

TITLE PAGE

**DOMESTIC STRUCTURE AND CONDUCT OF NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY, A
CASE STUDY OF GOODLUCK JONATHAN'S REGIME (2010-2015)**

BY

ENE ELIZABETH NNEAMAKA

U14/MSS/IRE/005

**A RESEARCH SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS GODFREY OKOYE UNIVERSITY ENUGU
STATE, IN PARTIAL FUFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD
OF THE BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (B.SC HONORS) DEGREE IN
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.**

JULY, 2018

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this project is based on study done by me in the department of Political Science and International Relations, Godfrey Okoye University, Enugu State. In partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of a degree of BSC in International Relations, under the supervision of Mr. Tony Onyishi.

This project work has not been submitted elsewhere for a degree award. Its ideas and reviews are product of research conducted by me and where other ideas by authors or researchers were expressed have been duly acknowledged.

Signature.....

Date.....

CERTIFICATION

It is hereby certified that this research project written by Ene Elizabeth Nneamaka was supervised by me and was submitted to the Department of Political Science and International Relations, Godfrey Okoye University, Enugu State.

Mr. Tony Onyishi

.....

Supervisor's Name

Signature

and Date

Mr. W.O. Okonkwo

.....

Head of Department

Signature and

Date

Prof. Onyema Ocheoha. (mni); Ph.D.

.....

Dean, Management and Social Sciences

Signature and Date

DEDICATION

This project is dedicated to the Almighty God. I also wish to dedicate this project to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Emmanuel Ene Nwosibe with whose support I have come this far, I love you so much mum and dad I wouldn't wish for better parents cause you are the best.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am expressing my gratitude to God Almighty for his guidance, protection, help, favour, journey mercies and grace in the commencement and completion of this project. I give Him all the glory and praise.

My sincere gratitude to the Vice Chancellor, Rev Fr. Prof Christian Anieke for his life-shaping teachings; and the Head of Department of Political Science and International Relations Mr. Okonkwo W.O..

I sincerely wish to thank my supervisor, Mr. Tony Onyishi for his dedication, patience and for correcting my mistakes, to all my lecturers, who in a number of ways have been there for me since the beginning of this academic sojourn, Mr. Okonkwo W.O, Mr. Netchy Mbaeze, Prof Onyema Ocheoha, Fr. Ogbuka, and Mr. Rowland Okoli.

To my parents Mr. and Mrs. Emmanuel Ene Nwosibe for their never ending love, care advice, support, prayers and encouragement, for being there and following me up since I began this work. I want to appreciate

my siblings Evelyn Ijedinma, Irene, Emmanuel, Victory, David, Amblessed, Treasure and Praise Ene for their love, support, for being a source of encouragement and inspiration to me. My gratitude also goes to Pastor Chikeleze Francis Okey, Mummy Chineye Goldy. I as well wish to thank my Uncle Nnaemeka and Ogochukwu for their help and support. To David Duru, Emeka Chidozie and Amarachi Udeani who would always tell me to do my work and do it well, to Offiong Aniebiet Bassey, Mondada all my friends and everyone who helped in the course of this academic sojourn. God bless you all and thank you very much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page	i
Declaration	ii
Certification	iii
Dedication	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Abstract	vii
Table of Contents	viii

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

1

1.2 Statement of the Problem

8

1.3 Objectives of the Study	9
1.4 Research Questions	10
1.5 Research Hypotheses	10
1.6 Significance of the Study	10
1.7 Scope of the Study	11
1.8 Limitations of the Study	11
1.9 Conceptualization of terms	13
1.10 Organization of Study	13

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction	14
2.1 Foreign Policy	21
2.1.1 Principles of Foreign Policy	22
2.1.2 Components and Factors of Foreign Policy	22
2.1.3 Instruments for conducting Foreign Policy	24
2.2 Foreign Policy and Domestic Policy	25

2.3 Relationship between Foreign Policy and Domestic Politics	
27	
2.4 Nigeria at Independence: Vision behind Foreign Policy	
31	
2.5 A Historical Overview of Nigeria's Foreign Policy	32
2.5.1 First Republic Nigeria Foreign Policy	
32	
2.5.2 Second Republic Nigeria Foreign Policy	35
2.5.3 Military Era and Nigeria's Foreign Policy	36
2.5.4 Nigeria's Foreign Policy under Obasanjo's Administration (1999-2007)	
41	
2.5.5 Nigeria's Foreign Policy under Yaradua's Administration (2007-2010)	
45	
CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY	
3.0 Introduction	47
3.1 Theoretical Framework	47
3.1.1 Application of the theory of Realism to the Research	
49	
3.2 Research Design	
50	
3.3 Method of Data Collection	50
3.4 Method of Data Analysis	
50	

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.0 Introduction	51
4.1 Nigeria's Foreign Policy under Goodluck Jonathan's administration (2010-2015)	52
4.2 Political Leadership's Character and its impact on Nigeria's Foreign Policy	54
4.3 Influence of Domestic Politics on Nigeria's Foreign Policy under Goodluck Jonathan's administration	58
4.3.1 Regional Democracy and Diplomacy	59
4.3.2 Strategic Partnership and Economic Diplomacy	61
4.3.3 Nigeria's International Image and Respect	63
4.3.4 Relationship with Great Powers	64

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.0 Introduction	66
5.1 Summary	66
5.2 Conclusion	68
5.3 Recommendation	69
Bibliography	

ABSTRACT

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

The research was carried out on the Domestic structure and conduct of Nigeria's Foreign Policy and a Case study method was adopted under Goodluck Jonathan administration (2010-2015). The review of literature on foreign policy and other related material and the adoption of "Realist Theory" which is anchored on interest led us to the conclusion that Nigeria's seeming inaction during the period of study was an acknowledgement of the limits of its power. Against this background the study concludes that Nigeria's foreign policy has since independence been consistently guided by the same principles and objectives. Nigeria's Foreign Policy initiatives and actions have been defined by one firm and constant variable, i.e. the protection of the country's national interest. As a recommendation, the study recommended, above all, that Nigeria must involve a "home grown" economic policy and honestly abide by its implementation.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

The foreign policy of nations differs from state to state. One of the main evidence of states independence is the capacity and ability to conduct an independent foreign policy. Nations attempt to achieve different goals and objectives in governing their sovereign entities, some of these goals can be achieved by nations on their own while some others can only be achieved with the help and cooperation of similar entities or political units beyond their own borders.

Foreign policy, to a great extent determines state to state interactions

and relations. Folarin (2014) refers foreign policy to a wedding ring with which the domestic context of a nation solemnizes its union with the international community. Nigeria's foreign policy is mainly "afro centric". Adetula and Ashiwaju (2011) assert that the centrality of foreign policy in states international relations cannot be over emphasized; in other words, it is through foreign policy that a nation is able to make known its appearance in the global state to other nations of the world as an independent state. Through foreign policy too, a state can also establish its national identity and as well promote other national symbols. Foreign policy also provides a means through which states are able to identify their friends, establish and cultivate friendship with other nations of the world. The foreign policy of a nation is a reflection of its domestic demands, needs and aspirations.

A study in Nigeria's Foreign Policy overtime has quite often emphasized the dominance of its domestic contents. The influence of Domestic Structures on Nigeria's Foreign Policy was made obvious to the international community on 1st October, 1960 by the then Prime Minister Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa in an address to the United Nations General Assembly in New York. He announced that; Nigeria does not intend to ally itself with any of the ideological power blocs

and Nigeria hopes to work with other states for the Progress of Africa as well as to assist in bringing all other African territories to a state of Independence.

It was assumed that Nigeria would play a leading role in the continent of Africa given the domestic nature, country's size and natural resources. Otubanjo, (1989) argued that Nigeria by virtue of her large size, huge population and rich natural endowment has always been expected to play a leading role in international African Politics. Nigeria's foreign policy is to a large extent is a product of myriad forces and factors which influence and affects the choices of foreign policy decision makers. Domestic factors usually reflect in the international arena and the external forces as well have repercussions on the domestic scene. Thus, the relationship is Dynamic (Irene, 2010).

Abubakar, O.S reviewing Gambari said that; the first phase of Nigerian Foreign Policy which was in itself one of uncertainty and timidity coincided with the period of the first republic (1960-1965). the major issue during this period was the official foreign policy declaration itself; the Anglo Nigerian Defense Pact, the Congo Crisis and African Unity, the Rhodesian Crisis, the Arab Israeli antagonism and the search

for a cohesive policy towards the Middle East. Nigeria operated a Pro-western Foreign Policy disposition throughout this period. The conservative nature in her foreign and external relations was dictated by Nigerian Federalism which professes three strong regions with a weak centre. Prime Minister Tafawa Balewa at that time had a constitutional authority which was not always matched by the political power needed to override these divergent groups impingement on Nigeria's foreign policy.

Nigeria's foreign policy was far more assertive, neutralist and Pan-Africanist during this period (1960-1965). The need to adjust in order to accommodate the contrasting views of governing parties sometimes made Balewa's foreign policy answerable to criticisms such as lacking in consistent imagination and dynamism and characterized by Ad-hoc decision making which tended to be contradictory and self-defeating.

The second phase of Nigerian Foreign Policy was the period between 1966-1975, under which a lot of changes took place at the domestic political level. The Nigerian foreign and external relation was marked by active, positive and influential roles especially in the African Continent. The fragile nature of federalism was replaced by a stronger centre with

12 states and the federating unit at the centre. The military rule under General Yakubu Gowon drastically changed the dimension of Domestic Politics and Nigeria's Foreign Policy.

The discovery of oil boom as well helped in allowing the country play a more decisive leadership role in World affairs, as it increased the revenue accruing to the federal government. The aftermath of the Biafra war experience was also instructive as the country came up with a coherent policy to her fellow African countries. The integrative efforts of Gowon with the formation of ECOWAS and the financial and moral assistance to neighboring West African nations were remarkable. The country played a frontline role in South Africa problems by increasing financial and other assistance to the liberation movement there. Gowon's active role in Africa earned the country the chairmanship of OAU.

A drastic shift of foreign policy position was achieved under the General Murtala/Obasanjo regime. This administration's foreign policy posture was characterized by dynamism as the regime sought to move the country's foreign policy to a more truly non-aligned position. The administration's bold move to recognize MPLA in Angola and the

memorable speech to the OAU extraordinary summit conference at Addis Ababa in January, 1976 remains a remarkable turning point.

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

There was recourse to the old order of passive and reactionary posture

in Nigerian Foreign Policy as manifested in the country's policy on the Chadian Crisis, OAU and ECOWAS. It was the lack of focus and inability of the regime to respond to the various domestic demands that precipitated the collapse of the 2nd Republic with the overthrow of the government by the Buhari led military Junta in December, 1983. The coming to power of this administration was very much welcomed by the Nigerian public. This was largely due to the total disaster of the Shagari administration. The new government was well received more so as it claimed to have been the offshoot of Murtala administration. The administration came with the purpose of restructuring and bringing the economy back to sound footing. It also vigorously sought to institutionalize a new ethic of National leadership based on discipline, public accountability and integrity. Buhari's anti - West Posture was remarkable, as it demonstrated its autonomy and status in decision making. Nigeria's diplomatic relations with such powers as United States and United Kingdom became ruptured. In all these instances, Nigeria demonstrated to the rest of the World that she was not ready to take insults or directive from any country big or small, the regime at the end suffered "Support Erosion" with its human right abuses, a situation which made it easy for it to be overthrown.

The Babangida government that succeeded the Buhari regime was described as a Liberal/benevolent military regime especially at its infancy. The administration like its predecessor was committed to economic restructuring which informed its choice of the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP). The programme had adverse effects on the life of Nigerians, and as expected had serious implications on the country's external relations. The regime's handling of the bombing of Libya by the USA was heavily criticized so also was the regime's OIC policy which almost precipitated serious internal upheaval. It was apparent that the government under the guise of economic diplomacy succeeded in playing into the hands of the Western powers as its economic programme could be said to be anything but humane. The failure of Babangida to respect the peoples mandate with the annulment of the June 12 Presidential elections result, after endless political transition led to the demise of the regime.

During the Abacha regime, development between China and Nigeria was one of the most prominent aspects of the shift in Nigeria's foreign policy. At this time Nigeria and China entered into different agreements, which allowed China to become involved in oil production, refurbishment of the long – neglected Nigeria Railway Corporation, the

dredging of Seaports at Calabar and Warri and the development of Mass – housing projects. Abacha's foreign policy thrust shifted to Asia, failing to realize that in a globalized world, aligning Nigeria with Asia alone is inadequate. The political heat from both home and abroad continued until Abacha died on 8th June, 1998.

Following the death of Abacha, General Abubakar Abdulsalam (rtd) took over as the Head of State of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. He succeeded in conducting a peaceful, free and fair election that finally brought Olusegun Obasanjo as the President and Commander-in-Chief of the Nigerian Armed Forces on May 29, 1999. The foreign policy during Obasanjo's administration was expected to end the hostile and unfriendly foreign policy outlook of the Babangida and Abacha military regimes and unite the re-integrative efforts of the preceding Abubakar regime.

President Yaradua that took over from Obasanjo in 2007 was more on a slow pace and not interested to pursue foreign policy with as much vigor as that of his predecessor (Irene, 2010, Adefolarin, 2014).

Goodluck Jonathan foreign policy under democratic rule has been underlined by Nigeria's return to a place of prestige in the International

Community. Particularly of interest in this research is the influence of domestic politics on Nigeria's foreign policy under Goodluck Jonathan Civilian administration (2010 – 2015). The foreign policy analysis shows the values of the linkages as an explanatory example for understanding Nigeria's foreign policy in the Fourth Republic, particularly under Goodluck Jonathan's administration (2010-2015).

12 Statement of Problem

This study examines the issue of Domestic structures and its influence on Nigerian Foreign Policy as well as how the character of the political leadership affects the Foreign Policy of Nigeria particularly under the Jonathan administration.

The goal of every foreign policy is to maintain a cordial relationship with other nations of the world and also build a good image for a nation in order to meet and achieve its national and domestic interest. Nigeria since May 29th, 1999 at the start of the Fourth Republic civilian rule has enjoyed 15 years of unbroken democratic process; given the fact that Goodluck Jonathan's administration was unable to combat the Boko-haram menace effectively following US refusal to sell arms to Nigeria this has seriously undermined Nigeria's Foreign Policy under

the Jonathan administration. It is therefore coherent to examine the influence domestic structures had on Nigeria's foreign policy outlook in Jonathan's regime (2010-2015).

1.3 Research Questions

1. Does the character of the political leadership affect Nigeria's Foreign Policy?
2. How has Domestic structure influenced Nigeria's Foreign Policy under Goodluck Jonathan's administration?

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The research is aimed at achieving the following objectives:

1. To assess how the character of the political leadership affects Nigeria's foreign policy.
2. To examine the influence of Domestic structure on Nigeria's foreign policy under Goodluck Jonathan administration (2010 – 2015).

1.5 Research Hypotheses

The research is based on the following hypotheses and proposes to investigate the following

1. The character of the political leadership has affected the foreign policy of Nigeria.
2. Domestic structure has influenced Nigeria's foreign policy under the Jonathan administration (2010-2015).

1.6 Significance of the Study

The significance of the study cannot be underrated and as such intends to enhance and advance our knowledge on the foreign policy of Nigeria and the influence of domestic structures on Nigeria's foreign policy posture particularly under Goodluck Jonathan's administration (2010-2015). It is therefore particularly important to re-examine the interface between domestic issues and foreign policy in assessing the possibilities and challenges that Nigeria faces in the Fourth Republic.

1.7 Scope of the Study

The research covered Domestic structure and the conduct of Nigeria's Foreign Policy under Goodluck Jonathan civilian administration (2010 – 2015).

1.8 Limitations of the Study

During the course of this research, the following were the limitations encountered.

Firstly, materials needed for the research to be done thoroughly by the researcher were difficult to come by and Secondly, the combination of school activities with the research work needed total concentration which was quite lacking.

1.9 Conceptualization of Terms

Foreign Policy

Foreign Policy is defined as a plan of action adopted by a nation in its dealings with other nations towards achieving its national interests and objectives. It consists of self-interest strategies chosen by states to safeguard its national interests and to achieve goals within the international relations milieu.

International Relations

International relations is the study of the interactions of states in the

global international system and it explains the behaviors that go on in the international community among several states operating in the international political system.

Diplomacy

Diplomacy is the art and practice of conducting negotiations between nations. it is the employment of tact to gain strategic advantage.

Democracy

Democracy is defined as the government of the people by the people and for the people. It is a political system in which the supreme power lies in a body of citizens to elect their representatives.

National Interest

National interest is a set of goals and objectives in a nations foreign policy, which the leaders aspire to achieve and promote in their relations with states within the international system.

Domestic Structure

Domestic Structure refers to how a state is organized within its borders. It is crucial to understanding of a State's Foreign policy as it determines key factors to the implementation of Foreign policy.

1.10 Organization of Study

This research project is divided into five chapters and each of these chapters addresses various issues that pertain to the subject of study.

Chapter One entails the Introduction that cover the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, research questions, research hypotheses, significance of the study, scope of the study, limitations and conceptualization of terms.

Chapter Two is the Literature review.

Chapter Three contains the Theoretical framework, research design, method of data collection and mode of data collection.

Chapter Four is the Data presentation and analysis.

Chapter Five entails summary, recommendation and summary of the

study.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

Foreign policy is an important key to the explanation of international behaviors. It is not possible to understand inter-state relations without understanding foreign policies of the states involved. The influence of domestic conditions as it affects foreign policy attitude and behavior in the international system can never be over-emphasized. This chapter therefore deals with thorough review of literature on foreign policy, Foreign policy and domestic policy, the relationship between foreign policy and domestic structures as well as a historical overview of Nigeria's Foreign policy.

2.1 Foreign Policy

The concept of foreign policy has been a focus of research in International relations and world politics for many years. It has taken many different forms, evolving through international politics and diplomatic drive to the understanding of the instrumentality involved in

conducting external relations. Since states are actors, they intend to exercise their various influence and power to achieve their various national interest and objectives. In the world of rivalry and conflict of interest, it is through foreign Policy that a state is able to announce its appearance to other nations of the world as an independent actor. The concept of foreign policy

like most concepts in social sciences has no universally accepted definition. It depends on the ideological inclination and background of the authors. As Aluko Olajide (1981) rightly observes, “nobody has really formulated a universally accepted definition of the concept of foreign policy and probably nobody will ever succeed in doing so”.

Agaba and Ukhami (2015) contend that the concept has been a huge one as there are several overwhelming definitions by scholars of international relations on the Subject matter. This is because this various definitions are guided by the perceptions and perspective of scholars. Northedge (1986) defines foreign policy simply as interplay between the outside and the inside. He believes that foreign policy is the manifestation of domestic and external realities. Buttressing this view, Beared Charles said” foreign policy of a state usually refers to

the general principles by which a state governs its reaction to their international environments". To a large extent therefore, both Northedge and Beared C. believe that foreign policy is determined by internal and external realities. Charles and Abdul (1979) maintain that the foreign policy of a state usually refers to the general principles by which a state governs its reaction to the international environment.

Norman (1954) described foreign policy as the content or substance of a nation's effort to promote its interests with other nations. Gambari (1989) defined foreign policy as an interaction between identifiable domestic forces and the dynamic of international political relations. Aluko (1981) defined foreign policy as an interaction between internal and external forces. For Agbu cited in Agaba and Ukhami (2015), foreign policy could also be said to be the interactions, actions and reactions of states target at the external. Millar (1969) posited that foreign policy is presumably something less than the sum of all policies which have an effect on a national governments relations with other national governments. Frankel (1975) definition tallies with that of Millar, as he sees foreign policy as consisting of decision and actions which involves to some appreciable extent relations between one state

and another, In other words foreign policy is what nations do in order to checkmate the extent of their interactions with other nations at the international environment.

In another major work, Frankel (1963) defines foreign policy as a dynamic process of interaction between the changing domestic demands and support and the changing external circumstances. Similarly Adeniran (1979) in agreement to what Frankel posits said foreign policy is by and large the policy pursued by a state in its dealing with other states. According to him, foreign policy consists of three elements; the first is the overall orientation and policy intention of a particular country towards another, the second element is the objective that a country seeks to achieve in relations with other countries and the third element of foreign policy is the means of achieving that particular goal or objective.

Foreign policy is defined by Goldstein and Pevehouse (2011) as the “strategies that government use to guide their actions in the international arena, they spell out the objectives which state leaders have decided to pursue in a given relationship or situation”.

Carlsnaes (2008) approached the definition of foreign policy in a more

detailed form. He argued that it consists of those actions which are expressed in the form of explicitly stated goals, commitments and/or directives, and pursued by governmental representatives acting on behalf of their sovereign communities which are directed toward objectives, conditions and actors – both governmental and non-governmental – which they want to affect and which lie beyond their territorial legitimacy.

Adeniran (1982) infers that foreign policy can best be understood through an explanation of what it actually is. Foreign policy, according to him consists of three elements. One is the overall orientation and policy intentions of a particular country toward another. The second element is the objective that a country seeks to achieve in her relations or dealings with other countries. The third element of foreign policy is the means for achieving that particular goal or objectives.

According to Legg and Morrison (1971) “foreign policy is a set of explicit objectives with regard to the world beyond the borders of a given social unit and a set of strategies and tactics designed to achieve those objectives”. This understanding subscribes to the designation of plans and clear cut strategies for the actualization of those plans.

For Vital (1968) “foreign policy implies rather a field of related but distinct actions and issues in which there neither is nor can be foreign policy”. According to his thesis, the realities of states’ behaviour entail decisions and policies being formulated in a disjointed fashion, largely in response to immediate pressures and events, in a number of separate structures and issue areas. Thus, Frankel’s (1964 and 1975) conception of foreign policy “as a dynamic process of interaction between the changing domestic demands and the changing external circumstances” is apt in Foreign policy.

Goldstein (1999) defines foreign policy as the strategy used by governments to guide their actions in the international arena. Foreign policies spell out the objectives state leaders use as guides in pursuit of relations. Chibundu (2004) defines foreign policy as a country’s response to the world outside or beyond its own frontiers or boundaries, the response which may be friendly or aggressive, casual or intense, simple or complex. It comprises many elements; namely diplomatic, military, trade, economic, social, cultural, educational, sporting, etc and it varies in form and focus according to circumstances. Some countries at different times might be friends or

enemies or valued allies within a relatively short or long period of time. Foreign policy has also been defined as a strategy with which institutionally designed decision-makers seeks to manipulate the international environment in order to achieve certain national interest in the light of occurrences in contemporary global political order.

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

According to Morgenthau, H "National Interest is determined by the political tradition and the total cultural context within which a nation

formulates its foreign policy". He maintains that the main requirement of a nation state is to protect its physical, political and cultural identity against encroachment by other nation states.

Buttressing the above are the views of Babangida Ibrahim who said;

"Nigeria's National Interest can be seen as: Military, economic, political and social security. Anything that will enhance the capacity of Nigeria to defend their national security must be seen as being in their national interest. Anything that promotes Nigerian economic growth and development is in the national interest. Anything that will make Nigeria politically stable is also in the national interest".

In political discourse, national interest serves two primary purposes: as an analytical tool and as an instrument of political action. As an analytical tool, it serves as a conceptual guide by providing the objectives often by a state while weighing an intended foreign policy option. An instrument of political action, it serves to justify or repudiate a state's foreign policy option and action in the international system, this explain the interconnectedness of Foreign policy and National Interest. Indeed, this explains what Hans Morgenthau said;

"no nation can have true guide as to what it must do and what it needs to do in foreign policy without accepting national interest as their guide".

The core thrust of foreign policy is the protection of National interest

of sovereign states or nations. All nations decisively and continuously search for national security, political independence and territorial integrity, second to security comes the promotion of economic interest, which includes the terms of trade. According to Deutsch Karl "the larger and more powerful a nation is, the more its leader, elites and population increase their level of aspiration in international affairs". This was evident in Nigeria's involvement in Africa conflicts, especially in West Africa, right from independence. Nigeria believes that once there is no peace in any of her neighboring countries, it might directly or indirectly constitute security risk to Nigeria as a nation. From the above, it can be deduced that, foreign policy and national interest are inseparable concepts in international relations, and indeed, the foundation of a states foreign policy is her national interest which in turn directs the course of foreign policy. Hence, the concept of national interests has continued to play a significant role in the foreign policies of sovereign states. A state's foreign policy is not operated in a vacuum. The main instrument in the conduct of foreign policy is invariably the promotion and pursuit of national interest.

According to Ogwu Joy, the major determinant factor for establishing

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

2.1.1 Principles of Foreign Policy

Agaba and Ukhami (2015) contend that every action or inaction of a state actor in the international system is guided by a set of principles or rules regulating it, although this principles varies from state to state. According to scholars, principles are platforms on which a country's foreign policy is laid; even though it changes at times, most elements guiding it remains static. The central role that principles play in guiding foreign policy has been listed by Rodee (1957) and others. According to him, foreign policy involves the formulation and implementation of a group of principles which shapes the behavioral pattern of a state while negotiating with other states to protect or further its own interest. Some of these principles according to Agaba and Ukhami (2015) are

stated below:

- (i) Upholding the sovereignty and integrity of the state
- (ii) Ensuring National Security and Defense
- (iii) Promoting National Interest.

2.12 Components and factors of foreign policy

According to Akinboye (1999) certain factors influence a state's foreign policy. For him, the foreign policy of a country is a product of environmental factors both internal and external to it. However, Agaba and Ukhani (2015) argue that these factors or conditions could be internally or externally motivated resulting to the type of policy to be formulated at a particular point in time. The factors are broadly divided into two; the internal and the external factors.

The internal factors that determine foreign policy as identified by Akinboye (1999) include the following:

1. Political structure of the country
2. Structure of the economy

3. Geo-political location of the country
4. Character of political leadership
5. Military factor
6. Demographic factor
7. Domestic political situation

Agaba and Ukhami (2015) observed that the external factors are dynamics that influences a nation's foreign policy from the outside. For these scholars, since foreign policy of nation states are strictly to inter-relate with other nation states of the world, the external factors that are involved in the international relations must be considered or compromised for countries to relate well in the international political system. Factors like international organizations, international laws and public opinions from various quarters of the international system and other states beliefs and reactions could pattern or shape the foreign policy of a particular state Agaba and Ukhami (2015).

2.1.3 Instruments for conducting foreign policy

The instrument for conducting foreign policy generally refers to the means used by states in conducting their relations with other states.

Akinboye (1999) stated the following as instruments for conducting foreign policy:

1. **Diplomacy:** This is the conduct of inter-state relations by means of negotiations. Of all means of conducting inter-state relations, diplomacy is the most peaceful and effective instrument for conducting foreign policy.
2. **Propaganda:** This refers to the manipulation and distortion of information in order to achieve one's interest and defeat the interest of an opponent. It involves the extensive use of mass media.
3. **Militarism:** This is a major weapon for conducting inter-state relations. It involves the use of force, terrorist attacks and military coercion in conducting foreign policy objectives of states. Due to its violent nature, it is often used as a last resort when other means for conducting foreign policy relations have failed.
4. **Economic Instrument:** Rather than resorting to war in order to resolve a conflict situation, certain economic devices could be used. These include; trade, boycott, withdrawal of aids and most importantly economic sanctions.

5. Cultural Instrument: These are inter-cultural activities like sports, dance, music, and games. This is becoming increasingly useful in conducting inter-state relations. For example the All African Games, World Cup (Football), the Olympic Games, music concert and awards. Nigeria in 1996 boycotted the African Nations Cup competition held in South Africa to protest that country's hard-line posture towards the killing of Saro Wiwa and his other kinsmen.

22 Foreign Policy and Domestic Policy

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

influence stemming from the manner in which government agencies perform their functions. Graham further stressed that; foreign and domestic policy issues are related products of the same political system and are designed to define and implement overall national purposes. Foreign and domestic policy must be mutually supporting if national policy aspirations are to be achieved in an atmosphere of political stability. The development of national economies requires the assembling of resources from other states, and the expansion of markets across international borders. The ability of a nation to extend military strength in the pursuit of its foreign policy objectives in turn depends upon a diversified and sound domestic industrial structure or help from allies that possess such resources. Both sets of policies, foreign and domestic, are conditioned by the ideologies, popular attitudes, and balance of political power that exist within the national system at any given time.

It has been revealed that in 55 years of Nigeria's independence three major factors were identified as being key determinants in Nigeria's foreign policy formulation: first the country's ravaged and weak economy; second, the personality and character of Nigeria's leaders

and their perceptions of how to nurse and revive the economy; and third, the issue of ethno-religions diversity in a federal context, which more often than not makes consensus or rational issues difficult to achieve. While other domestic factors such as historical traditions, domestic environmental factors, organized vested interests and public opinion have impacted on Nigeria's foreign policy, it can be said that, the three major factors identified above are decisive in the Nigerian context.

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

2.3 Relationship between Foreign Policy and Domestic Structure

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

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

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

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

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

According to Ogwu Joy; domestic influence is in most organized societies an in-built influence system which demands for or support government policies. It also provides bases for interactions between the ruler and the ruled as it justifies or condemns the ruler's action. Ogwu cited Coplins view when he recognized the needs of governments to generate support as he observed:

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

extent in the willingness of the members of society to provide support.... It is vital

to the decision maker because it makes his stay in office more certain and provides

him with the resources to carry out his policies.

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

There is a clean linkage between domestic and foreign policy in Nigeria.

The way we do diplomatic business and the effectiveness of our positions abroad

are related in part to the processes and objectives of our domestic politics.

Foreign policy provisions are in any case the external projections of interest,

which are defined at home.

Gambari goes further, by noting that in a new state where unity is weak or absent, foreign policy issues are often deliberately used to pursue domestic political goals and ambitions, especially by the opposition group as was revealed by Anglo-Nigeria defense pact issues. Thus contrary views expressed by public opinion and other domestic influences on foreign policy could be attributed to the large nature and diversities of ethnic groups, the absence of charismatic leader capable of insuring hegemony and the type of issues involved or being examined.

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

24 Nigeria at Independence: The Vision behind Foreign Policy and External Relation

At independence, on October 1st 1960 Nigeria's perceptions of the International system in which it would operate was conditioned and shaped by its domestic politics as well as the dynamites of world policies in the midst of the cold war.

Irena (2010) opined that Nigeria's foreign policies, like any other nations foreign policies is to a significant extent a product of myriad factors and forces which condition and influence the actions and choices of foreign policy Decision makers. Domestic factors and forces

usually reflect in the International arena while external forces also have repercussions on the domestic scene.

According to Sesay and Fawole (2011), it was impossible for a newly independent country to be completely immune to the dangerous voluntary geopolitical and geo-strategic circumstances and development that were shaping world politics at the time. A world precariously bifurcated into two opposing poles of power separated by conflicting ideologies that sought to destroy each other, undoubtedly left countries especially in Africa little room for independent choice. However, as Fawole (2011) argue as a country Nigeria could not conduct foreign policy before 1960 because they were under British colonial tutelage. The Colonial Nigeria could not conduct foreign policy and protect its interest abroad until after Independence. The nationalist and Politician's who fought the British to secure Nigeria's independence such as Nnamdi Azikiwe, Obafemi Awolowo, Anthony Enahoro, Remi Fani-Keyida, Dade Wachuku, had aired their views concurring the role that Nigeria must play in Africa affairs, on such diverse issues as colonialism, issues of Africa unity and continental integration, etc this was reflected in their writing and

speeches, contributions to parliamentary debates, public lectures (Nigeria institutes of international affairs, 2011).

2.5 A Historical Overview of Nigeria's Foreign Policy

2.5.1 First Republic Nigeria Foreign Policy (1960-1966)

According to Stremlau (1977), the foundation of Nigeria's foreign policy was laid during Nigeria's first republic between 1960 and 1966 when the guiding principles of Nigeria's foreign policy which successive administrations or regimes adhered to were first articulated. Nigeria's foreign policy was clearly pro-British and pro-Western in the immediate post colonial period, and hostile towards the Eastern bloc.

For Akinboye (1999) Nigeria's foreign policy commenced on a moderate level at independence. This was expected since the country obtained its independence on a platter of gold and was not expected to be too radical in the pursuit of her foreign policy, unlike an emergent nation state that obtained independence through violent means and liberation struggle. Thus, since Nigeria obtained Independence from British colonialism the country maintained cordial relations with Britain, the erstwhile colonial master.

Stremlau (1997) further argued that the realities of the international environment in Nigeria's internal or domestic policies made the country adopt what was perceived as a "moderate" and "pragmatic" foreign policy.

Otubanjo (1989) observed that at independence Nigeria's policy makers taking cognizance of the domestic and external environments came up with a set of core principles which were to guide the conduct of Nigeria's foreign policy. One of these principles gave premium attention to Africa. Thus it is the country's responsibility for posturing and risk taking on behalf of Africa and African nations.

In his first address at UN General Assembly in October 1960, Sir. Abubakar Tafawa Balewa laid great emphasis on the importance Nigeria has attached to Africa and why the continent would be the primary focus of its attention in its foreign policy (Sesay and Fawole, 2010). Thus, he laid the foundation for Nigeria's active commitment to pursuing and advancing the interest of African's, both within and outside the African continent.

Akinboye (1999) observed that significantly, the prime minister, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa adopted a conservative, pro-Western policy.

Although, he embraced the policy of non-alignment, there was no firm commitment by his government towards it. According to Balewa, thus,

Nigeria would be non-aligned in International relations with regards To the big power blocs, but never Neutral in matters affecting African peoples. Elaborating further, he stressed that, Nigeria would be selecting adequate objective, selecting the policy for each occasion in Nigerian's National interest and in that of world peace and that the country would not associate herself as a matter of routine with any of the power blocs. (Balewa, 1962)

However, inspite of this laudable stand of the Nigerian government at that point in time, the foreign policy posture was generally pro-west that had serious attachment to one of the power bloc. For instance the Anglo-Nigeria Defense pact of 1961 was considered a pro-British support, and this was greeted with violent student demonstrations and sharp criticism.

Idang (1970) contend that the pro-western policy of the Balewa government was manifested in various ways throughout the first republic, while the Balewa regime emphasized that the cornerstone of Nigeria's foreign policy would be Africa, subsequent actions of government did not justify the pronouncement as there was little

concretely done to illustrate the proclaimed Afro-centric policy. To collaborate the above argument Gambari (1989) posit that the assertion that the Balewa government lacked a dynamic foreign policy was exemplified in the handling of issue such as the Congo crisis, membership of the Monrovia group, General African policies of de-colonization and apartheid in South Africa.

2.52 Second Republic Nigeria's Foreign Policy (1979-1983)

According to Irene (2010), in accordance with the Murtala / Obasanjo regimes political transition programme, General Obasanjo successfully relinquished power to a democratically elected civilian regime on 1,October,1979. Alhaji Shehu Shagari was the second republic Nigeria president, that military handed over power to as it marked Nigeria's second attempt at operating democracy. The civilian administration of Shehu Shagari inherited a foreign policy that was popular with Nigerians and respected in the international community.

As Akinboye (1999) argue the Shagari era witnessed a retrogressive reversal in Nigeria's foreign policy as the government dampened the momentum of dynamic and radical foreign policy posture bequeathed it. Nigeria once again reverted to the conservative pro-

western policy that was reminiscent of Balewa era. Although the section 19 of the 1979 constitution committed government towards promoting African Unity, little effort was made by President Shagari to actualize this. Rather than pursuing an active foreign policy. The scholar contend that Shagari regime was engaged in proactive policy. For instance in June 1981 he failed to attend OAU summit in Nairobi, Kenya on the flimsy excuse that the OAU secretariat did not list on the agenda the border conflict between Nigeria and Cameroon. Similarly, the Shagari government declared in 1982 that Nigeria would not attend the OAU summit in Tripoli, Libya unless Libya satisfied two conditions. The first was that all OAU member states should be allowed to participate and secondly, Libya must withdraw its troops from Chad Republic. All together, the Nigeria foreign policy remained at a level of routine adherence to existing relationship and commitment. In other words, the Second Republic Nigeria foreign policy was uninspiring and ineffective in the political and economic life of the country.

2.5.3 Military Era and Nigeria's Foreign Policy

When the military took over power from the Balewa administration in January 1966, the pro-western posture of Nigeria's foreign policy did

not witness any fundamental shift. Major General Aguiyi Ironsi who then became the first military Head of state could not change the government's foreign policy outlook as he was busy trying to resolve the huge domestic problems precipitated by the counter coup of July 1966 which swept away the Ironsi regime and led to the emergence of General Yakubu Gowon as the new Head of state. Serious internal conflict erupted which brought the nation to a near state of disintegration. This had a severe impact on Nigeria's external relations as the country could not play an active role in foreign policy (Akinboye,1999).

Irene (2010) contends that the golden era of Nigeria's foreign policy under the military government of General Gowon was the decade of 1970s. This was the period when Nigeria's oil wealth increased dramatically empowering the Gowon regime to embark on significant nationalist and pan-African policies in Africa. The experience of the civil war years in particular imposed a more flexible outlook and comprehensive external relations portfolio on the Gowon regime. Beyond this, the post Civil war era saw General Gowon endeavoring to repair the damage done to Nigeria's relations with her neighbors' and some African countries. Nigeria became positively non-aligned

during this period, and played an active role in continental and West African policies.

The regime gave birth to the Economic Community of West African states (ECOWAS) which later led to the ACP-EEC agreements known as the Lome' conventions.

In July 1975, General Gowon's government experienced a bloodless coup by General Murtala Mohammed who brought dynamism and activism into Nigeria's external relations. The administration's interest in foreign affairs was demonstrated by the setting up of the Adediji commission to overhaul the entire foreign policy machinery of the country. The commission led to a definition of Nigeria's foreign policy objective and the setting up of guidelines that determined the course of Nigeria's external relation based on this, Murtala regime made far-reaching impact and achieved significant feat in foreign affairs (Akiboye, 1999).

The assassination of General Murtala on February 13, 1976 ushered in General Obasanjo (who was second in command when Murtala was alive) as the new head of state. He continued with the same policy as laid down by Murtala. General Obasanjo was also committed to the pursuit of Nigeria's interest, Africa goals and justice in the

international system. Indeed what Obasanjo did was to consolidate Murtala's effect, and Nigeria's voice continued to be heard in the international community.

The Buhari regime which prided itself as an off shoot of the Murtala/ Obasanjo government made strenuous effort to follow the regimes foot print in foreign affairs. For instance, just as the Murtala/Obasanjo regime gave recognition to MPLA of Angola, the Buhari/Idiagbon regime recognized the polisario government in Western Sahara against the back drop of opposition by some African states (Akinboye,1999).

Irene (2010) observed that the concentric circle approach articulated by the regime ensured the re-launch of Nigeria's deep commitment to the freedom and liberation struggle particularly in South Africa. Although the regime did not have time to rule, but its contribution to foreign policy was its efforts to define and defend Nigeria's national interest in relation to Africa's goals and objective and the pursuit of world peace and security. The regime was terminated in August1985.

General Ibrahim Babangida took over power from Buhari and quickly relaxed the radical posture of the previous government's foreign

policy. According to Akinboye (1999) one of the first things the Babangida's administration did was to direct his foreign affair minister, Professor Bolaji Akinyemi to organize an " All Nigeria conference on foreign policy" in order to examine the various perspectives of the country's foreign policy. The conference came up with specific recommendation on a new foreign policy. According to the scholar in attempt to restructure the nation's economy, the Babangida Administration came up with the structural Adjustment Programme (SAP), and on the external plane, the regime adopted economic diplomacy as the thrust of its foreign policy. The SAP programme failed to restructure the Nigeria economy in a manner as to reduce its dependence on the west. This, rather than reducing the nation's economic problem, it has escalated it.

The Babangida regime also initiated the formation of the economic community of West African states monitoring group (ECOMOG) and its other interventions in the Caribbean with the Technical Aid Corp (TAC) sent to many countries. However, Nigeria's financial, materials and human commitment to ECOMOG were criticized in some quarters, while it received thumbs up for its novel idea consistent with Nigeria's contribution to Global Peace keeping and her African Policy

(Adefolarin2014).

General Sani Abacha on November 17, 1993 overthrew the interim National Government (ING) that was hurriedly organized by Babangida. The regime had been following the footsteps of Babangida in, consolidating the achievements of Babangida's administration in the area of foreign policy. The Abacha government pursued a reactive impact made to project the image of the country outside.

Zabadi (2004) argue that under the leadership of General Sani Abacha, Nigeria became a Pariah state with whom none, except compliment and rebel African

countries had diplomatic relations with. Critical events and issues in the domestic level (like the hanging of the Nme Ogoni environmental activities, the jailing of General Olusegun Obasanjo, extreme human rights abuses and un diplomatic confrontational attitude towards foreign diplomats) led to Nigeria's isolation in the international community.

General Abacha was however credited for ensuring a lasting solution to the Liberian crisis, and the eventual emergence of democratic government. His government was also responsible for bringing back

democratic government to Sierra-Leone and the ECOMOG peace-keeping force lead by Nigeria was very active under his regime. Abacha's sudden death and the emergence of General Abdulsalam Abubakar in 1998 repositioned Nigeria in the international system. Abubakar responded positively to overtures made to him from the international community and put in place a credible transitional programme which culminated in the election of Chief Obasanjo as President and in reinstating Nigeria to her rightful place in the community of nation

2.5.4 Nigeria's Foreign Policy Under Obasanjo's Administration (1999-2007)

After fifteen years of unbroken military rule and unstable political landscape, Chief Olusegun Obasanjo assumed power as a democratically elected president in May, 1999. With the return to civil rule, there were high expectations that the liberation of the political space in Nigeria would impact on its foreign policy arena and that Nigeria would be moved out of its political doldrums at both the domestic and international realms. The Obasanjo administration was

expected to break off the hostile foreign policy posture of the Babangida regime and consolidate the re-integrative efforts of the preceding Abubakar regime. The Abacha's regime in particular saw Nigeria being perceived as a Pariah nation in global politics (Irene, 2010).

The President on assumption of office, sought to actively engage the international community to find solution to domestic problems. Recognizing the nexus between the domestic state of the nation and pursuing an effective foreign policy, the President Obasanjo summed up the domestic environment inherited by his administration at the occasion of the first democracy day on May 29, 2000 when he said thus:

...The economy was in shambles; Poverty was pervasive in rural and all the components of the national Infrastructure were in severe stages of decay and dereliction;... Internationally, Nigeria had become a Pariah state, shunned by many countries, Tolerated by a few, and treated with Contempt and condescension by all: We carried a heavy burden of international debt that seemed quite likely to ensure that most of our earning would be committed to paying mostly debt, leaving us little with which to address the legitimate needs of our people... (Obasanjo, 2000)

The Obasanjo administration sought to engender a conducive

environment for foreign policy formulation and implementation by attempting to consolidate the nascent democracy, enthrone good governance, rule of law and respect for human rights, poverty alleviation and the economic empowerment of the people. The democratic process as ushered into the Fourth Republic was expected to make possible values of democracy, that is expected to form part of the Nigeria's foreign policy posture under the Obasanjo administration (Irene,2010, Adefolarin2014).

The central focus of Nigeria's foreign policy shifted from Africa to the global arena. The President announced that the entire globe and not Africa was to be the canvass of Nigeria's exertion (The Guardian Newspaper, 1999). The emphasis was to win more trends for the country, attract investment and work hard to address the debt burden. This did not mean that Africa was no longer relevant in Nigeria's foreign policy, but Nigeria's economic interest was to be a

major determinant of its African policy. The administration attached great importance to the goal of regional cooperation and integration; it placed great emphasis on Nigeria's relations with countries within

West African sub-region whilst ECOWAS was to remain a major pillar in the architecture of African Integration (Obasanjo,1999).

The Obasanjo administration's shift from Africa as the center piece of Nigeria's foreign policy to globalism was however, not an indication of Nigeria's non-interest in the affairs of Africa. The relevant point of the new thrust was that Nigeria was poised to benefit more from globalization than in previous years.

Akinterinwa (2004), contend that Nigeria's foreign policy in essence, was to be guided by a more global approach than ever before, with premium put on economic component of bilateral relations. The significance of the new thrust of Nigeria's foreign policy under Obasanjo was that there was to be a reversion to economic diplomacy and adoption of a beneficial and constructive concentric circle policy.

Nigeria foreign policy, under Chief Obasanjo was broadened by the desire to achieve national or domestic industrial development as a necessary tool for consolidating Nigeria's strategic position in the region of Africa and West African sub-region. His extensive rounds of trips, also impacted considerably on shedding of Nigeria's pariah

status.

2.5.5 Nigeria's Foreign Policy Under Yaradua's Administration (2007-2010)

In his inaugural speech on May 29, 2007 President Yar'Adua acknowledged that President Obasanjo's administration laid the foundation upon which Nigeria's future prosperity can be built. According to the president during this period, Nigeria reached a national consensus in at least four areas namely: to deepen democracy and the rule of law; build an economy driven primarily by the private sector, not government; display zero tolerance for corruption in all its forms and finally, restructure and staff our government to ensure efficiency and good governance. He went further to say that the goal of his administration was to build on the greatest accomplishment of the past few years and relying on the seven-point agenda, concentrate on rebuilding our physical infrastructure and human capital in order to take our country forward, and accelerating economic and other reforms in a way that makes a concrete and visible difference to ordinary people (Yar'Adua, 2007).

The Yar'Adua seven– point agenda to transform Nigeria are: power and energy; food security and agriculture; wealth creation and employment; mass transportation; land reform; security; qualitative and functional education; the Niger Delta and disadvantaged groups. These are laudable programs that many analysts believe are good to transform Nigeria, as the government's intention was critical to fulfilling this while positioning Nigeria's external image. However, citizens diplomacy proceeds from the recognition that foreign policy can no longer exist independent of domestic policy.

Irene (2010) posit, the basic assumption of foreign policy should be the external

dimension of the conscientious quest for the welfare of the citizens whilst the basic needs of the citizens will become the rationale and justification for foreign policy engagement by the government.

According to this scholar, the proposition of citizens diplomacy under the Yar'Adua administration is that Nigeria should have the capacity to promote the welfare and rights of its citizens through its foreign relations.

The sun News paper carried an editorial analysis of the Yar'Adua citizen's diplomacy, thus:

So far, Yar'Aduada does not seem to have displayed any discernable goals or governing ideologies. Citizens diplomacy has failed to remedy the uncountable cases of maltreatment being meted out to Nigerian's by citizens and sometimes, authorities of other countries, on a daily basis the state and its agencies are also highly disrespectful of citizenship rights of Nigerian's (Sun Newspaper, 2008).

CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will give the Theory adopted for this research, the research design, method of data collection and mode of data analysis.

3.2 Theoretical Framework

A theory is a set of assumptions, propositions or accepted facts that attempts to provide a plausible or rational explanation of casual relationships between or among a group of observed phenomenon. It is also said to be a supposition or a system of ideas intended to explain something.

The research is based on the theory of realism. The chief proponent

of this theory is Hans Morgenthau. He postulated that, the test by which this theory must be judged is not “piori” and “abstract”, but “empirical and “pragmatic. This is to say that it must be judged not by some preconceived abstract principle or concept that does not relate to reality, but its purpose is to bring order and meaning to mass phenomena, which without it would remain disconnected and unintelligible.

Political realism believes that politics, like society in general is governed by objective laws that have roots in human nature. The realist school sees international politics in the context defined in terms of power. It assumes that the idea of interest is indeed the essence of politics and is unaffected by the circumstances of time.

Realism is an approach to the study and practice of International politics. It emphasizes the role of the nation state and makes a broad assumption that all nation states are motivated by national interests, or national interests disguised as moral concerns. At its most fundamental level, national interests is generic and easy to define, all states seek to preserve their political autonomy and their territorial integrity.

Realists explain foreign policy in terms of power politics. They disagree on the exact meaning of power and on how and to what extent politics is likely to influence policy, but they all find that power has a strong materialist component and that the influence of domestic politics on foreign policy is likely to vary with security challenges stemming from the external environment.

Realism is a top-down approach to explaining foreign policy. Realists begin from the anarchic structure of the international system. They argue that the absence of a legitimate monopoly of power in the international system create a strong incentive for states to focus on survival as their primary goal and self-help as the most important means to achieving this goal. However, “survival” and “self-help” may take many forms. These forms are shaped by mechanisms of socialization and competition in the international system and systemic incentives are filtered through the perceptions of foreign policy decision makers and domestic institutions enabling and restraining the ability of decision makers to respond to external incentives.

Generally speaking, the national interest must be defined in terms of

power. For a realist, power is a primarily relative term. The political realist fears centralized authority unless that authority is derived from the power of his or her own state.

3.2.1 Application of the theory of Realism to the research

The theory of Realism is applied or used in this research as it explains the bases of politics and power as well as national interest which are the major reason for a states formulation of its foreign policy. This theory becomes valid when considering the foreign policy in Nigeria where the absence of a board consensus on what constitutes national interest generally leads to significant oscillations in the policies and programs of the government. Nigeria in the fourth republic thus provides a clear instance of the dynamics relationship which the theory of realism identifies as posited under Jonathan administration 2010-2015.

3.2 Research Design

The research design used for that would be used for this study would be the exploratory research design. Exploratory research design, according to its name aims to explore specific aspects of the research area and does not aim to provide final and conclusive

answers to research questions.

3.3 Method of Data Collection

The research will be undertaken using entirely secondary sources of data. Secondary sources of data will include; Books from libraries of Nigerian institute, Journals, Newspapers, Online sources, Magazines, Articles, Conference materials and other related works of researches necessary for this study.

3.4 Method of Data Analysis

The method of Data Analysis will be descriptive qualitative analysis. Data collected will be descriptively analyzed and used to examine The Influence of domestic politics on Nigeria's foreign policy in the Fourth Republic under the Goodluck Jonathan's administration (2010-2015).

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

4.0 INTRODUCTION

Contradictions in domestic factors exist just as in any other actions

which characterize the nature of human beings. Domestic influence is frequently used to refer to demand on, or support for government policies, this domestic influence can be viewed as a way of providing a basis for interaction between rulers and the ruled and the international communities. The political, economic, sociological and historical circumstances of a nation are some of the decisive factors that configure its foreign policy. Some of the decisive domestic factors that have influenced Nigeria's foreign policy are the constitutional nature of Nigeria's acquisition of independence, the Nigerian civil war and the general perception of Nigeria as a powerful black African nation. Fundamentally, Nigeria's foreign policy has been quite consistent both in its aspiration and implementation.

Shifts in the foreign policy irrespective of regime types, always take into consideration the need for a deliberate and conscious re-appraisal of the domestic situation. The substance of Nigeria's foreign policy has tended to revolve around certain principles while taking cognizance of the fact that the foreign policy of any nation is necessarily a reflection of its domestic reality. Under the Goodluck

Jonathan administration (2010-2015) Nigeria's Foreign Policy is based on the following principles; legal equality of states, peaceful resolution of conflicts, non - alignment, multilateralism, noninterference in the internal affairs of other states and the African Centre piece policy.

4.1 Nigeria's Foreign policy under Goodluck Jonathan's administration (2010-2015).

The death of President Yar'Adua in 2010 ushered in the Jonathan administration to first complete the remaining two years left in the Yar'Adua four years mandate. However, after contesting and winning the 2011 presidential election, Goodluck Jonathan was saddled with the responsibility to lead the nation and this afforded him the opportunity to formulate a foreign policy direction for the country. From the domestic policy of transformation agenda of the government, many were optimistic that a pragmatic and visionary foreign policy would emerge. The foreign policy of the Jonathan administration was derived from the foreign policy

objectives of Nigeria as stated in the 1999 constitution. His foreign policy included:

1. Improved cooperation with other military forces all over the world to bring about peace globally.
2. Improved bilateral and multilateral trade agreement.
3. Cooperation and assistance in curbing health challenges all over the world.
4. Promoting the welfare of Nigerian's abroad to ensure they are treated with respect and dignity in all circumstances.

Okungbowa , (2011) contend that the Goodluck Jonathan Federal Government of Nigeria incidentally embarked on a comprehensive review of the country's foreign policy. The government anchored its foreign policy direction on domestic interest, to this scholar, whatever is the focus of the administration, domestic or economic diplomacy one thing that ought to be paramount on international relations is the interest of Nigeria.

Onuorah and Obayuwana (2011) in their analysis of the Jonathan

administration in Nigeria point to the fact that, the government in its bid to re-launch Nigeria's foreign policy ascertain the need for viable foreign policy options that include the task of building a sound domestic economic base .Their point of departure is credited to the betterment of the domestic demand. For instance, the minister for foreign affairs, Ambassador Olugbenga Ashiru asserted thus:

The average Nigeria national can
Only own and buy into this new
Foreign policy focus when they
are assured of an improvement
in their living standard.

Gambari (2011) in his admonition of the Jonathan Administration on the direction for new foreign policy said, the foreign policy must be anchored among others on domestic economic development and stability.

4.2 Political leadership's character and its impact on Nigeria's Foreign policy

The core thrust of Nigeria's Foreign Policy is Afro-centrism and the personality of individuals that has ruled Nigeria affects how the policy of Afro-centrism is carried out or how the nation's Foreign Policy is shaped.

According to Smith (2012), the impact of personality on decision

making in the realm of Foreign Policy analysis is controversial. Hogan and Kaiser (2005) and Echono (2012) put forward the argument that personality would influence leadership decision making quality and effectiveness which will in turn bring about development. They reported that the traits of good leaders include good decision making ability, vision, charisma and competence. Closely related to this stance is that of DeCremer & Knippenberg (2002) which stated that leadership charisma has a positive impact on cooperation which can bring about development. Byman and Pollack (2001) added that the goals, abilities and foibles of individuals are vital to the intentions, capabilities as well as strategies of the state (cited in Rourke, 2008). According to Jensen (1982), personality will only impact foreign policy decisions, if the leader display a high level of interest in foreign affairs and possesses high decisional latitude. The Nigerian state has had since her independence in 1960 foreign affairs machinery which has remained under the exclusive control of the ruling central authority. Nigeria made Africa the centerpiece of her foreign policy and has played key leadership roles in African politics since then. Alhaji Tafawa Balewa being the first prime minister enunciated the fundamental principles that underpin Nigeria's external relations. Nigeria's foreign policy

objectives are promoting and protecting Nigeria's national interest, promoting African integration and support African unity, promoting international cooperation for the consolidation of universal peace and mutual respect among all nations and also eliminating discrimination of all sorts. It also added the respect for international law and treaties obligations, the pacific settlement of international disputes via negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration and adjudication and also promote a just world economic order (Fawole, 2003).

The behavioral dispositions of the various heads of state Nigeria has had have rubbed off on her foreign policy, and domestic politics as well as her international image. However, her foreign policy has experienced continuity more than changes. For instance, leaders like Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, General Yakubu Gowon, General Murtala Mohammed, General Olusegun Obasanjo, General Abdusalami, in the course of the pursuit of Nigeria's foreign policy have displayed attitudes like discipline, passion and patriotism, conservatism and firmness which have earned positive recommendations for her. Some of them implemented some anti western policies that would have reduced their popularity and acceptance among western states (Abegunrin, 2003). However, they were able to drive Nigeria towards progress, unity,

national transformation and positive global image (Osuntokun, 2012; Kawu, 2011; Aluko, 1976). This is not to say that their administrations were void of weaknesses.

Leaders like General Muhammadu Buhari and Tunde Idiagbon were very strict in their rule. They were rigid, harsh and uncompromising in their drive towards national transformation. They were preoccupied with the agenda War Against Indiscipline (WAI) which was to put Nigeria back on the pedestal of moral decency and reawaken them to social norms after identifying indiscipline and corruption as challenges Nigeria was encumbered with. They ensured nationalism, patriotism and loyalty to national symbols, involvement in environmental sanitation, and public demureness like queuing and better work ethics amongst citizens (The Library of Congress Country Studies & CIA World Fact book, 2004). Despite their passion and drive for change, the regime was characterized with excesses like the violation of human rights and rigidness in their approach to national transformation. Their draconian decrees did not augur well with Nigeria's international image.

Musa Yar Adua was an altruistic leader. He displayed firmness, commitment, sense of probity, sensitivity to the feelings of Nigerian masses and respect for their rights. His sense of integrity displayed

when he declared his asset amongst other evidences. He was peace-loving in his approach to solving problems. For instance, he used dialogue to settle the militancy issues over resource control in the Niger delta (Ndagi, 2012; Alli, 2011). He was concerned about the domestic welfare of Nigeria as he pursued his foreign policy agenda. Ambitious, self-centered and dictatorial leaders like General Ibrahim Babangida and General Sani Abacha soiled the positive image Nigeria had built in the past by their actions. They were dictatorial, ruthless and violated human rights. These attracted international criticism and sanctions, severed relationships and earned pariah state status (Okpokpo, 1999; Sesay & Ukeje, 1997; Mahmud, 2001; Abegunrin, 2003). By 1999, Nigeria's public image had shattered and the task of rebuilding was hectic. Therefore, the choice of competent leaders to rebuild her image was therefore necessary.

There are various opinions to the personality of President Goodluck Jonathan. Some scores him low with respect to strong personality while others see him as dynamic and charismatic. For most Nigerians he is weak, without charisma to lead and even referred to as a kindergarten president (Tega, 2013). His actions do not address cogent and eminent needs of the Nigeria state especially as regards the state of the

domestic environment of her foreign policy (Echono, 2012). The increasing states of insecurity, corruption and religious fundamentalism have not received matching response from his administration. Jonathan's quite and considerate character and personality was considered a weakness at some point because he was not able to combat the high level of corruption and insecurity in Nigeria as at the time of his administration. The Jonathan's administration as a result of the character he possessed was not really efficient in carrying out its Foreign Policy posture as Nigeria's image was dampened due to high level of insecurity in the nation.

4.3 Influence of Domestic Structure on Nigeria's Foreign Policy under the Jonathan Administration

Foreign policy is a product of complex human thought processes. Hence, it is susceptible to battering by unpredictable transients engineered by the same human beings. But, the totality of the status of the country determines what the responses are. That is to say, the impact of the instantaneous domestic setting is constant and predictable. In most cases, the political, economic, sociological and historical circumstances of a nation are some of the decisive factors that configure its foreign policy.

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

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

4.3.1 Regional Democracy and Diplomacy

In line with the African Union and ECOWAS policy of zero tolerance for unconstitutional change of government, Jonathan administration condemned the undemocratic changes of government in Guinea Bissau and Mali. In addition, as a member of the ECOWAS mediating group, the Jonathan administration was actively involved in efforts to restore

security and constitutional rule in both countries, by playing a leadership role in initiating democratic transitional process.

For instance in Guinea Bissau, it was President Jonathan that negotiated a peaceful resolution of the crisis and stopped the coup leaders from executing their detained erstwhile presidents and prime ministers and he facilitated their safe passage out of the country. The government's desire to enthrone democracy in Mali is seen as a focal point of Nigeria's foreign policy thrust in Africa, as well as National interest of destroying the connection between the terrorist in Northern Mali and elements of BokoHaram in North-East of Nigeria. (The Guardian Newspaper, 2013).

Nigeria committed over 1,200 troops to the UN-mandated African-led international support mission in Mali (AFISMA) under the command of a Nigeria Major General Shehu Abdulkadir. Nigeria's intervention in the Mali crisis, was basically an act of fulfilling its foreign policy thrust in Africa especially in the sub-regional level. (Ashiru, 2013).

In post Arab spring crisis and civil war in Libya when the leadership in Africa and African Union were in total disarray, with no clear path to follow, it was Nigerian's timely intervention in the recognition of the then Transitional National Council (TNC) that showed the way for other

African countries to follow. Within a few days of Nigeria's government under the leadership of president Jonathan's announcement, majority of member states of the African Union, hitherto sitting on the fence, followed Jonathan's leadership role in the recognition of TNC in Libya. Accordingly, the commitment to the principles of defending democracy informed Nigeria's timely decision to support the aspiration of the Libyan people for freedom and democracy. Nigeria's position was dictated by her national interest and not influenced by any foreign power. The immediate result of Nigeria's action was the protection of our Nationals that remained in the country during the civil war.(OlugbengaAshiru,2013).

4.32 Strategic Partnership and Economic Diplomacy

The Jonathan administration in its wisdom to position Nigeria's economy embarked on strategic partnership and economic diplomacy. According to former minister of Foreign Affairs, late Ambassador Olugbenga Ashiru, in a bid to encourage and promote the inflow of Foreign Direct Investment into the country, Nigeria signed bilateral agreements with several countries in the areas of trade, technological cooperation ICT, education, Culture/tourism etc. the increase exchange of high level visits between Nigeria and other countries of the world

have enhanced Nigeria's bilateral cooperation with these countries. Such high level meetings have been able to attract considerable investment portfolios to the countries (Ashiru, 2003).

Furthermore, the Bi-national commission (BNC) between Nyere and the US as part of the Jonathan administration economy diplomacy was injected with fresh confidence into the Nigeria economy. This has significantly increased foreign direct investment from the US into under five working groups, designed to cover literally all aspects of US-Nigeria relations, including assistance in capacity building, technical support, funding, security collaboration and the environment.

Several projects and investments are flowing into the country to create jobs for the youths.

From the fore going, the strategic partnership and economic diplomacy of Nigeria's foreign policy under Jonathan administration, is clear to have achieve a handful basket in terms of foreign investment in flow into Nigeria.

A component of the country's economic diplomacy is the investment of the organized private sector (OPS). Economic diplomacy of the Jonathan administration saw the essence more than before for the OPS to be active in a number of African countries and continue to encourage

both the local OPS to receive the active support of the government abroad. Jonathan administration Nigeria's foreign policy through the ministry of foreign affairs and its missions in African countries have been supporting the businesses and operations of Nigerian business men, especially financial institutions and factories (The Guardian newspaper 2013). While the Jonathan administration embarked on strategic partnership and economic diplomacy as the new foreign policy direction for Nigeria, the question for many analyst on this however, is the danger this could posit, due to the none sustenance of agreement sign as a result of prevailing global economic down turn.

In this regard, economic diplomacy and strategic partnership perhaps was seen to be the effective tool for accomplishing the central objective of the overall foreign policy objective of Nigeria, as gate way's to achieving its national interest; this is where there was existence of an efficient score card for the Jonathan administration.

4.3.3 Nigeria's international image and respect

The Jonathan administration expectedly also enjoyed recognition among nations, for its contributions, projects and leading role in ECOWAS, the AU, NEPAD, the Common Wealth and the UN as well as in the area of conflict prevention and peacemaking through foreign policy

thrust direction. Nigeria earned more respect in the international community despite lingering domestic challenges. The whole internal security challenges, did not affect the good will, friendship and partnership that Nigeria enjoyed in the International System. Indeed the country received and continued to receive offers delegation and visitors from all countries seeking to engage with the government to invest in Nigeria economy and exchange views on important issues of common interest and concerns.

However, the effort of the Jonathan administration to effectively change the perception of Nigeria's international image was demonstrated in its alignment to strategically partner with other nations.

Nigeria's image problem is both a domestic and global concern. It is not necessarily the worst country in Africa or the world but it definitely parades the most unenviable image. The general perception and graphic portrayal these days

is that of a country where corruption is life and insecurity of life and prosperity is the defining characteristic, a country where nothing works and everything is wrong (Ridmap,2011).

4.3.4 Relationship with great powers

In terms of bilateral relations especially with the big powers, the Jonathan administration had good working relationship with most of them and some notable leaders paid state visits to Nigeria. However most clear exception was United States. Nigeria-US relations were not at its very best under the Jonathan administration.

According to Campbell (2015), the reason has to do with Nigerian security services human rights violation in the fight against the Islamist insurgent group, Boko-Haram and in part because of vocal criticism from the Jonathan administration that the United States was not doing enough to help in the fight against Boko-Haram. Nigeria had in 2013 cancelled a plan to have US military train a battalion of the Nigerian army to be able to confront the Boko-Haram, while the Nigerian government directly accused the US of refusing to sell arms to Nigeria in its fight against the Boko-Hram insurgency. The American government insisted it had supported the Nigerian government to the extent its laws permit and accused the Nigerian security forces of human rights violations. it went ahead to say its laws disallows the sales of arms to countries which poor human rights record. Though the American Secretary of State, John Kerry visited Nigeria in January ostensibly to push for a free and fair

election, relations between both countries did not normalize before Jonathan left office.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.0 Introduction

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

5.1 Summary

This research is aimed at finding out the influence of domestic structure on the conduct of Nigeria's foreign Policy under Goodluck Jonathan's administration (2010-2015).

For proper understanding of the problem of study, Realist theory was adopted. An indepth analysis on the impact of domestic structures on Nigeria's foreign policy under the military regimes shows that the regime of General Yakubu Gowon marked the switch of foreign policy focus in Africa. It was Gowon who first formalized Africa as "the centre piece of Nigeria's Foreign Policy". General Babangida made a radical shift in foreign affairs by initiating a policy of "Economic Diplomacy" anchored on the Structural Adjustment Programme. As a result of domestic problems, the international community treated Nigeria as a Pariah state during General Abacha's regime. The regime swung to the East, Asia and Islamic nations. The Jonathan's administration began embarking on Regional Democracy and ensuring that all African nations become independent as well as practice full democracy.

The findings revealed that Nigeria's foreign policy has since independence been consistently guided by the same principles and objectives. In the pursuit of these principles and objective, Nigeria's foreign policy initiatives and actions have been defined by one firm

and constant variable, which is the protection of the country's national interest.

The impact of dominant personalities in history of Nigeria as the head of state or government has shaped Nigeria's foreign policy. In term of peace and security, the mistake of the past is still there. The Jonathan administration put in place economic diplomacy that incorporated strategic partnership and upholding regional democracy in ensuring that the domestic structures was in line with the Foreign policy objectives of Nigeria in the Fourth Republic.

The Jonathan administration within the 6 years of his mandate was able to enthrone foreign policies that have coped with domestic challenges such as the corruption perception of the country, Internal security crisis, and the dwindling economy of the country.

52 Conclusion

The decade between 1999 and 2015 marked another attempt by Nigeria to operate a democratic government. The successful civilian to civilian

transition from Obasanjo's administration to Yar'Adua and to Goodluck Jonathan signaled a fundamental history.

The fourth republic civilian rule has given Nigeria the opportunity to effectively manage its foreign policy posture in the International System. Before now, Nigeria's image in the international system was tarnished especially during the military rule, this study was carried out in order to help in analyzing Nigeria's foreign policy under the democratic dispensation. The study used the Jonathan administration from 2010–2015 as a Case Study.

The era of Jonathan administration in the history of Domestic structure and Nigeria's foreign policy implementation and execution had some positive impact and influence on the African continent and Nigeria bilateral and multilateral relation even in the heat of the domestic insecurity, economy downturn and ethnic and religious tensions. Some of these positive effects were the restoration of democratic government in Guinea Bissau and Mali.

The administration also engaged in economy diplomacy that restored confidence in foreign investment, credit facility and entrepreneurs development. Another is the restoration of Nigeria image in the

international system. However, all of these achievements could not have come without several domestic and external influences as expected in carrying out foreign policy of a nation.

5.3 Recommendations

The following are some recommendations that will shape Nigeria's foreign policy objectives and help Nigeria sustain her democracy. It will also help in marshalling our National Interest concretely with our foreign policy posture, ensuring a dynamic foreign policy at the international arena.

1. Nigeria's Foreign Policy should be re-conceptualized to primarily address the domestic and developmental needs of the country.
2. There should be an appropriate domestic enrolment for democratic Foreign Policy making, one that allows public contribution to Foreign Policy formulation and not just restricted solely to government officials.
3. There should be need for a constitutional process that will promote national integration and make for a good sense of

national identity for the nation.

4. Elimination and reduction of endemic public corruption. Probity, honesty and transparency should be the watch dog in the conduct of politics.
5. The scope of Nigeria's foreign policy objective should no longer be restricted to just the continent but should be globally based and geared towards the protection of our cultural heritage and national interest.
6. Nigeria's foreign policy should focus on creating benefits for the betterment of the people
7. Maintenance of peace and security at home should be given more attention against leadership view of maintaining peace abroad while the house (Nigeria) is on "fire".
8. Nigeria must evolve a "home – grown" economic policy and honestly by its implementation.
9. Finally, Nigeria should pursue the goals of democracy, good governance and respect for human rights at home to ensure the

credibility of her leadership role abroad

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

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

Adeniran .T. (1982) *Introduction to International Relations*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books.

Adeniran, T. (1983) *Introduction to International Relations*, Lagos: Macmillan Nig. Ltd.

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

Akinboye, S.O. (1999) *Nigeria's Foreign Policy in Elements of politics*, Lagos: Malt house Publishers.

Aluko, O. (1981) *Essay in Nigeria's Foreign Policy*, London: George Allen and Unwin

Aluko O. *Essays in Nigeria's Foreign Policy*, Ibadan University Press

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

Asiwaju, A. and Adetula A.O.V. (2011) *Reflection on Nigeria's Foreign Policy:*

Foundation and Challenges, Abuja FBS Publication.

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

Fawole W. A. (1999) *General Sani Abacha and the New Nigerian Foreign Policy*

Ibadan: OAU Press.

Fawole,WA. (2003) *Nigeria's External Relations and Foreign Policy Under Military Rule (1966-1999)* Ile-Ife Obafemi Awolowo

Frankel, J. (1964) *International Relations*, New York, Oxford University Press.

Goldstein, J. and J. Pevehouse (2011) *International Relations*, United States:

Pearson.

Legg K. & Morrison J, (1971) *Politics and the International System*, New York:

Happer and Row

Morgenthau, H. (1973) *Politics among Nations*, New York: Alfred Krampf University Press Ltd.

Northedge, F.S. (1974) *the Foreign Policy of the Powers*, New York. The Free Press.

Northedge, F.S. (1954) *Introduction to International Politics*, New York: Macmillian Press.

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

Ogwu U.J (1986) *Nigerian Foreign Policy Alternative Features*, Ibadan:

Macmillan Nigeria Publishers.

Olusanya, G. O. (eds) *Nigerian's External Relations, The first twenty five years.*

Ibadan: University Press.

Padelford and Lincon (1986) *The Dynamics of International Politics,*
New York:

(Macmillan Press).

Saliu H. (1999) *Selected Themes in Nigerian Foreign Policy and International*

Relations, Illorin: haytee Books.

JOURNALS

Adefolarin A.O. (2014) Military Rule in Nigeria Foreign Policy in Academia.edu. open access online journal.

Adetula, V.A.O. (2010) Nigeria Foreign Service and the Challenges of Modern Diplomacy, current Issues in development, Vol 1 No 1 Pp 1.

Akindele, R.A. (2001) The United Nations in Nigeria Foreign Policy in International Journal of Foreign Policy Vol2. No3, Pp 1 –34.

Carlsnaes, W. (2008). "Foreign Policy", in Carlsnaes, W, T. Risse and B. Simmons (eds) Handbook of International Relations, pp 331-349, London: Sage Publications.

NEWS PAPER

Ashiru, O (2013) Foreign Policy: New Realities changing world in the Guardian Newspaper, p67.

Babalola, S. (2002) Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Nigeria Tribune July 9.

The Guardian Newspaper, 16 September 1999.

The Connet Newspaper, February 1, 2001.

National Concord, 20 February 2000.

The Sun News Newspaper, 2008.

This Day Newspaper, 2009

All African Newspaper

OTHERS

Obasanjo, O. (1999) Presidential Speech, May 29, 1999.

Yar'Adua M. (2007) Presidential Speech, May 29, 2007.

Aliu, M. (2001) New Trust of Nigeria, Foreign Policy at Presidential Retreat on National Security. Abuja

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

Gambari Ibrahim "Domestic Politics and Nigeria's Foreign Policy in New Millennium": Pre - convocation Public lecture at Arewa House, Kaduna. 1998.

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

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

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

World Bank operation Policies: Country ranked by per capital Income, "The

World Bank operational manual". (Washington, D. C. The World Bank) 2003.