "complexity" of the country. General Sani Abacha, known for his knack for political survival, still played to the American proclivity for "stability" by unveiling a massive public relations campaign in the United States, publicizing the "political, economic, and social stability" of his government despite the shaky and unstable relationships and sanctions, the Abacha regime never confronted the United States on issue of policy and international interest.

Political stability remains an important consideration for the United States with respect to Nigeria. This goal may be problematic, however, where it causes U.S. policymakers to overlook a militarized, non-democratic regime because it appears politically stable. Governments not built on popular support are by their very nature unstable: one unconstitutional militarized takeover begets another. In offering assistance to Nigerian democratization efforts, U.S. policymakers should be mindful of the fact that it compromises promotion of democracy when it hinges its support on the stability of undemocratic governments.

5.5 THE UNITED STATES' INTEREST IN RELATIONS WITH NIGERIA

Few foreign political actions are based entirely on goodwill; they are more often rooted in prudence and practicality. Although promoting democracy may, as was indicated earlier, be a sufficient national interest in and of itself, such idealistic abstraction is usually augmented by more concrete or material considerations. This is certainly true for the United States. "Every nation," President Kennedy once noted, "determines its policies in terms of its own [national] interests." As it is asserted, "the tradition of American foreign policy encompasses both moral idealism and raw self-interests." For instance, during the Iraq-Kuwait crisis in 1990–1991, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker traveled around the world stitching together a coalition against Iraq based on the moral principle of stopping aggression and building a "New World Order." At the same time, Baker openly indicated to U.S. reporters that the conflict was also "about jobs because cheap Middle Eastern oil would stimulate U.S. economic growth." The primacy of national interest overtaking the pursuit of ideals has deep roots in U.S. history. President Abraham Lincoln is fondly referred to by African Americans as the "great emancipator." Yet, Lincoln made black freedom (idealism) secondary to preserving the Union (national interest):

My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union If I could save the Union without freeing any slave I would do it, and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone I would also do that. What I do about slavery, and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save the Union.

Another of the United States' interests in Nigeria is Nigeria's endowment in human and natural resources coupled with the leadership role it plays in promoting peace and peaceful coexistence in Africa. Under General Babangida through Abacha, Nigeria led a peacekeeping

mission as part of the Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) that helped to stabilize long-time U.S. allies Liberia and Sierra Leone. Paradoxically, Nigeria was able, through its leadership and funding of ECOMOG, to install democracy in Liberia and to reinstate it in Sierra Leone. Some scholars have described this mission as a ploy by the regimes to enhance its “prestige at home and abroad.” Nonetheless, this “extraordinary investment” in regional stability arguably contributed to the American goal of making the world safe for democracy. As former U.S. Secretary of State Albright noted, Nigeria is “potentially a very valuable partner for us in promoting peace, democracy, and the rule of law throughout West Africa.”

Another U.S. interest is the maintenance of American cultural-historical linkages to the country of Nigeria. A great number of Americans trace their roots to Africa. Many of those Americans, including entertainer-scholar Paul B. Robeson (1898–1976), trace those origins to Nigeria.

5.6 NIGERIA’S INTEREST IN RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

Nigeria since independence has maintained diplomatic relationship with the United States despite the non-aligned stand it took in the cold war era. The partial sanctions placed on Nigeria years back under military rule especially under Sani Abacha, did not deter the forging of bilateral relationship. Nigeria has also seen the United States a a useful and beneficial partner.

5.6.1 Primary National Interests

First, Nigeria sees in the United States a steady buyer of its oil. Although Nigeria’s share of the U.S. market has dropped drastically over the years, the United States remains a primary

purchaser of Nigerian crude oil. Secondly, Nigeria values political ties with America. The United States is one of the most powerful countries in the world, and the two countries share similar demographic features such as ethnic, economic, and religious complexities. Nigeria relies on these political connections as it experiments with a presidential style of government. Dr Hakeem Baba Ahmed opined that the United States is a hegemon and has the potential to influence the post cold war era, he concluded that the policies of the United States has implication on other nations as it concerns democracy, accountability, transparency and so on. Third, like many developing countries, Nigeria seeks to tap into American “technological capabilities” for its manpower development needs. Tens of thousands of Nigerians have flocked to the United States in search of higher education, particularly during the 1970s and 1980s. Recently, the number of Nigerians seeking U.S. educations has decreased dramatically, but the impression of America as a destination of choice and land of opportunities and wealth is unshaken. Ambassador Joe Keshi is of the view that United States is hegemonic since the collapse of the Soviet Union. Keshi added that United States has a dominant presence globally economically, militarily, politically and even culturally but it does not take away enmity towards the nation like we saw in the September 11 (9-11) attacks. United States is a hegemon but the collapse of the Soviet Union did not usher in the United States as a sole super power, the end of bipolar global system did not usher in a unipolar system.

5.7 COMPLICATIONS RELATING TO INTERNAL TENSION

Naturally, a nation’s needs fluctuate along with changes to its internal social and intellectual landscape. For instance, despite the United States’ interest in the economic and political health of Nigeria, the nation occasionally appears more greatly motivated by a concern

for immediate benefit than for policies. The structure of Nigerian interests has been affected both by the emigration of its intellectual manpower and by the violent ethnic conflict of recent years.

Ironically, it is the United States that now benefits from the development in Nigerian manpower, rather than vice versa. Many Nigerians who come to America for education continue to reside in the country rather than return to unfavorable political conditions in their home country.

Nigeria may also need creative external help in containing the growth of religious-ethnic conflicts that is crippling the country. In a report released just before President Clinton's visit in 2000, Professor Wole Soyinka portended that Clinton "may prove to be the last serving United States President to have visited a nation called Nigeria." Impelling this prediction was the fact that one northern state after another was declaring its adoption of Islamic Sharia law over its former secular system of government. Not without reason, Professor Soyinka regards these declarations as effective acts of secession from the country. Recent upheavals in the country reinforce this thinking.

Although the pressing nature of these national concerns may seem fairly straightforward, Nigeria's pursuit of international assistance is complicated by the fact that Nigeria's leaders must be the ones to request it. There is little evidence that the Obasanjo government is seeking American help in combating its "brain drain" problem. With respect to ethnic-religious conflicts, General Obasanjo's response has been to either minimize the magnitude of the problem or to react temperamentally to any suggestion by Westerners that Nigerian democracy is wobbling from the stress of these conflicts. Positing that national unity is not a negotiable proposition, he has ruled out the possibility of any sort of national conference of ethnic groups to resolve some

of the conflicts before they expand. While one understands Obasanjo's fear that convening a national conference might spell the disintegration of the country, it demonstrates the extraordinary fragility of the country if the simple attempt to convene a meeting threatens its stability. The salient and latent conflicts all around Nigeria does not give room to assume anything automatic about Nigeria's unity, but rather we should be willing to engage in a far-reaching fundamental reform of the state.

Some writers have advocated for reorientation of Nigerian foreign policy to meet the internal needs of the country. Analyst Reuben Abati (Special Adviser to President Jonathan on Media) urges that the country pursue a "common man's foreign policy," "defined in terms of the interests of the common man." Such a policy would "enhance national pride" without "wasting our scarce resources" Abati wants Nigeria to "shed the father Christmas" image in its relations with the rest of Africa. Nigerian foreign policy, he said, must be defined "in terms of [the nation's own] gains and interests;" the country "must gain strength not weakness, from [its] relationship with outsiders."

5.8 UNITED STATES HEGEMONY AND NIGERIAN FOREIGN POLICY

Nigeria's foreign policy took some shape when the then acting Nigerian President Goodluck Jonathan entrusted Ajumogobia with the task. A nation described by Richard Bowden as a failed state that works in his book titled *Africa: Altered States, Ordinary Miracles* pose a great challenge to diplomats tasked with recreating international image powerful enough to safe

guard national interests while also interacting with other nations as a stable, prosperous country founded on the rule of law (Ekeh, 2001).

With the internationalization of Violent Extremism, largely dysfunctional local governments, Niger-Delta militancy, ethnic conflicts in Nigeria's middle-belt, poverty gap, police corruption amongst other rhetoric heard in the global civil right circles and analysts, the duty of establishing quality foreign relation mechanisms in enormous. Adding up to these challenges is the complexity that surrounds forging relationship with China. Despite the Chinese attractive offers to developing nations like Nigeria, the countries cannot afford to jeopardize relationship with the United States and cling solely to China.

Nigeria as a nation desires to be more visible internationally and is bidding to be a permanent member of the expanded security council of the United Nations, the nation clearly understands that such feat cannot be attained without the singular support of the United States.

United States plays the role of global police and all nations knows its potency and strive in achieving set goals to stand in its way. United States pushes disarmament and peace and security policies globally like Obama administration taking a diplomatic overture to Iran(one of the central promises of the president's election campaign), is to persuade Tehran to give up its nuclear ambitions. Vansin Dokken of the Africa Section, States Department Washington DC opined that United States is not a hegemon and has no such intention despite United States will always push for global peace and equality of all nation states. United States respects the sovereignty of every nation and relates with all nations that respect human rights, free trade and good governance.

Hillary Clinton (Secretary of State then) said that Iran's "worst nightmare is an international community that is united and an American government willing to engage Iran," according to the State official.

Dr Wayne Vaught of the Political science Department, University of Missouri Kansas City (UMKC) believes Nigeria is one of the most important countries in sub-Sahara Africa. Nigeria's stability and democracy carry great significance beyond its immediate borders. It could be recalled that in August of 2012, Mrs. Clinton visited Nigeria as part of her seven-nation tour in a diplomatic shift aimed at specific African countries, including Kenya, DR Congo, Angola. It is believed that Nigeria is seen as the key to United States relationship in West Africa. Her visit was to cement the diplomatic relationship with a view to address some issues which may mar their relationship such as Good Governance, Corruption, Rule of Law and Security. Through the instrumentality of a Bi-National Commission, Clinton said the United States will work with Nigeria to ensure security and development in the Niger Delta. She further said that the security of Niger Delta weighs up strongly in the deliberations because of what it meant for Nigeria stability and US-Nigeria trade relations.

Clinton proposed that the United States and Nigeria establish a Bi-National Commission to curb security challenges. She further said: "Nigeria is also a very strong ally of the United States in the military front. We are increasingly working together in the Maritime Security in the Gulf of Guinea, some of the most dangerous places in Africa owing to insecurity, piracy and the criminality that frequently goes on there. Now we appreciate the cooperative effort we are getting from Nigeria in the fight against terrorism. We also appreciate the fact that Nigeria has moved up to tier one in our annual report on Human Trafficking. "

However, the case of Umar Farouk Abdul Mutallab who attempted to blow up a Detroit-bound Delta Airlines flight has again brought Nigeria's global image to the front burner as it concerns terrorism and it contributed to United States decision to place Nigeria on the terror watch list, although criticism trailed that decision. In the wake of the terrorist attacks in the United States on September 11, 2001, the Bush administration began to show greater interest in the developing world, including Nigeria. In this regard, officials in the United States Defense Department have stated that cooperation on security interests in the region is of importance and will benefit both the United States and Nigeria. In this regard, a number of cooperative efforts have been implemented, including a defense assistance and training programme in Nigeria, which is the largest of its kind in Africa. With regards to hegemony Dr Wayne Vaught posits that Nigeria is a hegemon in Africa, it is my opinion that Nigeria has been extraordinarily naive by restricting its foreign policy to Africa as its cornerstone for far too long.

Before the United States decision on Nigeria, the relationship between United States government and the Nigerian government hasn't been smooth since the Obama administration took over as the Nigerian government has been perceived in Washington as both inept and unwilling to make the desired changes in her polity. Former United States Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in a speech at Georgetown University, in Washington D.C promised that the United States will pile pressure on the Nigerian government for refusing to make the necessary changes to move the country forward.

Just as Corruption and Poor Governance pose a great security threat between Nigeria and United States bilateral relations, experts have suggested that "diplomatic efforts should focus, not only on this kinds of negative image lists which just further punish the victim, but on how to resolve issues that affect both countries". Based on this premise, US Assistant

Secretary of State for Africa, Mr. Johnnie Carson visited Nigeria with a mandate from President Barak Obama to hold talks with top government officials on issues which are expected to cover the leadership crisis in the country and global terrorism. Mr Carson was also expected to discuss issues of governance, elections, corruption, trade improvement and investment opportunities.

Four conditions for delisting Nigeria from the terror watch list given by the United States were made known to newsmen by the Nigerian Foreign Affairs Minister, Ojo Madueke. These include Public condemnation of any form of terrorism anywhere in the world, Improvement of security in Nigeria's airports, Deployment of Air Marshals onboard U.S-bound aircraft and Passing of legislations geared towards combating terrorism in the country. Despite all these Mary Johnson of the Public Affairs Section embassy of the United States of America, Abuja explained that United States of America is not a hegemon and have no desire to be. She added that the United States is open to all irrespective of race, faith or sexuality. The United States will always respect the fundamental human rights of all, will support the entronement of democracy in all nations and will always rise to defend weaker nations when their sovereignty is violated.

5.9 UNITED STATES HEGEMONY AND NIGERIA FOREIGN POLICY IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBALIZATION

Globalization has also wrought some negative changes for Nigeria. Among the negative consequences, felt in other African nations as well, are the lag in science and technology, growing impoverishment, capital flight, ceding of economic autonomy to multilateral institutions, and the exaggeration of problems such as drug usage and trafficking. Whether the era which replaced the Cold War period constitutes a new international system is immaterial.

The fact remains that, more than any other country, “America stands at the center of this world of globalization.” The United States benefits from globalization in its ability to conduct foreign affairs in Africa unconstrained-as in the past-by the political, military, ideological, and economic competition from the Soviet Union. This benefit is magnified by the fact that developing countries that maintain bilateral economic relationships with this hegemon no longer have the leeway to play one superpower against another (Obi, 2005).

Globalization manifests itself in such a way that bilateral relations between the United States and Nigeria tend to favor the United States. But these manifestations are not entirely detrimental to Nigeria. As discussed, states are not “merely passive objects exposed to the swell of globalization” but instead may “push, resist” and “attempt to circumscribe or twist” the forces of globalization to their own advantage. A mutually rewarding relationship between the United States and Nigeria based on more than simple cooperation is possible if built upon the positive manifestations of globalization rather than the negative. Ms Chinasa Ude of Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos submits that United States is a super state with a large territorial influence and control, United States currency is international and it influences trade and other dealings of other nations. Even with the Cold War over, the reality of African international relations is still that Africans ““have so much to ask for and so little to bargain with.”” It is a dilemma that African leaders will have to face.

5.10 FINDING COMMON GROUND

Dr Wayne Vaught of the Political science Department, University of Missouri Kansas City (UMKC) is of the opinion that the United States is not a Hegemon and his argument is; how many times has the United States enjoyed a smooth sail on issues in the UN? How many nations stopped their nuclear armament because of the United States? How secured are we as a nation? How many innocent people have died right here in the United States due to terrorist attacks? Nigeria is even more of a hegemon in Africa with its record of successful peace keeping operations, look at Liberia, Sierra Leone see the interventions in Cote d'Ivoire and Togo, can United States boast of any such interventions and achievements?

Nigeria should maximize the benefit of its relationship with the United States by identifying and exploiting the points at which the two nations' interests overlap. According to Mr John Simon of National Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies, from the end of the cold war enhanced United States position of dominance in world affairs coupled with the position in the UN security council and veto power, he added that other nations are rising in different spheres like China is an economic power, Iran and Russia have military might but despite all that the United States cannot be subdued in global affairs.

Nigerian and U.S. interests converge with respect to the trade and security and the necessity of maintaining cordial political relations. Concerning the first, U.S. needs a market for its products and a viable place for investment and Nigeria with its population and economy can be that destination and this can boost development and growth. On the second point, U.S. policymakers see the need to maintain a diplomatic foothold in one of the most important and influential African countries. For its part, Nigeria needs strong and stable ties with the United

States to improve its image in the international community. Although these ties may also provide vital assistance in Nigeria's pursuit of the material "democracy dividend," even if no substantive help results, the Nigerian government can still flaunt the mere existence of cordial relations with "the leading nation of the world today" (Akinyemi, 2001)

Mallam Jibrilla Adamu of the Presidency Abuja added that United States has powers but it does not dominate the world as most people will want to believe, other nations are not sleeping. Brazil, China, India and Japan are rising. Adamu opined that United States hegemony influences Nigeria Foreign Policy in areas of globalization, human rights and democracy. This appearance of accord and mutual benefit will always be questioned by those political analysts who see U.S.-Nigerian relations as imbalanced and imperialistic. They contrast Nigeria's chummy relationship with the West against its more African-centered policies from 1975 to 1983, including those during Obasanjo's first regime between 1976 and 1979. Analysts lament the "near-disappearance of anti-imperialism from the politics of the Nigerian state and the civil society," maintaining ruefully, "our country is now the chief client of the global dictatorship." (Itugbu, 2001)

A developing country engaged in a bilateral relationship with a major world power needs domestic capability in order to "push, resist," and "attempt to circumscribe or twist the forces of globalization to its advantage." Does Nigeria possess the domestic capability necessary for weathering globalization? The point is simple but profound: in an era of globalization, as the context for African foreign policy is shifting, Nigerian foreign policy cannot proceed business as usual. Foreign policies "are strategies governments use to guide their actions toward other states." A sound political and economic base should underlie the conduct of such policy. Only a people confident and a government strong at home "can engage the rest of the world." The

evolution of economic policy from “low politics” to “high,” and the shift in foreign relations away from diplomatic posturing and toward economic restructuring are two components of the aftermath of globalization. Important domestic debates regarding foreign policy have moved from the political arena to economic arenas such as finance ministries and central banks.

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Nigeria foreign Policy has been consistent since independence focusing on Africa as the centerpiece and nonaligned position in the ideological conflict between United States Capitalism and the propagation of Socialism championed by Union of Soviet Socialist Republic. The collapse of bipolarity marked the end of the cold war and heralds a transition in the global system. The New Order has its implication on relations, position and actions of States. Nigeria's foreign policy is definitely making its way in the right direction at the end of the cold war despite the several limitations. All though the nation's diplomats may be at the crossroad considering the need to design the core aspects of any nation's foreign policy focusing on the national interests; this involves so many actors that need to unify on the needs and wants of the country. Deciding on this aspect comes with numerous challenges that will trigger the necessary shift from idealistic policies that does not align with our economic agenda to aggressively pursue of our ambitions such as our foreign direct investment goals. This study attempts to assess the implication of United States hegemony on Nigeria foreign policy formulation and implementation.

The collapse of USSR ushered in a New World Order although its features and classification are still unfolding, it is expected to have impact on the foreign policy formulation and implementation of developing nations like Nigeria. This study observed that there is significant shift in Nigeria's foreign policy with the end of the cold war, Nigeria is more careful

now in taking a nonaligned position that appears contrary to United States interest like was seen after the September 11, 2001 (9/11) terrorist attack in the United States when President Bush boldly and openly announced you are either for us or against us. Nigeria did not send a troop to support the US led multinational force assault but President Obasanjo paid Solidarity visit just like Senegal sending only one Soldier to join the force, this is in recognition of the hegemonic position of the United States and no nation want to openly say we are against you, the same was observed during the invasion of Iraq. The collapse of bipolarity propelled the United States to a hegemon and Nigeria seeks to maintain very cordial bilateral relationship although it didn't automatically transit Nigeria's relation to absolute loyalty to the United States it influences our foreign policy to be in tune with the values of the United States.

The United States sees Nigeria as a strong ally to push its interest in Africa especially in the West African Sub region. Nigeria's position as the most populous black nation on earth, the largest economy in Africa, the Giant of Africa with abundant natural and human resources with potential to be a regional hegemon and play a stronger role in the International system, with this realization the United States is keen on maintaining cordial relationship with Nigeria despite the internal challenges Nigeria is experiencing.

Nigeria is doing all possible with its current challenges of Insurgency and terrorism to ensure it keeps its position and prestige in the comity of nations. In dealing with the challenge of terrorism Nigerian government reached out to the United States to procure arms which was subtly declined despite knowing that the greatest challenge facing Nigeria now is insecurity and Nigerian government will go to any length to bring it to an end. Prior to the collapse of the cold war the United States would not decline since they know that Nigerian government will have just

reverted to Russia to get the arms. Although the request was declined Nigerian government did not sever relationship with the US or take a position that appears antagonistic to the United States because of the hegemonic position the US occupies among the comity of nations. But despite the presence and activities of terrorists in the Country that have targeted not just government institutions and infrastructures but civilians and United Nations facilities the United States has not listed Nigeria as a terrorist nation which will affect its diplomatic and bilateral relationship going by United States policy position rather the United States once referred to Nigeria as a country with terrorist groups/organizations but never as a terrorists country. This shows that the internal challenges Nigeria is battling with did not deter the United States from wanting to maintain diplomatic relationship with Nigeria obviously because of Nigeria's position in Africa.

With the collapse of bipolarity Nigeria has developed stronger ties with China in the areas of growing trade and strategic cooperation this is to curtail total dependence on the United States and to maintain flexibility on issues that touches on national interest and territorial integrity, this diplomatic diversification enables Nigeria to maintain its nonaligned policy position. The study observed that end of the cold war did not affect Nigerians non Aligned Position thus instead of absolute solidarity with the United States, Nigeria is growing its relationship with China in more areas to maintain its nonaligned foreign policy position.

Nigeria's trade relation with China is on the increase and as China stands as a strong economic threat to United States global power standing. The Chinese government too is extending incentives and development support to Nigeria with conditions far more favourable to what the United States and its financial Institutions can offer, despite all these enticements

Nigeria is still keen at maintaining cordial relationship with United States and even though there is a little diversification of economic and trade relations to China, Nigeria is propagating policy positions that upholds United States values like on the issue of Terrorism, trade relations, corruption, transparent democracy and so on, in recognition of the hegemonic stance of the US in global affairs. Nigerian government has established institutions that propagate and promote human rights, fight corruption, drugs, ensure free press and freedom of information, civil society, institutions like the Economic and Financial Crime Commission (EFCC), Independent Corrupt Practices and other related offences Commission (ICPC), National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), National Agency for Food and Drug Administration and Control (NAFDAC).

Another manifestation of United States hegemony was when Boutros Boutros Ghali wanted a second term as the UN Secretary General and the United States stood against him and despite all other member nations felt he deserved a second term in office, United States single handedly vetoed him out and brought Kofi Anan.

To resolve the unending violent conflict in Liberia, African leaders agreed to an asylum for Charles Taylor and there will be no litigation to try him for offences in the course of the wars the country experienced and it was agreed that he should move to Nigeria but Nigerian government had to yield to pressure led by United States and surrendered Charles Taylor to be tried in The Hague.

6.2 CONCLUSION

While U.S. policymakers still include idealism among the articulated motivations for American foreign policy, pragmatic national interest considerations obviously dominate. Although globalization and the end of the Cold War have provided a changed context for the conduct of U.S. policy, the nation's leaders still appear to have no more qualms about sacrificing ideology for domestic concerns than they did during the Cold War, the national interest of the United States supersedes ideology.

A second finding relates to the obviously low level of U.S. economic support for Nigerian democratization. Since military and political-diplomatic initiatives rank so highly above economic initiatives in U.S. policy toward Nigeria, it could be argued that the United States has done little more since 1999 than to normalize or "regularize" its relations with Nigeria after the regimes of Generals Babangida and Abacha. From 1983 to 1998, Nigeria experienced the "long spell of crude despotism" associated with military rule, resulting in the nation's reclassification by the United Nations from a middle-income economy to one of the poorest countries in the world. The people's agitation for democratic rule is to promote better relationship with the United States and something to do with Nigerians' general belief that economic progress is possible only under a democratically elected civilian government. General Obasanjo has repeatedly confirmed that economic progress will provide the "democratic dividend" that will help to sustain democracy in Nigeria.

Nonetheless, the United States has refused to cancel Nigeria's foreign debt and has provided economic assistance that can only be described as modest and symbolic. Despite the religious dynamics that acts of terror tend to take especially in attacks against the West and their

interest, Nigeria has joined the United States' global coalition in the war against terrorism. General Obasanjo continues to show his government's solidarity with the United States in its war on terrorism, yet Nigeria has not been rewarded economically, as has Pakistan and Nigeria is still keen at remaining in the good books of the United States by not criticizing its action or take a position that opposes US interest. This holds true even as U.S. strikes and support for attacks on nations classified as 'Islamic Countries' have produced "tension" in Nigeria, between Nigerian Muslims and Christians. Despite these facts, and despite all the talk of a paradigm shift in U.S. foreign policy, the growth of U.S.-Nigerian bilateral trade has been slow, and U.S. investment is primarily within the oil sector of the economy. American policymakers blame this occurrence on the lack of a conducive environment, but these trends have varied very little from what they were during the repressive era of military rules, when U.S. relations with Nigeria reached their lowest point.

This situation goes to validate some of the questions raised by African scholars about the depth of the U.S. commitment to democracy; it feeds the sneering cynicism with which these scholars react to the very notion of U.S. support for African democratization. Compared to the Clinton presidency and despite appearing to take "more than a passing interest" in Nigerian and African affairs, the Bush administration's economic initiatives remained modest and symbolic. Under President George W. Bush, U.S. economic initiatives are advanced only through the G-8 group, a situation the Nigerian government seems to have resignedly accepted. Even here, however, countries other than the United States are driving these initiatives.

Thirdly, although the United States recognizes that Nigeria is an important "regional partner," its policy toward Nigeria has been strongly, if not inextricably, tied to its policy toward

Africa as a whole. The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act is a law for all of Africa. And on issues from disease to debt relief, the United States does not have a distinct policy toward Nigeria as it has toward Africa more generally. Indeed, as Clinton's Secretary of State Madeleine Albright noted, Nigeria is the "key example" of the "stable, democratic and increasingly prosperous [Africa]" that America wants to help in building, and yet United States investment in Nigeria itself has been minimal. The use of the G-8 as a channel for United States economic assistance may reinforce this one-policy orientation.

The significance of this observation is that American foreign policy toward Nigeria has become subject to most, if not all, of the constraints that affect U.S.-African policy. In an important critique of current United States policy toward Africa, William Minter (2011) argued that the Clinton presidency marked a watershed in United States relations with the continent. He said that Clinton had empathy for Africa and that, more than any recent United States government, his administration injected a positive tone in American policy toward Africa. Before Clinton, U.S. engagement with the continent was considered unrewarding "social work." But under his leadership, the tone of American policy changed from "what to do about Africa" to "what to do with Africa." Minter found that "an extensive and continuing dialogue" is the exchange necessary "for the emergence of a genuine new partnership that is about listening, learning, and compromising." More than any previous U.S. government, the Clinton administration took greater steps toward meeting this important prerequisite.

In summary, a nation's domestic prerequisite for functional foreign policy is a stable and inclusive political system with space for civil society, attention to the rule of law, and economic development anchored in diversification, accountability, and economic transparency. These are

values propagated by the United States as a standard for development and global visibility. Nigerian foreign policy is strongly influenced by these issues to influence cordial relationship with the United States because after over fifteen years of democracy and with recent events in the country, Nigeria does not seem to have acquired the requisite economic development and political stability that would enable effective foreign policy vis-a-vis a major power like the United States.

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Nigeria's comprehensive foreign policy must have genuine political, economic and military dimensions that will project a nation that is truly ready to be independent while also able to protect its borders and sovereignty. This is beyond a ministry; it's a national task that may even require cultural re-orientation towards patriotism.

The scope of Nigeria's foreign policy should no longer be limited to continental affairs. It should be focused world-wide and geared toward the promotion of our cultural heritage, and scientific, economic and technical cooperation with viable partners. Its goal should aim at enhancing our national development, and military arrangements with NATO countries in order to give peace a permanent character in our societal needs and our sub-region. Finally, Nigerian foreign policy should aim at creating benefits for the betterment of the people. It should no longer focus on Africa without clearly defined policy objectives.

Such a policy shift would mean a very careful choice of external actors. Nigeria needs to make a careful choice of our closest allies based not on the wealth or technological advancement of the partner but on Nigeria's vital national interests in the cultural, economic, political, scientific and technical areas as well as in the military field. A commission comprising

diplomats, top-level military officers, university professors and politicians should be set-up to review our foreign policy objectives and to redefine our vital national interests. Its mandate should be short and precise. These interests should be made the fundamental guidelines of all our foreign policy objectives in Africa, the European Union, North and South America, Asia and the Pacific. Nigeria's foreign policy objectives should henceforth focus on the benefits of such policy for its people. Government's task should include to make the ordinary Nigerian feel the positive effects of the government on his or her life.

The role and place of Nigeria's embassies should be redefined. A dynamic and performance-oriented foreign policy leaves no room for amateurism like in the past. Our ambassadors and embassies should sit up and live up to national expectations. Nigeria's foreign policy has to produce results for the country and its citizens. The training programme for our diplomats should be reviewed to give them the necessary knowledge to practice the art and science of diplomacy because they are at the frontline of our foreign policy. Though Africa should not be forgotten, Nigeria's interests should come first in all our foreign policy analysis and decisions. The economic development and well-being of Nigeria should henceforth be the mainstay of our foreign policy.

At another level, Nigeria's foreign policy should encompass a clear opinion and strategy on major international issues such as the reform of the United Nations, bilateral relations between Nigeria and members of the European Union outside the ACP-EU framework, discussions with the dynamic Asian economies on how best to boost their investment in Nigeria, how to make G7 governments encourage more foreign capital flows to the vital areas of our economy through a liberal foreign investment policy.

Lastly, as a strong and respected country in Africa, Nigeria should campaign strongly to get admitted as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council. These achievements would make the ordinary Nigerian realize the usefulness of the country's foreign policy in real, not abstract terms.

REFERENCES

- Abbah T. (2000), How US, assists Nigeria's democracy in *The Punch*, March 10.
- Abegunrin O. (2003), *Nigerian Foreign Policy Under Military Rule, 1966-1999*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Abidde S. O (2006), Terrorists... Insurgents and the Middle East, in *DailySun* Newspaper, June 20
- Achilleus U. (2001). *The Ultimate Price*, The Source, May 7.
- Adebajo A. (2000), Nigeria: Africa's New Gendarme? *Security Dialogue*, 31, 185-199.
- Adebajo A. and Landsberg C. (2003), South Africa and Nigeria as Regional Hegemons. In Mwesiga B. and Landsberg C. On Dec 1, 2004, Elaine Windrich and others published BOOK REVIEW.
- Adeniran T. (2007), *Introduction to International Relations*, Lagos, Macmillan Nigeria Publishers.
- Ajibola W. A. (1978), *Foreign Policy and Public Opinion: A Case Study of British Foreign Policy Over the Nigerian Civil War*, Ibadan University Press.
- Akindele R. A. and Ate B. E. (1986), Nigeria's Foreign Policy, 1986-2000 AD: Background to and Reflections on the Views from Kuru. *Africa Spectrum*, 21(3), 363-370.
- Akindele R. A. and Oyediran O. (1985), Federalism and Foreign Policy in Nigeria. *International Journal*, 42, 600-625.
- Akinyemi B. (2001), Nigeria: A Mere Geographical Expression? *The Guardian* (Lagos), July 6.
- Akinyemi, B.A. (1993) In search of a New World Order in Jide Owoeye (ed) *Understanding the New World Order*, College Press Limited Ibadan.
- Albright M. (2000). On Global sustenance of democracy, Being a text of a lecture at John Hopkins University, USA, and published in *New Nigerian Newspaper*, January 27.

- Alkali R.A. (2003), *Issues in International Relations and Nigeria's Foreign Policy*, Kaduna North Point Publishers.
- Aluko O. (1981), *Essays in Nigeria Foreign Policy*, George Allen and Unwind London.
- Aluko O. (1973), *Nigeria's Role in Inter-African Relations: With Special Reference to the Organization of African Unity*. *African Affairs*, 72(287), 145-162.
- Aluko O. (1976). *The 'New' Nigerian Foreign Policy: Developments since the Downfall of General Gowon*. *Round Table*, 66(264), 405-414.
- Aluko O. (1977). *Nigeria and Britain After Gowon*. *African Affairs*, 76(304), 303-320.
- Aluko, O. (1981). *Essays in Nigerian Foreign Policy*, London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Anglin, D. G. (1981) *Nigeria Political Non-alignment and economic alignment*, *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, *Change in Nigeria Foreign Policy*, Zaria, Ahmadu Bello University Press.
- Appadorai, A (1981), *Domestic Roots of India's Foreign Policy: 1947-1972*, Oxford University Press, Delhi
- Ate B E. (1987), *Decolonization and Dependence: The Development of Nigerian-U.S. Relations 1960-1984*.
- Aydlini E. and Matthews J. (2000), *Are the Core and Periphery Irreconcilable: the Curious World of Publishing in Contemporary International Relations*. *International Studies Perspectives*, 1, 289-303.
- Ayoob M. (1998). *Subaltern Realism: International Relations Theory Meets the Third World*. In S. G. Neuman (Ed.), *International Relations Theory and the Third World*(pp. 31-54). Houndsmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan.
- Bach D. C. (1983), *Nigerian-American Relations: Converging Interests and Power Relations*. In T. M. Shaw & O. Aluko (Eds.), *Nigerian Foreign Policy: Alternative Perceptions and Projections*(pp. 35-55). London: Macmillan.

- Baregu and C. Landsberg (Eds.), *From Cape to Congo: Southern Africa's Evolving Security Challenges*(pp. 171-203). Boulder, CO: Lynne Reiter.
- Brilmayer L. (1994), *American Hegemony Political Morality in a One Superpower World*, Yale University Press.
- Brown C. and Ainley K. (2005), *Understanding International Relations*, Palgrave Macmillan UK
- Brown, W. (2006). *Africa and International Relations: a Comment on IR Theory, Anarchy and Statehood*. *Review of International Studies*, 32(1), 119-143.
- Bruce R. and James S. S. (1991), *The UN in the New World Order*. *Foreign Affairs Spring*, volume 70 No. 2
- Bruce R. and Harvey Starr (2004), *World Politics: The Menu for Choice*, Wadsworth Thompson Learning Center.
- Bruce R and John R.(1997), *Democracy, Interdependence and Conflict 1950- 1985 in International Studies Quarterly*, Volume 41, Issue 2 (1997)
- Bruce R. (1985), *The Mysterious Case of Vanishing Hegemony;or,Mark Twain Really Dead?* *International Organization Vol, 39, No 2. (Spring 1985)*
- Buah F.K (1978), *The World Since 1750*, Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Buzan B. (1988), *People, States and Fear: the National Security Problem in the Third World*. In Azar E.E and Moon C. (Eds.), *National Security in the Third World: the Management of Internal and External Threats*(pp. 14-43). Aldershot: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Chalk P. (2006),*West-European Terrorism and Counter Terrorism: “The Evolving Dynamic”*,2006, London: Macmillan.
- Chan S. and Weiner J. (1998), *Twentieth Century International History*, St. Martins New York.
- Charlesworth C. (Ed) (1987) *Contemporary Political Analysis*, New York John Wiley and Sons.

- Christopher H. (2003), *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Churchill, Winston (1984), *The Second World War Vol. 1, the Gathering Storm*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
- Claude S. (1963), *The Development of Nigeria Foreign Policy*, North Western University African Studies No. 13.
- Clegg, S.R. (1989) *Framework of Power*, Sage London.
- Coplin, W. D. and Kegley W. C. (1980), *Introduction to International Politics: A Theoretical Overview (Markham Political Science Series)* Markham Publication.
- Corey, C. W. (1999): "\$70,000,000 Debt Relief Plan" published in *New Nigerian* May 6.
- Cox K.R.(1993), *The Local and the Global in the New Urban Politics: A Critical View* published in *Sage Journal*
- David, S. R. (1991). *Explaining Third World Alignment*. *World Politics*, 43(2), 233-256.
- DeLancy M. W. (1983). *Nigeria: Foreign Policy Alternatives*. In Shaw T.M. and Aluko O. (Eds.), *Nigerian Foreign Policy: Alternative Perceptions and Projections*(pp. 164-190). London: Macmillan.
- DeutschJ. (2007) *Terrorism,Foreign Policy*, No. 108,p. 10-24;
- Diamond L. (1999), *Developing Democracy*, John Hopkins University Press Books.
- Dirzauskaite G. and Ilinca N.C. (2017). *Understanding Hegemony in International Relations Theories*, Aalborg University.
- Downs, G. W, Rocke, D. M., and Barsoom, P. N. (1996), *Is the Good News About Compliance Good News about International Cooperation*. *International Organization*, 50, 379-406.

- Edward W. (1973), *The Ideology of American Foreign Policy: A Paradigm of Lockean Liberalism*.
- Ekeh, P (2001) *Breakdown in Nigeria's National Consensus*, *The Guardian* (Lagos), July 2.
- Fearon J. D. (1994), *Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes*. *American Political Science Review*, 88(3), 577-592.
- Ferguson N. (2004) *A World without power* in *Foreign Policy Magazine*, July/August 2004.
- Fontana A. and Frey J.H (2005), *The Interview: From Neutral Stance to Political Involvement* in N.K denzin and Y.S Lincoln (Eds), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Sage Publication.
- Frankel J. (1968) *The Making of Foreign Policy*, London Oxford University Press.
- Friedman T. (1999), *Foreign Policy National Interest*, Anchor books USA
- <http://www.globalissue.org/geopolitics/foreignpolicy.asp>
- Gambari I.A. (1980), *Party Politics and Foreign Policies (Nigeria Under The First Republic)* Ahmadu Bello University press limited
- Gambari I.A. (1997), *Adversarial Journalism and New World Order*, A Paper Presented and Published in *Weekend Concord* Saturday September 13, 1997.
- Gambari, I. A. (1975), *Nigeria and the World: A Growing Internal Stability, Wealth, and External Influence*. *Journal of International Affairs*, 29(2), 155-169.
- Gambari, I. A. (1989), *Theory and Reality in Foreign Policy Making: Nigeria After the Second Republic*, Humanities Press International.
- Garba, J. (1987), *Diplomatic Soldiering*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books.
- Gardner, R N. (1990), *The Comeback of Liberal Internationalism*, *Washington Quarterly*, 13 (Summer), pp. 23–39.
- Gibson, H (1994), *The Road of Foreign Policy*, New York: Doubleday.

- Gimba A (2002), Letter to America Published in New Nigerian, July 16.
- Glaser C. L. (1995), Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help. *International Security*, Volume 19(3), 50-90.
- Gordon J. I. (1973), *Nigeria Internal Politics and Foreign Policy (1960 –1966)* Ibadan University Press.
- Harbeson J. W. (2000), Externally Assisted Democratization: Theoretical Issues and African Realities, in *Africa in World Politics: The African State in Flux* (John W. Harbeson & Donald Rothchild)
- Hass E. B. (1986), *Why we still need the United Nations; Collective Management of International Conflict, 1945 – 1984*, University of California Institute of International Studies, Berkeley.
- Hill C. (2003), *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*, Palgrave Macmillan UK
- Hendel C.W. (ed.) (1973), *David Hume's Political Essays*, New York : The Liberal Arts Press
- Herbst, J. (2000), *States and Power in Africa*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hoffman B. (2008), *Inside Terrorism*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.
- Holsti K..J. (1991) *Peace and War; Armed Conflicts and International Order, 1948–1989*, Cambridge University Press
- Holsti K. J. (1998), International Relations Theory and Domestic War in the Third World: the Limits of Relevance. In S. G. Neuman (Ed.), *International Relations Theory and the Third World*(pp. 103-132). Houndsmill, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan.
- Holsti, K.J (1993), *International Politics: A Framework for Analysis*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall
- Huntington, S. P. (1996), *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remarking of World Order*, The Free Press, London.

Idang J. G. (1973), *Internal Politics and Foreign Policy, 1960 -1966*, Ibadan University Press

Ihonvbere, J. O. (1991), *Nigeria as Africa's Great Power: Constraints and Prospects for the 1990s*. *International Journal*, 46, 510-535.

Ikelegbe A.O (1995),*Politics and Government: An introductory and Comparative Perspective*, Benin City, Ur Publishing Ltd.

Ikenberry G. J. (2001),*After Victory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ikenberry, G.J(2003), *American Hegemony and East Asian Order: Austrian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 58 No. 3 (2003)

Ikenberry G.J and Kupchan, C.A (1993), *Socialization and Hegemonic Power*, Published online in *International Organization*.

Itugbu,S. (2001),*Nigeria and the G[-]8*, *The Guardian (Lagos)*, Aug. 5

Izah, P.P. (1991),*Continuity and Change in Nigeria Foreign Policy*, Ahmadu Bello University Press, Zaria

Jackson, R. H. (1990),*Quasi-States: Sovereignty, International Relations and the Third World*, Cambridge University press.

Jacobson H. (1984), *Networks of Interdependence; International Organisations and the Global Political System*, Knopf, New York

Jervis R. (1997),*System Effects: Complexity in Political and Social life*, Princeton University press.

Jide O. (1995), *The New World Order and Prospects for International Understanding*, *African Journal of International Affairs and development* Vol. 1 No. 1.

- Jordan, E. (2003), The Concept of a Middle Power in International Relations: Distinguishing Between Emerging and Traditional Middle Powers. *Politikon: South African Journal of Political Studies*, 30(2), 165-181.
- Kaplan, R. D. (1994), The Coming Anarchy: How Scarcity, Crime, Overpopulation, Tribalism, and Disease are Rapidly Destroying the Social Fabric of Our Planet. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 273(2), 44-76.
- Kaplan S. (2006), West African Integration: A New Development Paradigm, *The Washington Quarterly*, 29(4), 81-97.
- Kartha, T (2009), Transnational Terrorism and Radical Extremism, *Asian Journal on Terrorism and International Affairs*, Vol. 2, No. 5, p. 33-57
- Kegley Charles and Raymond Gregory(ed) (2002), *Exercising the Ghost of Westphalia; Building World Order in the New Millennium*, Upper Saddle River, N.J. Princeton Hall.
- Kegley C. W.(ed) (1995), *Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge*, Philosophy Documentation Center, Western University, Canada
- Keneth W. T. and Roy C. M. (1995), *The Comparative Study of Foreign Policy*, Princeton University Press
- Keohane R.O (1989), *International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory*, Westview Press.
- Klingberg, F. L. (1983), *Cyclical Trends in American Foreign Policy Moods: The Unfolding of Americas World Role*, UPA Publishers
- Krauthammer, Charles (1981), Unipolar Moment, in *Journal of Foreign Affairs*, Volume 70, No 1, (Winter Edition) University of Chicago Press
- Laski H. (1981), *A Grammar of Politics*, MacMillan Publishers, Inc New York
- Lavrakas P.J. (2001), *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods; Sage Research Methods*.
- Lemke, D. (2003), African Lessons for International Relations Research. *World Politics*, Vol. 56(1), 114-138.
- Levi, W. (1979), *Contemporary International Law; A Concise Introduction*, Cow Westview Press, Boulder

- Levy J. S. (1983), *War in the Modern Great Power System, 1945–1975*, University of Kentucky Press, Lexington.
- Lloyd C.G. (1970), *Architects of Illusion: Men and Ideas in American Foreign Policy*, Chicago Quadriangle books
- Madelene A. Vital Voices Conference, Washington DC (2000)
- Madunagu E. (2001), Disappearance of Anti-Imperialism, *The Guardian*(Lagos), Aug. 9
- Mahmud S. (2001), Controlling African States' Behavior: International Relations Theory and International Sanctions. In K. C. Dunn & T. M. Shaw (Eds.), *Africa's Challenge to International Relations Theory*(pp. 129-145). Houndsmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave.
- Mbachu O. (2008), *Foreign Policy Analysis: The Nigerian Perspective*, Joyce Graphic and Publishers.
- Mbachu O. (2008), *Re-evaluating Nigeria's Strategic Interest in Africa: A Critical Analysis of Contemporary Strategic Studies*, Medusa Academic Publishers, Africa.
- Mearsheimer J. J. (2001), *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Medd R and Goldstein F(2007), *International Terrorism on the Eve of a New Millennium*, *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, Vol 20, No. 3.
- Meierding, E.(2010), *International Relations Theory as Politics, International Politics as Theory: A Nigerian Case Study*, Nigerian Foreign Policy Paper, University of Chicago 2010.
- Meierding, E. (2016), *Do Countries Fight Over Oil in The Palgrave Handbook of The International Political Economy of Energy*, Palgrave Macmillan, London
- Michael B. and Martin S. (ed) (1991), *State and Society in International Relation*, Harvester Wheat Sheaf, United Kingdom.

- Modelski G. (1962) *A Theory of Foreign Policy*, London, Pall Mall Press
- Moravcsiki A. (1997), *A Liberal Theory of International Politics*. *International Organization*, 51(4).
- Morgenthau, H. J. (1967), *Politics Among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: Knopf.
- Morgenthau H. J. (1973), *Politics Among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace* (fourth ed.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Mowle, T. and Sacko D. (2007), *The Unipolar World: an Unbalanced Future*, Palgrave Macmillan New York
- Nau R. H. (1992), *The Myth of America's Decline: Leading the world economy into the 1990s*, Oxford University Press.
- Nye S. J. (1990), *Bound To Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*, Basic Books New York.
- Ndue P.N (2007), *.Africa's Turn Toward Pluralism*, in *Global Perspectives: International Relations, U.S. Foreign Policy, and the View From Abroad* 293, 302
- Neuman, S. G. (1998), *International Relations Theory and the Third World: An Oxymoron?* In S. G. Neuman (Ed.), *International Relations Theory and the Third World* (pp. 1-29). Houndsmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan.
- Nicolson H. (1998), *Diplomacy Then and Now*, Council of Foreign Relation USA

- Norman D. P. & Howard C. P. (2001), *International Relations*, (third edition) CBS publishers and distributor, new Delhi India .
- Northedge F.S (ed.) (1968), *The Foreign Policies*, London; Faber and Faber.
- Northedge, F.S (1976), *The International Political System*, Faber and Faber
- Obi .E. (2005), *Political Economy of Nigeria*: Onitsha Book Print Ltd.
- Ofegbu, R. (1980), *Foundation Course In International Relations For African Universities*, George Allen and Unwin.
- Offiong, D. (1980), *Imperialism and Dependency Obstacles to African Development*, Fourth Dimension Publishers.
- Ogunbadejo O. (1976), *Nigeria and the Great Powers: The Impact of the Civil War on Nigerian Foreign Relations*. *African Affairs*, 75(298), 14-32.
- Ogunbadejo, O. (1979/80). *Nigeria's Foreign Policy Under Military Rule, 1966-79*. *International Journal*, 35, 748.
- Ojo .O. (1986), *Nigeria and Isreal* in Olusanya & Akindele (ed). *Nigeria's External Foreign Relations: The 1st Twenty-five Years*, Ibadan: University Press Ltd.
- Ojo O. J. B. (1980), *Nigeria and the Formation of ECOWAS*, *International Organization*, 34(4), 571-604.
- Okolo, J. E. (1988), *Morality and Realism in Nigerian Foreign Policy*. *World Affairs*, 150(2), 67-83.
- Olayiwola, A.O (2007), *Procedures in Educational Research*, Kaduna, Hanijam Publications.
- Olusanya G.O. (1986), *The Fundamentals of Nigeria's Foreign Policy and External Economic Relations*. In Olusanya & Akindele (ed) *Nigeria's External Relations: The First Twenty-five Years*, Ibadan: University Press Ltd.

Owoeye, J. (1995), Nigeria in International Institutions, Nigeria Political Science Association, College Press.(Revised Edition)

President William J. Clinton, Address to a Joint Session of the Nigerian National Assembly, (Aug. 26, 2000), available at <http://usembassy.state.gov/nigeria/wwwhclin.html>

Puchala, D. J. (1998), Third World Thinking and Contemporary International Relations. In S. G. Neuman (Ed.), International Relations Theory and the Third World(pp. 133-158). Houndsmill, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan.

Putnam, D.R (2001), Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community, Simon and Schuster Publishers.

Rapoport, A. (1986), Fights, Games and Debates, University Of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Tony S. (1990), China's Science policy in the eighties in Republic. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International, Inc.

Rice C. (2006), Introduction in US Foreign Policy in the 21st Century Foreign Policy Agenda, September 2006.

Richard C. S. (Etal) (1961), The Decision Making Approach to the Study of International Politics cited in James N. Rosenau (ed) International Politics and Foreign Policy New York, The Free Press.

Richter, P (2009), Clinton says U.S. diplomacy unlikely to end Iran nuclear program, <http://articles.latimes.com/2009/mar/03/world/fg-clinton3>

Riker, W.H. (1982), The Theory of Political Coalitions, New Haven Yale University Press.

Rodney W. (1972), How Europe Underdeveloped Africa, Harvard University Press, Washington.

Rosenau, A...J (1997), Turbulence in World Politics, Cambridge University Press.

Rousseau A.,J.(1969),Introduction to Politics and Foreign Policy, Free Press

Rourke, J.T. and Boyer, M.A. (2003), International Politics on the World Stage, Higher education, Mc Graw Hill.

Russett, B. (2004), Four Methods of Analysis and Five Revolutions, In Alex M. and Bruce R, (). New Directions for International Relations: Confronting the Method of Analysis Problem. Lanham, MD: Lexington.

Russett, B, Starr H and Kinsella D (2009), World Politics: The Menu of Choice, Wadsworth Cengage Learning, USA.

Sadan, E. (1997), Empowerment and Community Planning; Theory and Practice of People-Focused Social Solutions, Tel Aviv Hakibbillz Publishers. Israel

Saliu, H. A. (2000), Nigeria and Peace Support Operations: Trends and Policy Implications. International Peacekeeping, 7(3), 105-119.

Saliu, H. A. (Ed.)(1999), Selected themes in Nigerian Foreign Policy and International Relations; Sally and Associates, Ilorin.

Schelling J.C. (1960),The Strategy of Conflict, Cambridge, Harvard University press.

Sesay, A., and Ukeje, C. U. (1997), The Military, the West, and Nigerian Politics in the 1990s. International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society, 11(1), 25-48.

Shaw, T. M. (1983), A Problematic Power: the Debate about Nigerian Foreign Policy in the 1980s. Millennium, 12(2), 127-148.

Shaw, T. M. (1987). Nigeria Restrained: Foreign Policy under Changing Political and Petroleum Regimes. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 489, 40-50.

Slaughter, A M (2007),The Real New World Order,inGlobalization and the Challenges of a New Century, supra note 7, at 112, 118

Smith, K. (2009), Has Africa Got Anything to Say? African Contributions to Theoretical Development of International Relations. *The Round Table*, 98(402), 269-284.

Snyder, J. (1991), *Myths of Empire*. Cornell: Cornell University Press.

Starkey B. Mark A. B. and Jonathan W. (1999) *Negotiating in a Complex World; An introduction to International Negotiation* Lanham and Littlefield.

Steve S, Amelia H. and Tim D (eds), *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, 1st ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Strange, S, Still an Extraordinary Power: America's Role in a Global Monetary System, an article (1982)

Strange, S. (1987): Persistent Myth of Lost Hegemony, *International Organization* Volume 41, Issue 4, Autumn, 1987

Strange, Susan (ed) (1984), *Paths to International Political Economy*, Allen and Unwin, London.

The Guardian Newspapers, Sunday, August 9, 2009, p.3.

The Guardian Newspapers, Sunday, January 24, 2010, p.11

This Day Newspapers, Friday, February 12, 2010, p.1.

This Day Newspapers, Saturday, January 30, 2010, p.11.

Tickner A. (2003), Seeing International Relations Differently: Notes from the Third World. *Millenium*, 32, 295-324.

Touval S. (1972), *The Boundary Politics of Independent Africa*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Twaddle W. H (2000), US cherishes relations with Nigeria, Published in *New Nigerian*, May 9.

Wallerstein I. (1979), *The Capitalist World-Economy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

- Walt S. M. (1999), *Musclebound: The limits of U. S. Power*, in *Annual Editions: American Foreign Policy*; Sixth Edition 2000/2001.
- Waltz K. (1979), *Theory of International Politics*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Wayne S. and Kendall S. (2009), *International Norms and Cycles of Change*: Oxford University Press
- Wilberforce L. Hinjari, *Towards an Explanation of Nigeria Foreign Policy*, Political Science file no 194 (Faculty of Social Sciences Library, Ahmadu Bello University Zaria (unpublished).
- William A. A. (1978), *Foreign Policy and Public Opinion*, Ibadan University Press.
- Willam C. and Charles K. (1980), *International Events and the Comparative Analysis of Foreign Policy in The Analysis of Foreign Policy*, Prentice Hall.
- William M. (2011), *African Migration, Global Inequalities, and Human Rights: Connecting the Dots*, Nordiska Afrikainstitutet Publishing
- Wright S. and Okolo J.E (1999), *Nigeria: Aspirations of Regional Power*, in Wright S. (ed) *African Foreign Policies*, Colorado, Westview Press.
- Wright S. (1983), *Nigerian Foreign Policy: a Case of Dominance or Dependence?* In Shaw T. and Aluko O. (Eds.), *Nigerian Foreign Policy: Alternative Perceptions and Projections* (pp. 93-121). London: Macmillan.
- Yoroms G. J. (1993), *ECOMOG and West African Regional Security: A Nigerian Perspective*. *Issue: a Journal of Opinion*, 21(1/2), 84-91.
- Zacher M. W. (2001), *The Territorial Integrity Norm: International Boundaries and the Use of Force*. *International Organization*, 55(2), 215-250.

APPENDIX I

POPULATION OF THE STUDY

S/No	NAME	ADDRESS
1	Dr. Hakeem Baba-Ahmed	Formerly of the Department of Political Science, Usman Danfodio University Sokoto and former Permanent Secretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Abuja.
2	Dr Wayne Vaught	Department of Political Science, University of Missouri, Kansas City USA
3	Vansin Dokken	States Department, Washington DC (Formerly of Public Affairs Section,PAS) Embassy of the United States of America, Abuja
4	Ambassador Joe Keshi	Former Nigerian Consular General in Atlanta, USA
5	Alhaji Dalhatu Isa	Ministry of Foreign Affairs Abuja
6	Mallam Adamu Jibirilla-	The Presidency, Abuja
7	Miss Chinasa Ude	Nigerian Institute of International affairs, Lagos
8	Mr John Simon	National Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies, Kuru, Jos
9	Mary Johnson	The embassy of the United States of America, Abuja

APPENDIX II
LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Dear Respondent,

I am a Ph.D. candidate of the Department of Political Science and International Studies, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria currently undertaking a research titled “An Assessment of the Impact of United States Hegemony on Nigerian Foreign Policy (1999 – 2015)”, as part of the requirements for the award of Ph.D in Political Science. Your opinions on the following questions are hereby sought. You are assured that this is strictly an academic exercise and your response will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Thank you

Ndasule Maji Peterx

APPENDIX III
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What do you understand by hegemony?
2. What is your opinion on American hegemony and global politics?
3. Do you see the US as a hegemon even in the face of the rise of other countries to global prominence?
4. Does US hegemonic power in any way affect other nations' foreign policies?
5. In what ways do you think the US hegemony impact on Nigerian foreign policy?
6. Do you see challenges facing American hegemony in the current global setting?

APPENDIX IV

Interview with Dr Hakeem Baba-Ahmed, Department of Political Science Usman Dan Fodio University Sokoto and former Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Abuja on 3rd April, 2012 at CODE 062 Rabah Close off Rabah Road Kaduna.

What do you understand by hegemony in global politics?

In political economy context, hegemony is used in terms of the role of a hegemonic state in providing the stability and openness of the liberal economic system. Thus, a state-centric approach to hegemony seems essential in a world with an extremely unequal distribution of power where a single powerful state controls or dominates the system. In such a definition two characteristics of a hegemonic state are important: resources and willingness. The hegemon should have sufficiently large resources to enable it to assert leadership, and it must be willing to pursue policies necessary for a stable and open economic system.

The leadership of a hegemonic state can range from benevolent to coercive. A benevolent hegemon is concerned to promote common interests with other states, and takes the lead in establishing the necessary norms for such benefits. A coercive hegemon, on the other hand, is exploitative, and its leadership serves its own interests. While liberals view hegemony in benevolent terms, then, realists portray the hegemonic state as a self-interested actor.

What is your opinion on American hegemony and global politics?

Powerful countries have always had the capacity and the desire to influence the international system of which they are a part. What is remarkable about the contemporary era is that one country that is the United States is far more influential in this regard than any other. The US is without a doubt a hegemon and has a unique potential to shape both the rules and

regulations that govern the increasingly interconnected international system, and the behaviour of the other states and non-state actors that effectively constitute it. Consequently, America's foreign and domestic policies have assumed an unprecedented prominence in the affairs of other nations and regions as they seek to accommodate, and where possible benefit from, the evolution of America's hegemony.

Do you see the US as a hegemon even in the face of the rise of other countries to global prominence?

The United States has the ability to shape the post-cold war international order and the specific norms, values and rules promoted by the international financial institutions that has been at the center of American power over the last fifty years or so. The aftermath of September 11 and America's pre-occupation with peace and security agenda, serve as salutary reminder that been a hegemony also has an enduring and potentially crucial military component not forgetting economic and social.

Although American policy toward East Asia has been and remains different to its European-oriented position, this is not to say that some parts of East Asia does not recognize America's hegemony. American hegemony not only created the general conditions within which the 'Golden Age' of capitalist development occurred across much of the world, but it also provided a permissive environment within which many of East Asia's export-oriented, frequently mercantilist regimes were able to prosper: the US provided the crucial markets which underpinned much of East Asia's post-cold war industrialization and turned a blind eye to political practices and economic structures of which it might otherwise have disapproved.

Having the foregoing at the back of your mind will help you come to terms with the fact that the US is and will remain the global hegemon for a long time to come.

Does US hegemonic power in any way affect other nations' foreign policies?

United States foreign policy is informed by a grand strategy, the present era is clearly one based on the development and application of American primacy. The pursuit of 'full spectrum dominance', or permanent, overwhelming military superiority in every sphere, the repudiation or selective use of multilateralism, and the desire to contain challenges to American hegemony are not simply characteristic of contemporary policy under Bush II, as we have seen, such ideas have been in circulation for more than a decade. It follows therefore that US domestic and foreign policy inadvertently and automatically have implications on other nations of the world. That is inevitable.

In what ways do you think the US hegemony impact on Nigerian foreign policy?

Nigerian government as always related to the United States as a strong ally and diplomatic partner and most of the time has been on the side of the United States especially in the areas of policies that America lends weight and focuses with keen interest , for example Nigerian government lent strong diplomatic support to U.S. Government counter-terrorism efforts in the aftermath of the [September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks](#). The Government of Nigeria, in its official statements, has both condemned the terrorist attacks and supported military action against the Taliban and Al Qaida. Nigeria also has played a leading role in forging an anti-terrorism consensus among states in Sub-Saharan Africa. An estimated one million Nigerians

and Nigerian Americans live, study, and work in the United States, while over 25,000 Americans live and work in Nigeria. Nigeria is consistently a pro-America nation.

The United States has a lot of presence in Nigeria's development through direct government relationship, donor agencies and civil society. The United States is helping Nigeria make exceptional efforts to develop inclusive, transparent, and effective institutions of democratic governance. U.S. assistance helps rebuild basic mechanisms of democratic governance to make elected officials accountable to constituents through free and fair elections, strong government institutions, and well-organized, informed citizens who demand performance. The U.S. advances rule of law in Nigeria by strengthening the capacity and transparency of law enforcement agencies and judiciary. The United States supports democratic local government and decentralization and improves fiscal administration by maximizing revenue collection in credible audits. It strengthens the civil society by promoting existing watchdog groups that have lobbied successfully for more transparency, accountability, and pluralism in Nigeria's fiscal, electoral, conflict management, political, and human rights affairs.

Do you see challenges facing American hegemony in the current global setting?

Being a hegemon comes with its own challenges as you will have to stretch your budget to accommodate more than you will normally place relevance on. You have to be assertive and establish presence in all global affairs that affects or hinges on your national interest or national goal. This has increased the challenges and the perspective with which the United States view global affairs although the result of some of the interventions have not been fantastic. The areas where the US has intervened most directly and enjoyed the greatest dominance is the Middle East, Central and South America and they have also been the most troubled and unstable. It is

becoming painfully clear that utilizing America's undoubted power is a good deal more complex than the ideologically driven views of the Neo-conservatives strategists would have us believe.

APPENDIX V

Interview with Ambassador Joe Keshi, Former Nigeria's Consular General in Atlanta USA at the Cabinet Secretariat Abuja on 19th April, 2012.

What do you understand by hegemony in global politics?

To me when we are talking about hegemony either in diplomacy or political science, we are talking about 'Power'. The power of nations to influence others in the International system to dance to your tune, to influence and mobilize support for the attainment of your national interest and to be able to cajole support against all odds for endorsement of your positions in a committee of nations.

What is your opinion on American hegemony and global politics?

That America was 'hegemonic' became clear in the aftermath of the collapse of the Soviet Union as an ideological power bloc which also marks the end of the cold war, the US was revealed to be the most powerful country on the planet. However that power was measured – military, economic, political or even 'cultural' the US outstripped its rivals and dominated international affairs. Nothing has happened in the interim to change this basic position, despite widespread concerns in the 2000s about the supposed decline in America's hegemonic position. Indeed, the end of the Cold War and the US's apparent economic renaissance during the late 1990s consolidated its pre-eminent position and appeared to lock-in its dominance for the foreseeable future.

The events of September 11, and the subsequent 'war on terror' provided a dramatic reminder of both the US's continuing vulnerability, and about the extent of antipathy toward the

US generally and its foreign policy in particular thus the position of a hegemon does not take away enmity towards a nation.

Do you see the US as a hegemon even in the face of the rise of other countries to global prominence?

The United States is really a hegemon in the present global system and will be for a very long time to come. The role the United States play in global affairs now is unrivalled by any nation and the adventurous foreign policy it undertakes cannot be thrown away with the wave of the hand. There are emerging nations with global reckon like China and other nations that make up the Asian tigers, the European Union and so on but the dominance and strength of the United States as a hegemon and global police cannot be contended. I will not say we have a Unipolar global system at the end of the cold war but I will agree with the position of the United States as a hegemon in world affairs.

Does US hegemonic power in any way affect other nations' foreign policies?

First of all please pardon me to make the following statements. The specific content of American foreign policy at any given moment may reflect the work of an agency more than country structure, American foreign policy has provided an important domestic ideological coherence and underpinned a sense of national identity for an increasingly diverse population. National identity and foreign policy exist in a mutually constitutive, dialectical relationship in which in America, at least the discursive privileging of democracy occupies a central place, something which helps to account for the powerful continuities in American foreign policy from the Truman policy of containment to the Bush doctrine of pre-emption.

The foreign policy of America directly or indirectly contributes to shaping the foreign policy of other nations or at least how the nations react or positions they take in international enterprise and issues. Even nations whose system does not conform to Americas democratic tenets try to ensure acceptable human rights practice and free market thus nations try to ensure that they accommodate America's value in one or more spectrum of their national life.

In what ways do you think the US hegemony impact on Nigerian foreign policy?

Nigeria accepts international observers especially from the United States and agencies of the US government just to ensure that our democracy enjoys the endorsement of the United States. After the September 11 attack and President Bush made his landmark comment of '*you are either for us or against US*' Nigerian government pledged support on the side of the United States. Check the 2012 United States Global Leadership Report:

(The Report in brief: According to the 2012 U.S. Global Leadership Report, 77% of Nigerians approve of U.S. leadership, with 9% disapproving and 14% uncertain,

In addition: according to a 2013 BBC World Service Poll, 59% of Nigerians view U.S. influence positively, with 29% expressing a negative view. According to a 2014 Global Opinion Poll, 69% of Nigerians view the U.S. favorably.)

Nigeria is opened to the United States support for the peacekeeping and simulation centers at the Armed Forces Staff College the only one in Africa and a major regional asset and has continued to provide equipment and training for Nigerian peacekeeping forces while promoting effective civilian oversight of the military and its adherence to human rights norms.

The U.S. is through Nigeria building the capacity of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) to prevent and respond to regional instability and promote the integration of ECOWAS security mechanisms into a broad Africa framework. It is also funding military-sponsored schools, clinics and basic community services to demonstrate U.S. commitment to help build the nation's infrastructure. Beyond fostering maritime cooperation with security services in the Niger Delta, the United States supports the European Union's leading role in helping Nigeria fight corruption, organized criminal elements, document fraud, drug traffickers, and terrorists.

Do you see challenges facing American hegemony in the current global setting?

Coming to power is not as tough as remaining in power as you poise a challenge to every other nation/person. Although the Soviet Union has disintegrated, Russia is not down and out. Nations are forming alliances, Asian countries like China are becoming nations of reckon globally and others are rising too. America will remain a hegemon for a very long time but gaining a Unipolar status is not feasible, not in the foreseeable future.

APPENDIX VI

Interview with Dalhatu Isa, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Abuja on 11th June 2012 at the Ministry of Foreign affairs Abuja.

What do you understand by hegemony in global politics?

Power and Influence, the world hegemony became popular in the early 90s just as the USSR was crumbling. Political Scientist were not convinced that the collapse of bi-polarity automatically brought about unipolarity, there is a consensus to the strength of the United States, there is a consensus that the USSR was collapsing in the presence of its arch enemy the US but political scientist didn't unanimously agree that the end of the cold war created a unipolar world with the US as the only super power. There are other nations emerging as super powers in other spheres. The word hegemon was popularized to describe the United States position in global affairs.

What is your opinion on American hegemony and global politics?

United States is a hegemon in global affairs; the influence of the United States is felt in every corner of the globe. The positions of the United States on issues even in the United Nations is a position that cannot be pushed away by other nations because of the influence it weighs, no nation wants to draw the battle line with the United States not even Russia who led the former adversaries.

American position in global political issues is almost a law although nations diplomatically push their own positions to further their national interest, no nation wants to take a position of confrontation against the United States.

Do you see the US as a hegemon even in the face of the rise of other countries to global prominence?

Other nations are rising and are forming alliances the strength of the European Union cannot be under rated, the emergence of the BRIC nations is another possible strong alliance, the Asian tigers and the economic strength of China is a force to reckon with globally but American still has a towering image that dwarfs all of the nations and alliances when it comes to the position of power and influence. Political scientist will not agree that United States is a sole Super Power but they will not refute its position as a hegemon.

Does US hegemonic power in any way affect other nations' foreign policies?

I believe it does because nations are careful in the positions they take where US interest is concerned. The UN is always on the side of the United States, the US single handedly refused Boutros Boutros-Ghali a second term as UN Secretary General. Nations are always joining allied forces led by the US to fight wars they do not believe in. No nation took a stand against the invasion of Iraq etc despite the obvious reason for the invasion, despite nations didn't see the truth in America's assertion or convinced by the need.

I strongly see the effect of America's hegemony in the foreign policy of nations as it concerns not just global affairs but even domestic.

In what ways do you think the US hegemony impact on Nigerian foreign policy?

The impact of United States hegemony can be seen in Nigeria's policies in areas of Human Rights, Democracy, Free Market, Freedoms etc an analysis of the foreign policies of the United

States and Nigeria is revealing with the plethora of deficiencies observed in both. Even though both countries practice the Presidential system of government and have capitalist economies, they adopt markedly different approaches to the pursuit of their national interests. For whereas the mechanism of checks built into the U.S system of government ensures that U.S foreign policy is citizen-centric, the same cannot be said of Nigerian Foreign Policy. Nevertheless, a good government at home doesn't guarantee the efficacy of foreign policies abroad. While the U.S. remains highly influential in the world and many consider it to be the world's only remaining superpower, its dominance, especially in economic matters, is being challenged by the European Union and developing powers such as the BRIC nations.

Do you see challenges facing American hegemony in the current global setting?

No nation can control the others forever. At a point in history it was Britain then Germany but today the story is different. Other nations are not sleeping, Russia is not sleeping, China is not sleeping, Japan is not sleeping. Definitely nations will rise to challenge the position of US hegemony, it is just a matter of time.

APPENDIX VII

Interview with Mr Jibirilla Adamu, The Presidency, Abuja on 11th June 2012 at Rockview Hotel Abuja.

1. What do you understand by hegemony?

This word hegemony is often confused with empire and frequently appears with such ancillary words as imperial, imperialist, and so on, as if they all meant the same thing. Of course, they can be made to mean the same thing. I argue that the main thrust of contemporary world politics is the result of the particular hegemony exercised by American society in the rest of the world through the agency of both the U.S. government and a wide range of other institutions, corporate, philanthropic, and inter-governmental whose basic structures and norms are those of the marketplace society that developed in the United States in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Hegemony, therefore, is more than the simple domination implied when it is equated with empire or, as in other conventional accounts, when it is seen simply as the identity of a dominant state without inquiring into the nature of that identity and how it affects that state's relationships with others.

2. What is your opinion on American hegemony and global politics?

The major themes regarding the history of U.S. foreign policy from the American Revolution to the present are isolationism in the nineteenth century and global hegemony in the twentieth. Still U.S. foreign policy is characterized by a commitment to free trade, protection of American interests, and a concern for human rights. In the twenty-first century, U.S. influence remains strong but, in relative terms, is declining in terms of economic output compared to rising nations such as China, India, Russia, Brazil, and the newly consolidated European Union. Substantial

problems remain, such as climate change, nuclear proliferation, and the specter of nuclear terrorism.

Having said that in my opinion, one of the most common ways of addressing American influence today is to refer to the United States as an actual or incipient “empire.” With the disappearance of the Soviet Union as a competing superpower, the U.S. government certainly seems to have no peer. Indeed, particularly since September 11, 2001, the U. S. government has confronted the rest of the world with its hegemonic power. But the term empire usually implies much more than this. It implies a high degree of territorial organization, effective centralized power, and a directing intelligence. These traits do not seem to match the ways that an essentially improvising American government currently relates to the rest of the world.

In my usage therefore hegemony is the enrollment of others in the exercise of your power by convincing, cajoling, and coercing them that they should want what you want. Though never complete and often resisted, it represents the binding together of people, objects, and institutions around cultural norms and standards that emanate over time and space from seats of power (that have discrete locations) occupied by authoritative actors. Hegemony is not, therefore, simply the exercise of raw military, economic, and political power by the latest in a long line of “hegemons” as if the exercise of power had remained unchanged through the centuries.

3. Do you see the US as a hegemon even in the face of the rise of other countries to global prominence?

My answer to that question is yes in view of my argument to the previous question. This is more so when you consider the fact that globalization is a hegemonic project intimately connected to the geopolitical calculation of the U.S. government and economic interests during

the Cold War and to the incorporation of the entire world into its grip in the years since the demise of the Communist project in the former Soviet Union and China by a myriad of U.S.-based agents.

4. Does US hegemonic power in any way affect other nations' foreign policies?

Once again my response to that can be gleaned from my position earlier that of contemporary world politics is the result of the particular hegemony exercised by American society in the rest of the world through the agency of both the U.S. government and a wide range of other institutions, corporate, philanthropic, and inter-governmental whose basic structures and norms are those of the marketplace society that developed in the United States in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

5. In what ways do you think the US hegemony impact on Nigerian foreign policy?

With regards to hegemony, it is my opinion that Nigeria has been extraordinarily naive by restricting its foreign policy to Africa as its cornerstone. It was a laudable goal before the 1990s, but its evolution is needed for Nigeria to meet the needs of today's diplomacy as we move into the new world. Africa as the centerpiece of Nigeria's foreign policy no longer suffices; a broader perspective is necessary. Although Nigeria hasn't got the means and might to have a global foreign policy, it endeavours to take more into consideration of current trends in international relations and diplomacy such as globalization, human rights, and democracy. This is as a result of the hegemonic influence of the United States.

Consequently the Nigerian government has lent strong diplomatic support to the US Government counter-terrorism efforts in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 attacks. The Government of Nigeria, in its official statements, has both condemned the terrorist attacks as

well as supported military action against the Taliban and Al-Qaeda. Between 2007 and 2012, Nigeria has played a leading role in forging an anti-terrorism consensus among states in Sub-Saharan Africa. One can therefore argue that US hegemonic role in global politics significantly determines Nigeria's terrorism policy internally and externally.

6. Do you see challenges facing American hegemony in the current global setting?

The foreign policy of the United States is the policy by which the United States interacts with foreign nations. While the U.S. remains highly influential in the world and many consider it to be the world's only remaining superpower, its dominance, especially in economic matters, is being challenged by the European Union and developing powers such as China, India, Russia and Brazil. The United States budget for security and military is unequalled the world over and that will ensure its military and political domination of other countries.

APPENDIX VIII

Interview with Chinasa Ude, Nigeria Institute of International Affairs on 28th June, 2012 at the Nigeria Institute of International Affairs Lagos.

1. What do you understand by hegemony?

Hegemony is from a Greek word signifying domination or leadership, particularly of a state or nation in a league or confederation, but without clear commitment to whether this is the result of coercion, consensus, or a mix of the two. Hegemony is simply the relatively unconstrained coercive power exercised by a hegemon. The word “hegemony” is therefore also a purported solution to the dilemma of either singular economic or cultural determination by positing an “integral form of class rule which exists not only in political and economic institutions and relationships but also in active forms of experience and consciousness

2. What is your opinion on American hegemony and global politics?

Since the end of the Cold War, the United States has acquired a dominant global military position as far as military spending is concerned. Furthermore US leadership can be seen in a world in need of public goods direction on issues of global importance, a global currency, global enforcement of norms of conduct, intervention on behalf of human rights, etc. that can only be provided by the last remaining superpower. From this point of view, the United States has tended to favor soft over hard power in a world that is culturally pluralistic and politically fragmented. In this respect it differs fundamentally from previous “hegemons” in that it depends upon soft power. This goes back to the essentially liberal image that the U.S. government claims to have of its role in world order, in which the absence of spontaneous international collective action

requires a leader willing to take on the task of organizing international institutions and agreements.

3. Do you see the US as a hegemon even in the face of the rise of other countries to global prominence?

To a large extent, yes. This is in view of contemporary discussions of the US role in the world which insist that the United States is either simply just “another state” (albeit a bigger, more powerful one) or super state, by stretching the manifestly territorial meaning of “super state” to include non-territorial influence and control. The present day is often considered the time of “globalization” to signal the rise of actors (multinational firms, global nongovernmental organizations [NGOs], international institutions, etc.) and processes of development (globalized financial markets, global commodity chains, etc.) that cannot be linked to a single territorial address. Second, this world has not been brought about predominantly through direct coercion or by territorial rule, but rather through socio-economic incorporation into practices and routines derivative of or compatible with those first developed in the United States. The best word to describe these processes is “hegemony.”

4. Does US hegemonic power in any way affect other nations’ foreign policies?

Naturally yes. This is so because the costs and benefits of hegemony need placing in the context of the times. States and other actors in world politics are increasingly part of global arrangements that point beyond both US hegemony and Super State. The world economy today is truly global to a degree never seen before in its geographical scope, in the pace of transactions between widely scattered places within it, and in its hollowing out of simple territorial forms of

political authority across a wide range of issue domains (economic, social, and political). It has become so in this way, I argue, because of the nature of US hegemony.

Using the example of currencies, the United States has encouraged the use of the U.S. dollar in world trade and finance since the collapse of the Bretton Woods system in the early 1970s. The U.S. government, insofar as it can influence the Federal Reserve (the U.S. central bank), can use its currency to manipulate the world economy to benefit its producers and consumers. In these ways and so many others, the US can use its position to influence other countries' policies domestically and internationally.

5. In what ways do you think the US hegemony impact on Nigerian foreign policy?

Well by its control over military hardware, economy and other essential elements of power, I am of the view that the US hegemonic influence in global politics has a lot to do with Nigerian foreign policy.

For centuries, United States foreign policy has been outwardly characterized by its diplomatic and economic encouragement of fledging democracies around the world. In particular, the nations of Africa and particularly Nigeria are seen to benefit from America's idealistic foreign Agenda. It should however be noted that few foreign political actions are based entirely on good will; they are more often rooted in prudence and rationality. Although promoting democracy may be a sufficient national interest in and of itself, such idealistic abstraction is usually augmented by more concrete or material considerations. This is certainly true for the United States' interest in relations with Nigeria. There are a plethora of cultural, historical and political reasons why Nigeria has been important to the U.S. These range from population, oil, resource and strategic geographic importance. Nigeria's colonial history left

behind external economic relations policy that was closely linked with the west. This continued to have profound impact on the country's external behaviour even after independence on 1st October, 1960. Therefore, The Nigerian foreign policy between 1960–1966 was politically and economically aligned (in spite of the non-alignment principle) to the west especially Britain and America.

My conclusion on this is that it is evident that America had a profound security, political, and economic interest in Africa and Nigeria as a regional power was seen as bellwether nation in the period under study. This explains the warm economic and military relations between the two nations.

APPENDIX IX

Interview with John Simon, National Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS), Kuru- Jos on 31st October and 1st November, 2012 at the National Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies Kuru.

What do you understand by hegemony in global politics?

Hegemony in simple terms is talking about the position of influence a nation occupies in relating to other nations. Hegemony is possible because of globalization, nations are breaking barriers and expanding their borders by fusing into organizations and unions making the world a global village as if moving towards a one government world and that is when hegemony has relevance. If nations stay on their own as independent entities the position of hegemon will not be relevant but since nations has agreed and have signed conventions and protocols like in the United Nations (UN), European Union (EU), African Union (AU) etc then the position of power becomes relevant because nations have different national interests.

What is your opinion on American hegemony and global politics?

America is today the most powerful nation on earth, it has hegemony in global politics. We cannot say that years back during the cold war because the Soviet Union were still a power block that checks America in global issues but since the end of the Cold War and the introduction of Perestroika the Soviet Union just fizzled out and American remain the nation with the greatest influence in global affairs and this can be seen in America's position in the UN, in decision making in the security council and in using their veto power.

Do you see the US as a hegemon even in the face of the rise of other countries to global prominence?

Countries like China, Japan, Iran, Russia etc are rising. China is a world economic power, Iran and Russia can be termed as having military might but America is a superior power because even in areas where these other nations have influence America cannot be subdued and these countries cannot withstand America in global issues and intervention for world peace. America is a hegemon and has great influence the world over.

Does US hegemonic power in any way affect other nations' foreign policies?

Countries outline their foreign policies to promote their varied national interest, like it is always said 'Nations have permanent Interest but not permanent friends', so nations can have their foreign policy conceptualized as it pleases them especially on domestic affairs but when it comes to the international arena you have to give consideration to powerful countries like America and on that ground I believe America's hegemony has influence on foreign policies of other nations. No nation will take a position against America's interest except if that position is completely against the interest of that nation and will affect growth and development, even when America takes a stand on issues that contradicts the believes of others most nations are silent on the issues but definitely not taking positions against the United States as we have seen with the gay issue. Despite it is against the value of Nigeria as a nation our government still did not take a position that will jeopardize our relationship with the United States.

In what ways do you think the US hegemony impact on Nigerian foreign policy?

There is no one document that can be picked like a book and referred to as Nigeria Foreign Policy, our foreign policy is in the hands of the executives and the lead executing agency is the ministry of foreign affairs. Most people who are shouldered with the responsibilities of foreign policy formulation and execution are participants or alumnus of the institute (NIPSS) and you can tell people's disposition from their positions in a conversation. The truth is America is a nation of significant importance and interest to Nigeria. Since independence and irrespective of the government Nigeria has always wanted to maintain cordial relationship with the United States although there are times when the relationship was not as cordial as with other administration and times but the fact still remains Nigeria always make policies that the United States is disposed towards, so it can be said that America's hegemony impacts Nigerian foreign policy.

Do you see challenges facing American hegemony in the current global setting?

Russia, China, France, Britain, Germany will not keep quiet in the face of an American intimidation. America is a hegemon but it cannot over ride other countries without consideration for their interest and might. There are nations that will challenge America's hegemonic position and will go all the way and even Iran will not be shoved around by the US.

APPENDIX X

Interview with Dr Wayne Vaught, Department of Political Science, University of Missouri, Kansas City on 20th August, 2012 at the Post Graduate students lounge UMKC Missouri.

(Before we even settle down Dr Wayne said ‘I have seen your questions and I will just talk about it generally without really taking them one at a time’. Let’s just discuss and learn from each other).

Below is the summary of points he raised.

In political science hegemony is looked at from the perspective of power, influence and dominance.

If you are thinking that America has that kind of power in its relation with other nations either bilaterally, in a committee of nations or elsewhere, I will not agree with you. I am an American and I should know, America has been involved in operations to keep peace and respect for human rights in quite a number of nations in the world, America has spent millions of tax payers money to help other nations but what did we get in return? How many times have we had a smooth sail in pushing a position in the United Nations? How many nations has stopped their nuclear armament because America asked them to? How many innocent people have died because of terrorist attack? How secured are we as a nation? And you think we are that powerful and we are a hegemon?

I think your country Nigeria is even more a hegemon than America even if it is just within the African continent. You have led successful peace keeping operations in Sierra Leone and Liberia, you have led successful interventions in Togo and Ivory Coast, that’s influence. Can the same be said about America?

No nation formulates its foreign policy with the United States interest at heart, no nation considers what the United States wants or do not in its foreign policy pursuit, no nation takes the side of the US in global issues unless it is beneficial to them and you consider the United States a hegemon? The US I believe enjoy a stronger position of influence during the cold war, the disintegration of the communist republic took with it some America's influence and with globalization most countries now pursue inter personal relations that are economically beneficial to them and that is why China is in every discussion. The European Union is building a global market system that is beneficial to nations in Europe, other nations are forming alliances that will benefit them. How many alliances are the US engaged in, in recent years? What is the economic benefit of NATO to the people of the United States?

Nations are just been political by referring to America either as a hegemon or super power. What the end of the cold war heralded is multiple bases of power and no one nation has it all. China is an emerging economic power, Russia still has its military might, Japan is a technological power, India too, nations of Africa like Nigeria are resource powers too if well harnessed.

What has placed Third world countries especially in Africa at a disadvantage is leadership, third world countries need a renaissance, they need a new crop of purposeful leaders that will take them out of this state they are in at the moment and the greatest challenge they need to contend with is corruption.

Look around the United States there are so many people from these countries we refer to as under developed doing very well in their chosen fields; sports, medicine, ICT, Academics, business you name it. How many of them are willing to return to their countries and invest the same time and energy? None, why? Because the systems are not working, the environment is not

conducive, the government has not created an environment where creativity will thrive and that is the difference. America is not perfect but we have systems that work and people are allowed to explore their full potentials and earn a legitimate living.

APPENDIX XI

Interview with Vansin Dokken, States Department, Washington DC (Formerly of Public Affairs Section, PAS) Embassy of the United States of America, Abuja on 17th July, 2012 at Silver Spring Washington DC.

What do you understand by hegemony in global politics?

Hegemony refers to power, influence, control and dominance by a group or nations over others and over the affairs of others

What is your opinion on American hegemony and global politics?

America is not a hegemon and has no intention or desire to be. America believes in the equality of states, people and races and will never aspire to dominate others. We believe in the universality of rights and believe all nations should enjoy their sovereignty and should be allowed and respected to function as such.

Do you see the US as a hegemon even in the face of the rise of other countries to global prominence?

America's desire is to create an enabling environment for every nation and people to thrive and develop. We are spending millions of dollars on climatic change and global warming because we believe everybody and every nation should live and enjoy life to its fullest. America will never hinder the growth of any nation and we are not interested in dominating any country rather we want to see countries develop so that their citizens will live a better life. That is what the US is known for and that is why our country attracts people of all races and faith and they enjoy a non-discriminatory environment that allows them to thrive.

Does US hegemonic power in any way affect other nations' foreign policies?

United States does not affect or influence the foreign policy of other nations. America respects sovereignty and will not interfere in the internal affairs of another country.

In what ways do you think the US hegemony impact on Nigerian foreign policy?

The United States will not interfere in the internal affairs of other nations and will not disrespect the sovereignty of any nation. The United States enjoy cordial diplomatic relationship with Nigeria respects Nigeria and will continue to respect the internal policies of Nigeria as a sovereign state.

Do you see challenges facing American hegemony in the current global setting?

I don't see America as a hegemon. We are a nation that relates with every nation, that respects fundamental human rights thus the issue of challenges to American hegemony does not arise. America does not have an expansionist tendency and does not want to dominate any nation, we want to work together with all nations to promote causes that will benefit humanity.

APPENDIX XII

Discussion with Mary Johnson, Embassy of The United States of America, Abuja on 16th January, 2013 at Bolingo hotel, Abuja.

America is a nation that is open to everyone irrespective of race, faith or sexuality. We want to be on friendly terms with all the nations of the earth but it has come with its own challenges.

America will want to see a world where there is respect for the fundamental rights of all creation, where democracy is enthroned so that citizens will have a say in things that affect them like choice of leadership, America will want to see a free world and a free market economy where hard work pays but that is not to say that everything is perfect in America, we really hope that things are perfect in the United States like I always hear people say but things are not as everyone thinks, we have our own internal struggles just like every nation on earth.

America does not have a policy of expansionism neither do we want to dominate the world, we want people to be free and that is a position America always stands by, freedom for all and sundry. We are not a hegemon and has no desire to be but we will rise to defend weaker nations when their sovereignty is been violated.

America will always stand on the side of the truth and will support nations to explore their potentials and reduce poverty and promote good practice and respect for the rights of others.