

**The Influence of Internal and External Factors on
Nigerian Foreign Policy Formulation and
Implementation**

Blessing Sunday Dickson

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
International Relations

Eastern Mediterranean University
August 2017
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Tümer
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Prof. Dr. Erol Kaymak
Chair, Department of Political Science and
International Relations

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality and as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Berna Numan
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Asst. Prof. Dr. Umut Bozkurt

2. Asst. Prof. Dr. Nuray Ibryamova

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Berna Numan

ABSTRACT

State behaviour internationally has long been understood to be the result of various factors that emanate both from the state itself and its constituting external environment. The influence of these factors tends to vary between states. Using the case of Nigeria, this thesis set out to determine whether internal or external factors are deterministic for Nigerian foreign policy.

Following a review of the literature on sources of foreign policy and an overview of Nigerian foreign policy through history, evidence of relevant sources in relation to Nigerian foreign policy was presented and subsequently used as a basis for formulating interview questions. The resulting evidence was then taken in conjunction with the answers to the interview questions in the hope of finding evidence in support of the thesis hypotheses, which collectively predicted that internal influence takes dominance over external influence where Nigerian foreign policy is concerned.

As expected, findings indicate that internal influence on Nigerian foreign policy has been more pervasive than external influence. This, however, does not mean that external influence has been non-existent or entirely secondary but that the majority of Nigerian foreign policy behaviours can be explained primarily by internal considerations.

Keywords: Foreign policy, Nigeria, Unit-Level, Foreign Policy Analysis, Case Study

ÖZ

Devletlerin uluslararası sistemdeki davranışları hem uluslararası etkenlerden hem de devletlerin kamuoyu gibi içsel etkenlere dayandığı uzun zamandır kabul görmektedir. İç ve dış etkenlerin etkinlik boyutu devletler arasında farklılık göstermektedir. Bu tez, Nijerya'yı bir vaka çalışması çerçevesinde inceleyip, iç ve dış etkenlerin Nijerya dış politikasındaki belirleyiciliğini tespit etmeyi hedeflemiştir.

Tezde öncelikle, kapsamlı bir literatür taraması ile farklı düşünce okullarına göre dış politika kaynaklarının tipolojisi çıkartılmış. Akabinde Nijerya'nın dış politikasının tarihsel süreçler içerisinde nasıl değiştiği tespit edilmiştir. Bu bulgular uzmanlarla yapılan mülakatların temelini oluşturmuş ve tezde birincil kaynakların kullanımını tezin tümdengelim tasarımına uygun olarak yapılmasını sağlamıştır. Böylelikle hem ikincil hem de birincil kaynaklar kullanılarak kuramlara dayalı hipotezler test edilmiştir.

Araştırma sonuçları, Nijerya dış politikasının kamuoyu odaklı iç etkenlere dayalı olduğunu, iç etkenlerin dış etkenlerden daha belirleyici olduğunu göstermiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dış Politika, Nijerya, Birim-düzey, Dış Politika Analizi, Vaka Çalışması

DEDICATION

To my mother Mrs. Kate Ndeya and my sister Jenifer Gona

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

My profound gratitude goes to God Almighty for His infinite mercies and endless love throughout the course of my study.

My endless gratitude also goes to my parents especially my mother for all the love, prayers, support, advice, encouragement and most of all financial contribution to see me through school, thank you mummy for always believing in me and ensuring that I achieve my goals in life.

I want to also acknowledge my supervisor, Asst. Prof, Dr. Berna Numan for her patience, advice, corrections, and the time she put in to make sure she brings out the best in me. My gratitude also goes to all my professors at EMU who contributed in one way or the other to my intellectual journey.

Finally, I also want to appreciate my family, friends, colleagues and everyone who stood by me, my parents Mr. Sunday Dickson and Mrs. Kate, and my sister Jenifer, my friends Chukudozie Udakor, Ruth Eze, Mfon Etukudu, Asanga Fon, Samuel Akoni, Daniel Olokpa, Mr. Buhari Maipyen and many others who have contributed in one way or the other to my success.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZ	iv
DEDICATION	v
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xii
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Scope and Limitations	1
1.2 Methodology	2
1.3 Literature Review	3
1.3.1 Sources of State Foreign Policy	5
1.3.1.1 International Sources of State Foreign Policy.....	5
1.3.1.2 Domestic Sources of State Foreign Policy.....	7
1.3.1.3 Foreign Policy and Public Opinion	9
1.3.2 How Do the Domestic and International Sources of Foreign Policy Interact?.....	12
1.4 Research Question.....	13
1.5 Theory-Guided Hypotheses	13
1.5.1 Alons' Predictions.....	14
1.5.2 Rosenau's Typology	15
1.5.3 Hypotheses	17
1.6 Organization of the Thesis	18
2 NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY THROUGH HISTORY	19
2.1 The First Republic.....	19

2.1.1 The Balewa Administration (1963-1966)	19
2.2 The First Period of Interim Military Rule	21
2.2.1 The Ironsi Regime (1966)	21
2.2.2 The Gowon Regime (1966-1975)	22
2.2.3 The Muhammed-Obasanjo Regime (1975-79)	24
2.3 The Second Republic	25
2.3.1 The Shagari Administration (1979-1983)	25
2.4 The Second Period of Interim Military Rule.....	27
2.4.1 The Buhari Regime (1983-1985)	27
2.4.2 The Babangida Regime (1985-1993).....	28
2.5 The Third Republic	29
2.6 The Third and Final Period of Interim Military Rule	30
2.6.1 The Abacha Regime (1993-1999).....	30
2.7 The Fourth Republic	31
2.7.1 The Obasanjo Administration (1999-2007)	32
2.7.2 The Yar’adua Administration (2007-2010)	34
2.7.3 The Jonathan Administration (2010-2015).....	34
2.7.4 The Buhari Administration (2015-Present).....	36
3 EXTERNAL INFLUENCE ON NIGERIA’S FOREIGN POLICY	38
3.1 External Influence on Foreign Policy	38
3.1.1 Relationship Between Position in The International System and Foreign Policy	39
3.1.2 The International Power Structure and State Foreign Policy.....	41
3.1.3 International Organizations, Alliances, and State Foreign Policy	43
3.2 External Influence on Nigerian Foreign Policy	44

3.3 Conclusion	46
4 INTERNAL INFLUENCE ON NIGERIA’S FOREIGN POLICY	47
4.1 Internal Influence on Foreign Policy	47
4.1.1 The Individual Level of Analysis.....	47
4.1.2 The Society Level of Analysis	48
4.1.2.1 Role Perceptions and Foreign Policy	48
4.1.2.2 Culture and History	50
4.1.2.3 Public Opinion and Foreign Policy	51
4.1.2.4 Media and Foreign Policy	52
4.1.2.5 Other Societal Influences on Foreign Policy	54
4.1.3 The State Level of Analysis	54
4.1.3.1 Nature of the Political System and Foreign Policy	54
4.1.3.2 Political Accountability and Foreign Policy	56
4.1.3.3 The Diplomatic Institution and Foreign Policy.....	57
4.2 Internal Influence On Nigerian Foreign Policy.....	57
4.2.1 Individual Influence on Nigerian Foreign Policy.....	57
4.2.2 Societal Influence on Nigerian Foreign Policy	61
4.2.3 State Influence on Nigerian Foreign Policy	66
4.3 Conclusion	67
5 ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	68
5.1 Data Collection.....	68
5.2 Data Analysis	70
5.3 Discussion	78
6 SUMMARY CONCLUSION	80
6.1 Direction for Further Study.....	82

REFERENCES.....	83
APPENDICES	92
Appendix A: Interview Questions.....	93
Appendix B: Interview Transcripts.....	94

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: List of Respondents in Alphabetic Order, and their Respective Positions.....	78
Table 2: Respondents' Keys.....	79
Table 3: Select Factors and their Corresponding Respondents.....	80
Table 4: Select Themes Common among the Respondents.....	83
Table 5: Principles Historically Known to Have Guided NFP According to the Respondents.....	86

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AU	African Union
ECOMOG	Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EU	European Union
FPA	Foreign Policy Analysis
GNP	Gross National Product
IMF	International Monetary Fund
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NFP	Nigerian Foreign Policy
OAU	Organization of African Unity
US	United States of America
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
UN	United Nations

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

As Africa's most populous country, its largest oil producer, and with one of its largest economies with numerous opportunities for growth, Nigeria is particularly poised to play a leading role on the African and global scenes. However, it has been unable to do this due to the numerous domestic economic and political challenges it faces, which have stifled the country's ability to lead. In light of, and despite these constraints, the country has historically maintained an active foreign policy continentally and globally. Understanding how the country has been able to remain so active vis-à-vis its foreign policy requires an exploration of the factors that drive the formulation and implementation of its foreign policy objectives.

It is widely accepted that a country's foreign policy is driven by factors internal and external to it. However, specific factors tend to take primacy over others at specific times depending on the particular political climate. Based on this understanding, this thesis intends to explore how various factors have affected Nigerian foreign policy since independence in 1960 with a look to establishing which of these factors have played a larger role.

1.1 Scope and Limitations

This thesis explores the influence of domestic and international factors on the foreign policy of a country. It does so using the case of Nigeria, and more specifically, its foreign policy from the establishment of the first republic in 1963 till date. This, with

the aim of determining which factors enjoy primacy over others. To achieve this aim the thesis reviews the literature on foreign policy analysis and other relevant works and formulates the research question guiding this thesis. The central research question of the thesis is “To what extent have internal and external factors played a deterministic role for Nigeria’s foreign policy?”.

One primary limitation of this research is that it uses just one case study, which limits its generalizability. However, factors present here in Nigerian case may be applicable to other cases. Therefore, this study provides essential evidence for other studies looking to design ‘most similar cases’ or ‘most different cases’ analysis. Furthermore, the thesis is also limited in that it relies on secondary sources for identifying evolution of Nigerian Foreign Policy. This limitation is minimized by triangulation of the findings by use of elite interviews. In a way, primary sources were used so as to compensate for this.

1.2 Methodology

The thesis employs a longitudinal case study design to identify the evolution of Nigerian Foreign Policy. In doing that, it uses deductive qualitative methods. Theory guided hypotheses were derived from the literature reviewed, and secondary and primary data were used to test these hypotheses. It is deductive in that it lays its foundation in previous studies in the field of foreign policy. Following a review of the literature, the thesis provides a historical look at Nigerian foreign policy from independence to the foreign policy of the current regime. The various internal and external influences on foreign policy are elucidated, both in general and in particular reference to the Nigerian case by utilizing a combination of theoretical approaches on foreign policy. The conclusions from the above are then combined with the

responses gotten from certain authorities on Nigerian foreign policy contacted by the researcher to offer an explanation of what factors have been deterministic for Nigerian foreign policy over the years. In other words, the interviews were used to triangulate the secondary data.

1.3 Literature Review

The establishment of the current system of nation-states by the 1648 Peace of Westphalia gave rise to the notion of state sovereignty and the understanding that the sovereign entities that make up the current international system of states are, at least theoretically, equal. This equality of states caused more attention to be directed to the ways in which states deal with one another: through the diplomatic institution specifically, and their foreign policy orientations in general.

If we accept that relations between states are, for the most part, regulated by their respective foreign policies, how can the term ‘foreign policy’ be defined? Different scholars have, over the years, offered different definitions of the concept; each focusing on different aspects of foreign policy’s constitutive processes, some more pessimistic than others. Ota and Ecoma (2015) offer one such pessimistic understanding of foreign policy as “a coordinated and articulated strategy” through which a state’s decision makers intend to “*manipulate* the international environment” so as to achieve their national objectives (p. 57; added emphasis). Such an understanding stands in contrast with more neutral definitions of foreign policy such as that offered by Oni and Taiwo (2016) who define foreign policy as “a body of decisions formulated to serve as the guiding principles of a nation-state in its interaction with other nation-states” (p. 63). One of the foremost authorities on

foreign policy, James Rosenau, sees foreign policy as “adaptive behaviour” and the nation as an “adaptive organism” (see Rosenau, 1970).

Despite their differences, the three definitions of foreign policy offered above, when taken together, highlight four salient elements of foreign policy: it is a coordinated activity, it is externally oriented in that it is directed towards the international environment, it aims to achieve certain objectives of the constitutive state, and it is adaptive. These four elements lead to a comprehensive definition of the foreign policy of a state as its externally oriented activities aimed at the attainment of certain national goals vis-à-vis other states in the international system of states that are adapted to fit changing realities. Such an understanding of foreign policy is hardly definitive because, as has been pointed out by Holsti (1970), some commentators view foreign policy behaviour as “patterned or recurring decisions” by state governments (p. 233), a far cry from the adaptive understanding offered by Rosenau, highlighting the multiplicity of understandings of foreign policy in the field.

Regardless, the study of foreign policy, under the auspices of the sub-field ‘Foreign Policy Analysis’ (FPA), has become increasingly important in the field of International Relations in recent years, least of all because foreign policy (with its focus on relations between states) is concerned with issues so important that they have implications for mankind as a whole (Rosenau 1970, p. 366). The importance of the foreign policies of states, in that state policies towards other states play a deterministic role for the stability of the international system, begs the question of how states derive their foreign policies. Departing from the notion that different factors converge to form foreign policy outputs (Garrison 2003, p. 155), it is

precisely these “explanans”: factors that influence foreign policy (decision making and decision makers alike), that FPA as a field is concerned (Hudson 2005, p. 2).

Overall, there are two central schools of thought on the sources of state foreign policy; here termed the domestic and the international schools of thought, under which other individual sources fall. It is necessary to note that very few (if any) scholars of foreign policy claim the exclusivity of their respective schools i.e. scholars that privilege domestic sources of foreign policy do not claim that international factors exert zero influence and vice-versa. Where they differ is the level of influence they believe domestic and international factors exert on foreign policy respectively and any complete account of a state’s foreign policy must take both domestic and international factors into account, as it is the result of “environmental factors, internal and external to [the state]” (Northedge, 1968 cited in Lawal and Hassan 2015, p. 6). Before exploring the interplay between domestic and international factors in determining a state’s foreign policy, an overview of both schools is necessary.

1.3.1 Sources of State Foreign Policy

1.3.1.1 International Sources of State Foreign Policy

Proponents of the international school of thought on foreign policy emphatically highlight the influence of external factors on a state’s foreign policy. Represented by variants of the neo-realist theory of international relations, they argue that systemic factors are consistently dominant in determining a state’s foreign policy (Rose 1998, p. 146).

Advocates of this position (e.g. Waltz, 1979) argue that domestic politics is hardly important in understanding a state's foreign policy. They maintain that analysts treat the state as a black box, ignoring its inner workings and use only its position in the international system vis-à-vis other states in explaining its behaviour. According to Fearon (1998), such 'systemic' theories assume states are unitary rational actors driven in their relations with other states by properties of the system such as their respective relative power thereby negating the need to take each state's particular characteristics into account (pp. 291-292).

The two theories of foreign policy generated by scholars in this school: offensive and defensive realism, take different paths in arriving to the same conclusion that external factors account for state behaviour and that is why states with different domestic systems often behave similarly in the international arena and vice-versa (Rose 1998, p. 148).

In offensive realism, the condition of anarchy makes security scarce. Therefore, states try to maximize their relative advantage, and implicitly their relative power. External pressures on the state are sufficient and powerful enough to direct state behaviour causing similarly-situated states to act alike. Explaining a given state's foreign policy therefore, is a simply a matter of looking at its relative capabilities in relation to its external environment as these determine how it pursues its interests. Conversely, defensive realism posits that rather than being scare, security is often plentiful regardless of anarchy, causing state behaviour to be each state's proper rational reaction to systemic security-related incentives. The resulting stability might, however, often be interrupted in periods where rogue states, "ignore the true

security-related incentives” offered to them by the system itself (Rose 1998, pp. 149-50).

In summary, the international school of thought on the sources of state foreign policy argues that state behaviour is driven by external systemic pressures engendered by the very condition of the international system itself: anarchy. These pressures either make states security-maximizers (as in the case of defensive realism) or power-maximizers (as in offensive realism. Regardless of which form these systemic pressures manifest they, the same conclusion is reached in both defensive and offensive realism that systemic pressures directly shape state foreign policy irrespective of each state’s individual characteristics.

1.3.1.2 Domestic Sources of State Foreign Policy

Although initially understood to be the result of external [international] pressures on the state apparatus, internal [domestic] pressures, from the 1950s and 60s, began gaining increased acceptance as exerting an influence on foreign policy (Brecher et al. 1969, p. 75; Alons 2007, p. 213). Now a relatively widely accepted approach, proponents of this ‘domestic’ school of thought see domestic factors as the primary determinants of a state’s foreign policy consequently requiring that foreign policy analysts look into the ‘black box’ that is the state for an explanation of its foreign policy choices. This school is represented by ‘*Innenpolitik*’ theories, a broad umbrella comprising different variants each stressing a specific domestic variable (Rose 1998, p. 146; 148).

In addition to the differences between the various innenpolitik theories in regards to which domestic independent variables are the most salient, scholars in this school also often disagree about the direction of influence within domestic society itself

before it is translated into foreign policy. According to one such proponent, “foreign policy is a reflection of a nation’s development, economic and political system. Domestic issues and ideologies...make demands on policy makers, which in turn impact foreign policy.” (Wapmuk 2012, p. 9). Simply put, a state’s behaviour in the international arena, its foreign policy, is a product of the pressures put on policy makers by domestic society at large.

While this illustrates one way of explaining the influence of a state’s internal environment on its foreign policy – a “bottom-up” trend, where the “general public has a measurable and distinct impact” on foreign policy – domestic influence may also manifest itself in a “top-down” fashion, where “popular consensus is a function of the elite consensus” (Risse-Kappen 1991, p. 480; 481; see also Cantir and Kaarbo 2012, p. 7).

Risse-Kappen (1991) warns however that such simplistic understandings of domestic influence on foreign policy (top-down or bottom-up) suffer from conceptual shortcomings in at least three respects: firstly, both models treat the mass public and the elites as unitary actors ignoring internal differences between the broadly defined groups¹; secondly, the models ignore that the groups influence policy-making in different stages and in different ways effectively failing to account for indirect channels of influence; and lastly, it is misguided to assume that elite and mass opinion interact and are translated into policy in the manner across different states (pp. 482-483).

¹ A point buttressed by Cantir and Kaarbo’s (2012) observation that in addition to vertical (mass-elite) situations, foreign policy may also be contested horizontally amongst the elites themselves.

Overall, regardless of differences between them, members of the domestic school on foreign policy seem to agree on at least two points: foreign policy is a product of a country's internal dynamics (Rose 1998, p. 148); as such, domestic politics is typically pivotal in explaining a state's foreign policy (Fearon 1998, pp. 289-90), and the path taken by internal factors in influencing the foreign policy of a given state is largely dependent upon the domestic structure of the state in question as it is the domestic structure of a state that determines how it deals with societal pressures (Risse-Kappen 1991, p. 484).

In contrasting this school to the opposing 'international' school on foreign policy, Fearon (1998) argues that domestic politics tends to matter for foreign policy either by "causing states to pursue suboptimal foreign policies", or, and perhaps most commonly, when differences between states' internal constitutions are directly responsible for their different foreign policy choices (p. 302).

1.3.1.3 Foreign Policy and Public Opinion

Proponents of the domestic school agree that internal pressures on the state drive said state's foreign policy. One such internal pressure is that exerted by public opinion.

Various foreign policy commentators, particularly those who agree that domestic influence on the foreign policy choices of a state is strong enough to warrant particular attention, have drawn attention to the role of public opinion in the formulation of a state's foreign policy.

More often than not guided by the presumption that public opinion does indeed matter, at least to some degree, they have challenged by other theorists who do not see public opinion as being a factor in the creation of a state's foreign policy.

Scholars within the realist school of international relations for example, have long viewed the relationship between public opinion and an effective foreign policy with great scepticism. Of the opinion that while the general public might have ample knowledge regarding domestic policy issues to be useful, they argue that foreign policy issues are too distant from the average citizen's experience for public opinion on such issues to be reliable and/or useful (Holsti 1992, p. 440).

Following the end of the Second World War, the consensus that developed among realists and other sceptics was based on three propositions

1. Public opinion is unstable and consequently cannot serve as a strong foundation for foreign policy.
2. Public attitudes are so incoherent that they are hardly attitudes at all.
3. Public opinion has hardly any bearing on foreign policy. (Holsti 1992, p. 442).

The resulting consensus believed that foreign policy is essentially externally driven as policy-makers are hardly inhibited by an uninformed public with unstable views (Holsti, 2002 cited in Cantir and Kaarbo 2012, p. 11) and thus have only external dynamics to consider. Holsti (1992) warns however, that contemporary scholars be wary of transposing these assumptions about public opinion generated during the cold war era to one "of strikingly different circumstances" (p. 461).

While initial studies into the matter during the 1950s and 60s seemed to side with the sceptics, concluding that public opinion was in fact unstable (e.g. Almond, 1950; Miller, 1967), subsequent studies beginning in the 70s began to argue the contrary. Scholars such as Caspary (1970) instead advanced the notion that public opinion on

foreign affairs is relatively coherent and consistent, making it more reliable than previous studies had shown and a factor policy-makers should also take into account (Wittkopf, 1990; Page and Bouton, 2006). If the contemporary understanding is that public opinion does indeed matter for the foreign policy choices of a state, how then is it formed?

Thought to be formed by the constituting society itself, public opinion is understood to be the attitudes of society at large to specific issues resulting from interactions between individuals and their social environment (Noelle-Neumann 1974, p. 43). Public opinion therefore, comprises the opinions of each member of the public resulting from their interactions with society, as well as other individuals.

It is widely accepted that public opinion is the result of various societal forces fighting for the public's favour. One way through which this is done is mass media. The media is considered to be a very effective means of influencing the public's thoughts on foreign policy issues, as in addition to providing policymakers with reports on public opinion, it is also the main source of foreign policy information for the average individual (Soroka 2003, p. 28; Baum and Potter 2008, p. 40) since most foreign affairs events occur "beyond the realm of personal experience" (Soroka 2003, p. 42).

In conjunction with the fact that the influence of public opinion on foreign policy choices is much higher when the public is sufficiently informed (Baum and Potter 2008, p. 48), media influence is even more important in the present era where technological advances have made it easier for citizens to react to the foreign policies of nation-states (Foyle 2003, p. 167;168).

Ironically, the fact that the media exerts such a great influence on public opinion has been used to support the idea that perhaps public opinion is not a “stable and independent source of foreign policy” due to the influence of media framing where attention is drawn to some issues while purposely ignoring others (Cantir and Kaarbo 2012, p. 12).

1.3.2 How Do the Domestic and International Sources of Foreign Policy Interact?

Putnam (1988) first introduced the notion of the “two-level game” decision-makers must play during the formulation of a state policy. He posited that the decision-makers were often at a crossroads between domestic politics and international relations. Claiming that attempts to illustrate which of the two determined the other were fruitless, Putnam concluded that they both occasionally determined the other. In relation to foreign policy, it is possible to draw the implication that a state’s foreign policy is consequently driven by both domestic and international variables working in conjunction.

Scholars from the neoclassical realist school of foreign policy occupy a similar position (see Rose, 1998). Occupying a middle ground between the domestic and international schools on foreign policy, which emphasize internal and external influence respectively, they include both internal and external variables in arguing that although a state’s foreign policy is driven by its place in the system and its relative capabilities, systemic incentives are also filtered through domestic intervening variables. These variables include domestic policy makers’ perceptions, through which external pressures are filtered, and state-society relations, which determine how much room for manoeuvre policy-makers enjoy.

1.4 Research Question

Accepting that these intervening variables filter external incentives in no way implies that they exclusively inhibit them. According to Alons (2007), although external influence is decisive in situations where internal polarity (concentration of power in the government's hands) is high and external polarity (concentration of power in the international system) is low, the reverse may also be the case. The task therefore is determining whether internal or external pressures prevail in particular situations and to what degree.

Using the case of Nigeria, it is precisely that task that this thesis aims to undertake. Thus, using a unit-level perspective, the central research question guiding this thesis is: To what extent have internal and external factors played a deterministic role for Nigeria's foreign policy?

In a seminal text, Rosenau (1966) contended that understanding what variables prevail in determining a state's foreign policy requires an understanding of its particular genotype. Rosenau's typology provides a healthy starting point for the project at hand as determining Nigeria's genotypic group could provide useful in formulation of the study's hypothesis.

1.5 Theory-Guided Hypotheses

Before exploring the implications of Rosenau's genotypes, I find it necessary to elaborate further on Gerry Alons' work on predicting a state's foreign policy for some conceptual clarity and assistance in determining the study's hypotheses.

1.5.1 Alons' Predictions

Alons (2007) opined that while both internal and external variables matter in the conduct of any state's foreign policy, domestic considerations may trump international considerations and vice-versa depending on two variables: internal polarity (concentration of power in the government's hands relative to society) and external polarity (centralization of power in the international system).

The first – internal polarity – refers to the domestic political structure, particularly state-society relations, which directly affect the government's ability to wield state power in the conduct of its foreign policy i.e. high internal polarity is preferable to low internal polarity for a government intent on having an active foreign policy. Similarly, “external polarity affects the stability of power relations and thereby the degree to which states need to take account of their external interests” (p. 212).

In analysing the circumstances by which domestic or international incentives may prevail in determining a state foreign policy, Alon identified two principal variables that come into play: internal polarity and external polarity. By internal polarity, reference is made to the degree of concentration of power in the hands of the government relative to society. External polarity on the other hand refers to the degree of concentration of power in the international system (basically power distribution or structure: unipolarity, bipolarity, tripolarity and multipolarity). Alons predicted that in cases where internal polarity is low and external polarity is high, internal influences should be prevalent while external influences should prevail when internal polarity is high and external polarity is low.

While operationalizing the degree of concentration of power in the international system of states is beyond the scope of this study, what is salient for present purposes is the first part of Alons' argument – internal influence should prevail when internal polarity is low and external polarity is high. Even in the present democratic setting, the Nigerian government remains powerful relative to civil society and the executive maintains a near monopoly on foreign policy thereby titling the balance of power to its favour in relations to the society. It can be deduced from this that internal polarity is low in the case of Nigeria.

1.5.2 Rosenau's Typology

“Rosenau's Typology” (Ideal Nation-Types) refers to a midrange theory of state level analysis of foreign policy first elucidated in James N. Rosenau's famous article "Pre-theories and Theories of Foreign Policy" in *Approaches to Comparative and International Politics*. Rosenau identified three state-level factors which, he postulates, influence foreign policy choice and behaviour: the country's size (small or large by population), its political system (open or close depending on whether or not it is a democracy) and the economic system (underdeveloped or developed depending on its GNP). The theory's fundamental concentration was to come out with a typology that will enable the ranking of variables from five levels of analysis in relation to their influence in foreign policy formulation of eight nation-types he identified (Neack, 2008).

Using three dichotomous variables – size, economic development (wealth), and political system (accountability) – Rosenau (1966) posits eight genotypic groups, one of which each state belongs to. Moreover, regardless of which genotype a particular state belongs to, he opined that five sources are deterministic in regards to its foreign

policy. Each of these sources is related to a particular level of analysis and they are: individual, role, societal, governmental, and systemic sources/levels of analysis. Of the five, four (individual, role, societal, governmental) are internal variables while systemic sources are external to the state.

Depending on the particular genotype of the state in question, the aforementioned five sources are said to influence said state's foreign policy in different configurations and varying degrees of intensity. The various genotypes and the corresponding sources of foreign policy in order are listed below using the following key: Size - Large (L)/Small (S); Economic Development - Developed (D)/Underdeveloped (U); Political System - Open (O)/Closed (C).

1. LDO: Role, Societal, Governmental, Systemic, Individual
2. LDC: Role, Individual, Governmental, Systemic, Societal
3. LUO: Individual, Role, Societal, Systemic, Governmental
4. LUC: Individual, Role, Governmental, Systemic, Societal
5. SDO: Role, Systemic, Societal, Governmental Individual
6. SDC: Role, Systemic, Individual, Governmental, Societal
7. SUO: Individual, Systemic, Role, Societal, Governmental
8. SUC: Individual, Systemic, Role, Governmental, Societal

Before trying to relate Rosenau's Typology to the present study, it is important to highlight this nuance in his overall conception. Rosenau's wrote in the context of the 1960s with examples that have been obsoleted with the passage of time (the Soviet Union he presented as a Large, developed and close state was dissolved and India

and China have attained significant levels of development that renders inaccurate their classification as underdeveloped countries).

In relating Rosenau's typology to this study, we must answer the following question: which of these genotypic groups does Nigeria belong? This may be determined by determining Nigeria's size (in terms of population), economic development (in terms of GNP), and political system (democratic or otherwise). Although Rosenau's choice of dichotomizing the variables is somewhat limiting, his typology is still useful for the purposes of this study.

Regarding its size, while the argument might be made that Nigeria is a small country – and it no doubt is relative to some other countries' populations (e.g. China) – if we accept that Africa has always been the centrepiece of its foreign policy (Kayode, 2016), the counter-argument could be made that Nigeria does indeed qualify as a large country (in the African context) seeing as it has the continent's largest population. The counter-argument is further buttressed when Nigeria is viewed in relation to other countries in the West-African sub-region. Economically speaking, Nigeria remains classified as an underdeveloped country despite its size especially as its economy remains extremely dependent on oil revenues which has proven problematic politically as well (Watts, 2004). Lastly, Nigeria is currently governed by a democratically-elected administration and thus qualifies as open. It has however been governed by autocratic military regimes in the past meaning that it qualified as a closed system during those periods.

1.5.3 Hypotheses

Overall, the 'Rosenauan' genotypes applicable to Nigeria are numbers 3 (LUO) and 4 (LUC). Interestingly, in both cases, internal influences (specifically that of

individual leaders) are expected to be more deterministic than external influences. The only difference is that during the military regimes where Nigeria was politically closed, we would expect governmental influence to precede systemic influence whereas in the case of democratic rule, societal influence should precede systemic influence.

Based on Alons' prediction and Rosenau's typology, internal influences are expected to be more deterministic than external influences in the formulation of Nigeria's foreign policy. This is not to say that the latter are in fact obsolete but an indication that they can be expected to exert relatively less influence. The study's guiding hypotheses are

H₁: Internal influences should play a deterministic role in the formulation of Nigeria's foreign policy.

H₂: External influences should play a supporting role in the formulation of Nigeria's foreign policy.

1.6 Organization of the Thesis

Following this first introductory chapter containing the research question, objectives, scope and limitations, methodology, and hypotheses of the thesis as well as a review of the extant literature is a second chapter that outlines Nigerian foreign policy through history. The third chapter provides an overview of the external influence on foreign policy, both in general, and for Nigeria specifically while the fourth does the same but for internal influence. The fifth chapter provides an analysis of the interview results as well as a discussion of the relevant findings. The sixth and last chapter provides a conclusion and direction for further study.

Chapter 2

NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY THROUGH HISTORY

Exploring the determinants of Nigerian foreign policy requires that the core elements and historical turning points in Nigerian foreign policy be outlined. This is the focus of this chapter, which aims to trace the development of Nigeria's foreign policy starting from the establishment of the first republic up until that of the present Buhari administration. To aid this task, Nigeria's policy is split into 6 distinct politically determined time periods.

2.1 The First Republic

Although Nigeria gained independence from colonial Britain in October of 1960 and only became a republic in October 1963, the 'first republic', however, is often used to refer to the period from independence up until the first military coup in early 1966.

Nigeria's external relations began upon independence in 1960 when she became the 99th member of the United Nations. As Lawal and Daiyabu (2015) point out, only recently emerging from colonial rule, Nigeria's foreign policy during this period did not start on a 'clean slate'. It was heavily influenced by the nation's relationship with Britain, which caused it to be effectively pro-west despite Nigeria's claims of non-alignment (p. 6; Onoja 2008, p. 15).

2.1.1 The Balewa Administration (1963-1966)

The foreign policy of then Prime Minister Abubakar Tafawa Balewa held on strongly to the colonial legacy and was largely normative. For Balewa, foreign policy was

determined by the simple issue of either supporting the West, and being in good company, or the communist powers in the East, and being in the company of the devil (Ogunbadejo 1980, p. 748). Claims of non-alignment, such as Balewa's 1960 address to the United Nations (see Onoja 2008, p. 14), were no more than political rhetoric as there was hardly any concrete effort to better relations with the communist powers.

Overall, Balewa's foreign policy centered on the following principles: "the legal equality of states, non-interference in the internal affairs of other states, good neighborliness, and the inviolability of national boundaries" (Ogunbadejo 1980, p. 749). The aims of Balewa's foreign policy, as espoused by his foreign minister Jaja Wachukwu, were broad and afro-centric. They were: to promote national interest and world peace; have Africa as the centerpiece of the nation's foreign policy and promote the continent's progress and total independence; to promote international cooperation and neutrality, and to respect the sovereign equality of states through non-interference (Ota and Ecoma 2015, p. 58; see also Oni and Taiwo 2016, p. 64; Nwolise 1992, p. 122).

The first objective of Nigeria's foreign policy, the advancement of its national interest, was difficult to pursue, as what exactly that 'interest' entailed was never specified. Sinclair (1983) opined that perhaps the abstract nature of the policy objectives was an attempt to transpose the conservative domestic nationalist objectives to the African and global levels (p. 2). Summarily, Nigeria's foreign policy during the first republic can be said to have been overtly Afrocentric and pro-western.

The western orientation of Nigeria's foreign policy begs the question of how the Balewa administration managed to be pro-western if the nation itself was intended to be non-aligned. Ogunbadejo (1980) explains that the answer lies in the domestic situation at the time. Firstly, coming from the dominant party in a coalition government, Balewa's administration was allowed the luxury of ignoring the junior partners' calls for a more balanced foreign policy; secondly, foreign policy formulation was an exclusively executive power concentrated in the hands of Balewa himself; thirdly, the federal parliament played a largely peripheral role as did public opinion and pressure groups, which were largely ineffective; and lastly, the Nigerian economy's neo-colonial dependency prevented it from adopting a truly non-aligned policy (Ogunbadejo 1980, pp. 749-50).

Overall, Balewa's Afrocentric foreign policy laid the foundation for the nation's role and influences in international politics, which shaped the nation's image to the international community (Ajayi, 2005 cited in Chidozie *et al.* 2014, p. 52).

2.2 The First Period of Interim Military Rule

2.2.1 The Ironsi Regime (1966)

The Balewa administration was overthrown in January, 1966 in a bloody coup during which Balewa himself was killed and just a year before the start of the Nigerian civil war (1967-1970). General Aguiyi-Ironsi, the nation's first military head of state, succeeded Balewa. Not enough was achieved in the 6 months the Ironsi regime was in power for a concrete assessment of its foreign policy (Kayode 2016, p. 5) as General Gowon, his successor, took power in a counter-coup in July, 1966. The regime did however follow in the footsteps of the Balewa administration in declaring

‘non-alignment’ to be the central theme of the nation’s foreign policy (Ogunbadejo 1980, p. 751).

2.2.2 The Gowon Regime (1966-1975)

The military regime of General Gowon made an effort to reinvent the nation’s foreign policy to reflect its hegemonic inclinations as exemplified by Nigeria’s leading role in the creation of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). Gowon’s foreign policy was aggressively pan-African, a stance which the oil boom experienced during his regime allowed him to pursue (Kayode 2015, p. 6) Furthermore, Gowon’s regime marked the start of a new era where Nigerian foreign policy would no longer be blindly pro-western as lessons from the civil war necessitated a re-evaluation of the nation’s stance towards external actors (Lawal and Daiyabu 2015, p. 6; 7; Onoja 2008, p. 53).

As tensions between the Federalists and the Eastern region (as Biafra) were on the rise and even in the immediate aftermath of the latter’s secession, the western powers maintained wary positions. The Soviet Union on the other hand, saw this as an opportunity to address Nigeria’s skewed version of non-alignment and immediately sent missions to Nigeria (Ogunbadejo 1980, p. 751). The western powers’ reluctance to pick a side in the conflict continued even after hostilities ensued and the civil war was well underway forcing Gowon to look to Moscow for assistance particularly with arms supplies (Onoja 2008, p. 54).

The Soviet’s willingness to supply arms to the Federalists coupled with their voraciousness in battle caused some Western powers, particularly Britain to support the federalists as a means to counter the seemingly increasing Soviet influence in Nigeria. Consequently, the Soviet’s and Britain were Nigeria’s main allies during the

war years while France, Portugal, and South Africa (Oni and Taiwo 2016, p. 65) backed the secessionists alongside China who imported the ongoing Sino-Soviet conflict into the Nigerian civil war (Ogunbadejo 1980, p. 753).

Nigeria's foreign policy during the war years therefore was geared towards the central objective of gathering international support for the Federation and maintaining internal unity. Following the end of the civil war however, Gowon's foreign policy was refocused towards the goal of reconciliation with the external powers who had sided with the secessionists, particularly those states who had gone as far as according them recognition – Tanzania, Gabon, Haiti, Ivory Coast, and Zambia with Gowon making 20 state visits to other African states between 1970 and 1973 (Sinclair 1983, p. 5). The civil war experience highlighted a need to secure sub-regional allies as France's support of the secessionists presented a real danger seeing as all of Nigeria's immediate neighbors are Francophone countries and were indeed used to provide support to Biafra (Oni and Taiwo 2016, p. 65; Obi 2008, p. 188)

In an effort to maintain the country's declared non-aligned position, Gowon continued his periodic flirtations with the Soviet Union and China (Onoja 2008, pp. 55-56) although he remained a dedicated anglophile and placed Britain and the commonwealth at the center of his foreign policy (Ogunbadejo 1980, p. 757). Arguably, on the global level, Nigerian foreign policy returned to its pre-war configuration with only minute changes. The same however, could hardly be said for the African level as the post-war foreign policy was became incredibly militant towards the 'white south', who had provided unbridled support for the secessionists, with Nigeria taking up the mantle of championing decolonization and the end of apartheid by supporting various liberation movements (Onoja 2008, p 17). Overall,

Africa was declared to remain the centerpiece of Nigerian foreign policy although the argument might be made that there was an inbuilt qualification. What was meant was black Africa, as Nigeria remained publicly against the white governments of Southern Africa.

2.2.3 The Muhammed-Obasanjo Regime (1975-79)

The Gowon regime was overthrown in military coup in July 1975 that resulted in the coming to power of General Murtala Muhammed. The new administration promised to gear the nation's foreign policy towards genuine non-alignment and the defense of Africa's interests (Ogunbadejo 1980, p. 759). The first opportunity for the Muhammed regime to prove itself came in the form of the Angolan crisis where Nigeria backed and even recognized the MPLA despite explicit American requests not to do so signaling to the international community that perhaps Nigeria's foreign policy had indeed entered an era of true non-alignment (Onoja 2008, p. 18).

Although General Muhammed's term in office was cut short when he was assassinated in an aborted coup in February 1976, his deputy, General Obasanjo, succeeded him and proceeded to reaffirm the foreign policy principles outlined by his predecessor (see Ade-Ibijola 2013, p. 567 for an outline of the guiding foreign policy objectives). He continued to stress the importance of majority rule in Namibia and Zimbabwe, the end of apartheid in South Africa, Africa as the centerpiece of Nigerian foreign policy etc (Kayode 2016, p. 6) although both leaders were less committed to ECOWAS and the OAU and focused more on pan-African issues and minority rule in Southern Africa (Oni and Taiwo 2016, p. 65). During their administrations, Nigeria was also involved in a host of peacekeeping missions (Chidozie *et al.* 2014, p. 53).

Obasanjo went a step further by repairing Nigeria's relationship with America, which had been damaged by the Angolan crises. The relationship between the two countries became so cordial that some commentators concluded that Nigeria's foreign policy was reverting to its pro-west model of non-alignment. However, relations with the states that were negatively affected by the indigenization policies of Obasanjo (and to a lesser extent Muhammed such as Britain with the nationalization of British Petroleum) were strained (Kayode 2016, p. 6; Onoja 2008, p. 60).

Summarily, the Muhammed/Obasanjo period is often described as the "golden era" of Nigerian foreign policy due to the effectiveness with which policy objectives were articulated and implemented, which Kayode (2016) links to the assertive and principled personalities of the generals themselves (p. 4; Ade-Ibijola 2013, p. 567).

2.3 The Second Republic

As per his promise, General Obasanjo lifted the ban on political activity in 1978 with elections being held and a new constitution adopted the following year. On the 1st of October 1979, Shehu Shagari was sworn in as the first elected president of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

2.3.1 The Shagari Administration (1979-1983)

The foreign policy objectives of the Shagari administration followed the objectives outlined in Section 19 of the 1979 constitution:

The state shall promote African unity, as well as total political economic, social and cultural liberation of Africa and all other forms of international cooperation conducive of the consolidation of universal peace and mutual respect and friendship among all peoples and states and shall combat racial discrimination in all its ramifications (Federal Government of Nigeria, 1979).

While the objectives themselves remained erringly similar to those of previous governments, the path to the realization of these objectives changed drastically however, relative to previous administrations. According to Lawal and Daiyabu (2015) the nature of the regime (civil-democratic) meant that there were multiple centers of decision-making meaning that it could not act as drastically as the military regimes or even Balewa's administration forcing it to reverse many of the radical foreign policies of its predecessors (p. 7).

Nigerian foreign policy under Shagari was characterized by a lack of pro-active behavior and concrete policy direction (Kayode 2016, p. 6). Under the Shagari administration, oil revenue peaked and then sharply dropped leading to a volatile domestic economic situation to which the government responded by expelling over two million illegal-alien from the country (Oni and Taiwo 2016, p. 65). The illegal aliens were blamed for the country's rising crime rate and majority of them were from fellow ECOWAS members Ghana and Benin. The decision to expel them therefore antagonized the country's neighbors and threatened the integration process. Furthermore, the nation's image in the international community was seriously tarnished (Chidozie et al. 2014, p. 52).

The Shagari period witnessed a return to a pro-west foreign policy orientation, as the administration was unable to formulate an entirely independent foreign policy. This was due in part to the mono-cultural nature of the local economy, which meant that oil dependence prevented disagreement with the western powers. Overall, the passive posture of the administration internationally and its inability to respond to domestic demands led to the overthrow of the regime via a military coup in December 1983 (Onoja 2008, pp. 19-20).

2.4 The Second Period of Interim Military Rule

2.4.1 The Buhari Regime (1983-1985)

In December 1983, Nigeria's second republic ended with the military's return to power under the command of General Muhammadu Buhari.

According to Oni and Taiwo (2016), Buhari began his military rule by antagonizing Nigeria's neighbors as Shagari had done before him. He closed the borders as a means to control migration, a protectionist move that was lambasted in the sub-region (p. 65).

General Buhari's dealings with the international community in general were no less tumultuous. Arguably, the most striking example, and probably the lowest point in Nigerian foreign policy during his regime, was the Dikko Affair – an unsuccessful attempt by security agents under his command to extract Alhaji Umaru Dikko from London in July 1984 leading to a diplomatic row between the Britain and Nigeria (Kayode 2016, p. 7) as well as damaging the nation's image internationally.

The Buhari regime did, however, make a conscious effort to improve the nation's international image with the introduction of new anti-drug and anti-corruption policies and taking decisive action in tackling the debt accrued by the Shagari administrations (Chidozie *et al.* 2014, p. 53). According to Onoja (2008), the regime's focus on such domestic issues – drug trafficking, corruption, debt relief, etc. – caused its foreign policy focus to be on those issues internationally (p. 61).

Buhari's foreign policy, despite its faults, was remarkably anti-west as demonstrated by its autonomy in decision-making. During his regime, relations with the United

States and the United Kingdom were relatively strained (the Dikko Affair comes to mind again). His regime demonstrated its unwillingness to take cues from any other country regardless of size and historical relationships (Onoja 2008, p. 21) but continued to place Africa as the centerpiece of its foreign policy as previous administrations had done (Kayode 2016, p. 7).

General Buhari's military regime was overthrown in a coup that brought another military leader, General Babangida, to power.

2.4.2 The Babangida Regime (1985-1993)

The Babangida regime did nearly irreparable damage to Nigeria's image as it "institutionalized corruption as if it was a cardinal state policy" (Emordi, 2008 cited in Chidozie *et al.* 2014, p. 53). The regime reinstated officials dismissed under Buhari's anti-corruption initiatives, reinstating confiscated property, etc. leading the nation to become synonymous with corruption in the eyes of the international community, a stigma that continues to this day.

Dwindling oil prices extensively limited the regimes ability to achieve its foreign policy objectives (Oni and Taiwo 2016, p. 65) and in an effort to better the economy, the regime undertook certain structural adjustment programs. These programs had adverse effects on the lives of ordinary Nigerians and affected its relations with other nations – particularly those it became indebted to – due to its use of economic diplomacy. The regime was further criticized for how it handled America's bombing of Libya (Onoja 2008, p. 22) and Nigeria's membership of the Islamic Conference despite its secular nature as outlined by the constitution (Kayode 2016, p. 7); both in 1986.

Despite its faults, one positive development during the Babangida regime was the Technical Aids Corps Scheme. Beginning in 1987, the scheme was intended to institutionalize aid to other African countries and Africans in diaspora by sending Nigerian professionals to areas in need (Onoja 2008, p. 62) and continues to this day. Furthermore, the scheme arguably marked the highlight of Nigeria's commitment to the development of Africa as a continent as Africans were and remain the intended recipient.

By 1990, Nigeria's image began to improve, at least regionally, when it led the Anglophone West African nations in establishing ECOMOG and intervened in the Liberian crisis. However, the move was received with mixed feelings as some West African states suspected that Nigeria was using the crisis as a means to further its own hegemonic ambitions and its apparent willingness to violate its longstanding principle of non-interference in other African states' domestic politics did little to allay such suspicions (Oni and Taiwo 2016, p. 66).

The nation's image took a deeper plunge in light of the flawed transition program and the eventual annulment of the 1993 election results intended to usher in the third republic. This was particularly problematic as international observers labeled the elections as exceptionally free and fair (Chidozie *et al.* 201, p 53). The internal upheaval following the annulment of the election results led to the demise of the regime.

2.5 The Third Republic

Chief Moshood Abiola was elected the second president of Nigeria and was intended to be the first president in the third republic.

The annulment of the election results by the transitional military regime meant that Abiola never took office and thus never took any foreign policy actions.

2.6 The Third and Final Period of Interim Military Rule

2.6.1 The Abacha Regime (1993-1999)

In the aftermath of the domestic upheaval that resulted as a consequence of the annulment of the election results, the interim Ernest Shonekan government put in place by General Babangida was deposed in a coup that brought General Sani Abacha to power.

Just a month after he came to power, Abacha started a foreign policy nightmare by invading the Bakassi-peninsula – a disputed oil-rich territory Cameroun also laid claim to (Oni and Taiwo 2016, p. 66). This was the first of many such decisions in a period where the country acted as one without a foreign minister and a foreign policy that was characteristically inconsistent making Nigeria a pariah in the international community (Okpokpo 2000, p. 32; Abdulrasheed *et al.* 2016, p. 1457). Abacha's foreign policy was arguably the most anti-west foreign policy stance taken by any other leader before and after him and was marked by a disregard for the international community as a whole making it the lowest point in Nigeria's international image ever (Chidozie *et al.* 2014, p. 53).

In line with his militantly anti-west position, Abacha made overtures to China. The two countries entered into various agreements with allowed China to participate in Nigerian railway, housing, and waterway projects. The re-alignment to Asia was a response to what he perceived as undue pressure from the traditional western allies (Onoja 2008, p. 23; 69).

Under Abacha, a vast number of human rights abuses were committed by the state leading to an international relations nightmare. The sticking point was the 1995 extra-judicial execution of Ken Saro Wiwa and other environmental activists from the oil-rich Niger Delta Ogoni tribe (collectively known as the Ogoni eight) despite an international appeal on their behalf. The resulting international displeasure resulted in sanctions from the US & EU, Nigeria's suspension from the commonwealth, as well as a number of states withdrawing their ambassadors (Oni and Taiwo 2016, p. 66; Kayode 2016, p. 7).

In addition to the adverse international effects of Abacha's domestic actions, his foreign policy actions were also condemned at home. In an attempt to improve the nation's image, Abacha initiated an ECOMOG intervention in Sierra Leone to restore the country's democracy in 1998. While the international community viewed this more optimistically, it was condemned locally for the inherent hypocrisy (an autocratic military government fighting for democracy elsewhere) and the undue cost of the operation (Adebajo, 2000). In an effort to avoid external criticism, Abacha avoided leaving the country and attending international fora (Abdulrashed *et al.* 2016, p. 1460).

2.7 The Fourth Republic

General Abacha died in office in 1998 leaving behind an impoverished country, despite its large oil reserves, with a battered international image due to the severity of the human rights abuses under his regime. His successor, General Abdulsalami Abubakar made good on Abacha's delayed promise to transition back to democratic rule, which occurred as early as the following year ushering in the fourth and present republic under a democratically elected President Olusegun Obasanjo.

2.7.1 The Obasanjo Administration (1999-2007)

Upon assuming office, Obasanjo's foreign policy was directed towards restoring Nigeria's reputation abroad. Nigeria was readmitted to the Commonwealth of Nations soon after Obasanjo came into power in 1999 followed by Nigeria's withdrawal from Sierra Leone to reduce costs and redirect resources to resolve the deteriorating local security situation in the Niger Delta region in Nigeria (Oni and Taiwo 2016, p. 66).

In as much as the president's passion towards regional integration facilitated Nigeria's support for ECOWAS and improved the state's international reputation, it also attracted much criticism at the domestic level, much of which came from his policy of sending troops on peacekeeping missions to conflict regions such as Darfur, Sudan and the DRC (Chidozie *et al.* 2014, p. 54). During Obasanjo's two terms in office, he put in place policies that aided in restoring Nigeria's image and recognition globally (Kayode 2016, p. 9). As stated by Lamido (2012), since Nigeria's return to civilian rule, its economic policy has been geared towards developing the country's economy by attracting foreign investment (p. 9). Subsequently administrations since Obasanjo have adopted this in the conduct of both foreign and national policy.

President Obasanjo at inauguration in May 1999 inherited a nation with a battered image and without external credibility. He made efforts to build the country's image and re-integrate Nigeria into the world while regaining her lost glory through shuttle diplomacy. Under his leadership, Nigeria assumed leadership of several international bodies like ECOWAS, the African Union (AU) and the G77. Nigeria was also able to recover most of the stolen funds in foreign banks located in Belgium, Switzerland,

Britain, America and Germany as a result of Obasanjo's diplomatic activity. He held periodic meetings with the Nigerians in the countries he visited in order to discuss issues of common interest and update them on government policies, as well as possible ways they can help the country forward (Chidozie *et al.* 2015, pp. 53-54).

The thrust of Obasanjo's foreign policy sought to fine-tune the country's foreign policy posture to the realities of Nigeria's domestic circumstance, which were characterized by economic difficulties, thus culminating in corrective reform measure. 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, security such that despite the global dimension of Nigeria's foreign policy many roles were played in the African continent.

The belief that foreign policy can be used to expand and expedite democratic consolidation appreciation of the essential inter-dependent linkage between his foreign and domestic policies (Onoja 2008, p. 23). The gains of democracy and good governance, correctly perceived by the Obasanjo's administration during the period of the study, constitute a necessary prerequisite for the conduct of an effective and result oriented foreign policy. Apart from the dictates and structures of the constitution which regulate the government, the country's foreign policy also has to be reconciled with the prevalent realities in the country among which is a depressed economy and large external debt of about 32 billion dollars. Obasanjo's long crusade on seeking a position he had canvassed at every available international forum promotion and attraction of foreign investment. In seeking to attract foreign investments at this period, Nigeria was faced with an uphill task. In the first instance,

being a debtor nation placed the country at the mercy of international lending agencies which Obasanjo persuaded for debt forgiveness (Lamido 2012, p. 4).

2.7.2 The Yar'adua Administration (2007-2010)

Alhaji Musa Yar'adua came to power in a 2007 election that was reported by international observers to be extremely flawed. The European Union specifically criticized the 2007 elections and described them as being faulty, falling short of required international standards (Chidozie *et al.* 2014, p. 54).

Yar'adua's foreign policy was short-lived and lasted only from 2007-2010 as a result of his death due to medical issues while still in office. Furthermore, it was hardly commendable due to his passive foreign policy posture. Nevertheless, Yar'adua's foreign policy tried to shift the focus from economic diplomacy to citizen diplomacy as the thrust of his foreign policy was geared towards identifying with Nigerian citizens and hinged on the protection and welfare of Nigerian citizens both at home and in diaspora (Kayode 2016, p. 8).

2.7.3 The Jonathan Administration (2010-2015)

Following Yar'adua's death, his vice-president Goodluck Jonathan became acting President to finish out his term after which he himself was elected to the Presidency.

President Jonathan predicated his administration's objective on the transformation of Nigeria. This vision formed the basis for the Transformation Agenda of his government. Despite the ambitious nature of the transformation agenda, Jonathan administration has a chance to institutionalize the actualization of this goal using foreign policy as sustainable instrument overtime (Lawal and Daiyabu 2015, p. 7). The Jonathan administration gave special attention to the improvement and

strengthening of economic ties with the country's partners in the international community as a foundation for stability and growth (Nwankwo n.d. cited in Boma, Terfa and Tsegyu 2015, p. 5).

The transformation agenda was basically a policy package by the administration of President Goodluck Jonathan to holistically overhaul all spheres of Nigerians' national life. It was impinged on a 14-point program and driven by a world class team of twenty-eight technocrats under the chairmanship of the President himself and the coordination of the renowned economist, Dr Ngozi O. Iweala. The aim was to dramatically revamp the economy of the country in an effort to lay the foundation for making the Nigerian economy one of the first-twenty economies in the world by 2020 as represented by the vision 20:2020 of Nigeria (Lawal and Daiyabu 2015, pp. 4-6). In regards to the foreign policy orientation of President Jonathan, it basically revolved around economic and citizen diplomacy of the past as well as the reinforcement of Nigeria's role in regional politics. The administration initiated a paradigm shift in the country's foreign policy by not just reacting to global events as they occur but using the internal needs and dynamics of Nigeria to construct progressive external relations (Lawal and Daiyabu 2015, p. 8).

However, Jonathan's foreign policy marked a low down-turn in Nigeria's foreign relations. He was a passive leader and this passiveness reflected in Nigeria's foreign policy posture. Thus, Nigeria was not accorded the kind of status it deserved due to a lack of action internationally by Jonathan's administration (Kayode 2016, p. 4)

There was hardly anything remarkable about the six years of Goodluck Jonathan's foreign policy that spanned 2009 – 2015. It could be regarded as period of

international hiatus for Nigeria; a period of lull or inaction as a result of the lukewarm nature of Jonathan's government which reflected on Nigeria's foreign policy outlook.

Nigeria's foreign policy under President Jonathan's administration was also impacted by the security challenges, terrorism, leadership incompetence, corruption, economic stagnation, ethnic crisis, religious division, inter-communal violence, democratic consolidation, and the threats to the national integration of the Nigerian state, which had adverse effects on the conduct of Nigeria's foreign policy (Kayode 2016, pp. 8-9).

Therefore, the Jonathan administration, like many other administrations in Nigeria before it, while not lacking in the area of foreign policy formulation, it was defunct in regards to implementation (Chidozie *et al.* 2014, p. 55).

2.7.4 The Buhari Administration (2015-Present)

Regarding the foreign policy of current President Buhari's civilian administration, it is too early to make a meaningful critical assessment of his foreign policy due to his emergent nature of his administration. However, his posture and emergence as a change agent invokes hopes of reviving a dynamic foreign policy in Nigeria (Kayode 2016, p. 9).

Buhari has taken some new directions in his administration's foreign policy in line with his party's campaign manifesto which promised the electorate that Nigeria's national interest will guide his foreign policy, after which his administration will focus on the sub-region of West Africa (Premium Times May 28, 2016).

It is noteworthy that the president has not deviated from his three cardinal agendas: the fights against insecurity and corruption and the economy/job creation, even in his foreign policy implementation. This can easily be tracked from the president's foreign travels which have been motivated by the fight against corruption and negotiations to repatriate national funds stashed abroad to the country, and a commitment to finding ways to make Nigeria an economically viable country through diversification from oil dependency and aiding its technological advancement. For the first time in Nigerian foreign policy history, Buhari decided to court both the traditional Western powers and China in order to deliver on the three cardinal agendas he promised the country.

Chapter 3

EXTERNAL INFLUENCE ON NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

This chapter explores the various external influences on Nigerian foreign policy. It first provides an overview of the various external influences in general and how it is they come to affect particular states' foreign policies followed by an analytical look into how select external factors have come to influence Nigeria's foreign policy over the years.

3.1 External Influence on Foreign Policy

Factors that influence the foreign policy of a state but are outside of the state itself are known as external factors. Rather than being a function of the particular characteristics of the state in question, these factors are beyond the state in that they are a function of the attributes and characteristics of the international system itself within which state and non-state actor operate.

According to Neack (2008), the study of foreign policy at the systemic level involves state-to-state relations that occur bilaterally/multilaterally and regionally/globally. Such scholarship is guided by the assumption that foreign policy is driven by a states position in the system, which is defined by each states relationship to other states in the system (p. 131). It is the nature of the system therefore, and certain factors engendered by it, that determine foreign policy in that they encourage certain behaviours e.g. power-based interactions in the realist world.

3.1.1 Relationship Between Position in The International System and Foreign Policy

Arguably, the most glaring examples of an external influence on the conduct of a given state's foreign policy relates to its position in the international system and relations with other states because, as is argued by neoclassical realists, no state's foreign policy can go beyond the limits set by the international environment (system) itself in the long-run (Rose 1998, p. 151). However, understanding how the two are related requires an understanding of the concept of power as states in the international system are often classified based on power considerations. Moreover, states having varying levels of power (and thus positioned differently in the international hierarchy) are expected to act differently i.e. exhibit different foreign policy behaviours.

Historically, the concept of power has proven elusive to definition. Any attempt at a comprehensive definition of the concept would involve that a near infinite number of variables, such as military capabilities, economic size, population, citizenry education amongst others, be taken into account. Generally, power can be understood to encompass all these tangible state resources (Neack 2008, p. 134).

States are often classified into one of three categories (great, middle, and small powers) based on their power capabilities lending them to similar positions in the international hierarchy. Some of the variables inherent in determining a state's power – such as geography, economic development, and military capabilities – delineate the foreign policy options available to the state in question.

Great powers for instance, sit at the top of this hierarchy and can be recognized by their willingness to use force in advancing their interests as they often do. Conversely, small powers are severely limited in their range of action and as a result are unable to significantly impact the system. Middle powers occupy a unique position in that while they are stronger than small powers and can exert much more influence, they are less forceful than great powers and tend to act primarily in multilateral settings although the particular dynamics of behaviour vary between traditional and emerging middle powers (Jordaan, 2003).

Overall, a state's position in the international system as determined by its particular power capabilities influences its foreign policy in that it determines the range of actionable options available to policymakers. A more radical view of this influence such as that espoused by classical realists such as Mearsheimer (2001) predicts that similarly positioned states would act similarly *all* of the time.

The influence of position on a state's foreign policy is not limited to its position in the international hierarchy. A state's literal position, i.e. geopolitically, also matters for its foreign policy (Wanjohi, 2011). As Mahdi (2016) proves in the case of landlocked countries, a state's actual geographic location in conjunction with the stability and wealth of the constituting region are of great importance for its foreign policy. Using Switzerland and Afghanistan as illustrative examples, Mahdi demonstrates that while location matters in of itself [for example landlocked countries face problems with defence as they lack a naval force and are vulnerable to land attacks on all sides], the characteristics of the state's region also affects its foreign policy – states in poor and unstable regions tend to act differently than those in rich and stable regions and even those in poor and stable regions (pp. 92-93).

Furthermore, the societal characteristics of the region such as the presence of overlapping ethnic communities can also affect state foreign policy.

3.1.2 The International Power Structure and State Foreign Policy

Related to the influence of a state's geopolitical and power position on its foreign policy is the influence of the prevalent international power structure and its consequent dynamics on foreign policy preference formations (van der Kamp-Alons, 2005). The prevalent power structure may be understood in terms of polarity – the concentration of power in the international system.

The prevalent power structure of the international system at any particular point in time is a function of the distribution of power and state influence in the international context. There are generally understood to be four types of polarity: unipolarity, where international power is concentrated in the hand of one state; bipolarity, where two states enjoy a preponderance of power; tripolarity, where power is near equally distributed between three states; and multipolarity, where there are multiple centres of power.

The bipolarity that characterized the Cold War period and the subsequent unimultipolarity following the war's end has been influential in the foreign policy of all nations particularly during the war itself (Huntington 1999, p. 35). The Cold War period saw state foreign policy to be largely driven by the wider context of East-West relations, particular in Europe although this effect did spill-over to other regions as both superpowers vied for influence. Consequently, the end of the cold war resulted in a fundamental shift in international political dynamics (Nuamah 2003, p. 4).

Apart from the structural distribution of power, the very nature of the international structure itself has also been argued by neorealist to be determinant for state foreign policy. Waltz (1979) argued that state foreign policy is primarily driven by the ordering principle of the international structure: anarchy. The condition of anarchy implies that there is no overarching authority above states and so they enjoy formal equality. The policy implications of this centre around the fact that state foreign policy, as a result of anarchy, is driven by self-interest and survival whereas cooperation is scarce. This position has been used to explain unilateral state foreign policy initiatives although its explanatory capacity has since been called into question (see Wendt, 1992).

Apart from anarchy, other structural forces have been known to influence state foreign policy. Two such forces are prevalent international norms and globalization. Norms, understood to be “shared moral assessments” of prescriptive action (Finnemore and Sikkink 1998, p. 892) can influence state foreign policy in that states might take actions that reinforce prevalent norms – such as the use of force only as a last resort in attaining policy objectives or humanitarian intervention – in an effort to avoid pariah status in the eyes of the international community (see Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998).

The forces of globalization, especially with the evolution of transnational communities with little regard for defined national borders and the increasing influence of non-state actors on the international arena, have also affected state foreign policy formulation and implementation as it has added a whole new dimension of interests for consideration. In light of this, an edited volume by Korany

and Dessouki (2008) tabled for discussion the effect of globalization on the foreign policies of Arab states.

3.1.3 International Organizations, Alliances, and State Foreign Policy

One final external factor that influences a state's foreign policy is its membership in international organizations and alliances. While international organizations exert an influence on foreign policy at both the formulation and implementation phases, the influence of an alliance on a state's foreign policy is mostly limited to the latter stage.

One way in which international organizations can influence state foreign policy formulation is by 'teaching' them norms that increase their propensity towards certain types of actions and policy objectives as found by Finnemore (1993). Membership in an international organization can also restrict states from embarking on certain kind of foreign policy adventures as the organizations' founding treaties often embody certain legally-binding prescriptions.

On the implementation side, organizations and alliances both affect state foreign policy in that states may choose to act collectively rather than unilaterally to a particular policy issue area by taking concerted action. Alliances in particular, may also be a direct cause of foreign policy action due to their defensive element. In a security alliance such as NATO where an attack on one member is viewed as an attack on all, a state might fight itself being compelled to declare war on another state despite a lack of direct provocation.

3.2 External Influence on Nigerian Foreign Policy

It has been noted that Nigerian leaders have a tendency to respond to external demands, pressures, and interests at the expense of domestic pressures and influences, particularly within the context of the challenges posed to the nation by globalization (Nuamah 2003, p. 6).

As has been noted earlier, a state's foreign policy is a function of its position/status in the international system, which in turn is a function of its relative capabilities and Nigeria is no different. Nigeria's foreign policy has been heavily influenced by its middle-power status in the international system. This position was reaffirmed in 1987 when Nigeria's Foreign Minister at the time, Bolaji Akinyemi, initiated the 'Concert of Medium Powers'; an informal body comprised of sixteen countries who exercised considerable influence in their respective regions (Aribisala, 2013).

The initiative, which was christened at the Lagos Forum marked one of the few times in the country's history where it took the initiative on such a scale getting fifteen other countries – including Sweden, Switzerland, India, and Mexico – to participate in the concert. Furthermore, in addition to the position-related reasons for the initiative (i.e. Nigeria's position as one such middle/medium power), it was also motivated in part by the bipolar power structure of the time as there was an apparent need to middle powers such as Nigeria to assert themselves in response to the increased use of threats by the superpowers – the US and USSR (Salami 2013, p. 140).

Nigeria's status as a regional leader also contributed to its spearheading the establishment of the Economic Community of West African States, a testament to

such powers' tendency to prefer multilateral action. It has tried to cultivate a regional sphere of influence within which its security could be guaranteed insofar as it tries to project itself internationally. ECOWAS' creation was also motivated by an attempt to reduce France's influence in the region (Obi 2008, p. 188; 189).

Where France's interference in the the West African sub-region cause Nigeria to be more active regionally, the Western powers' alienation of Nigeria under the Abacha regime due to the severity of its human rights abuses drove Nigerian foreign policy Eastward with the country developing closer relations with China and North Korea further illustrating how the actions of external actors have served as a foreign policy impetus (Abdulrasheed *et al.* 2016, p. 1459).

The unique place of oil in the Nigerian economy has made it particularly susceptible to external influence. Some other states to whom it supplies oil, such as the US and Japan, and some of the multinational corporations operating in the country, such as Shell and British Petroleum, have been known to meddle in the country's policy-making – domestically, where they relate to the oil-rich Niger Delta region, and its foreign policy, particularly as it relates to the oil sector, repatriation of profits, etc.

As Ota and Ecoma (2015) note, the country's inability to pursue and sustain a dynamic foreign policy is due to its dependency status on the international scene (p. 58) which itself is a result of its domestic dependence on oil revenue which has translated to an international dependence on foreign loans and aid. The bulk of Obasanjo's foreign policy actions were predicated on a need to secure debt relief from such external creditors through the use of economic diplomacy (Lamido 2012, p. 5).

Finally, as a member of both the United Nations and the African Union, Nigeria has evidently been influenced by international human rights norms. It has participated in a number of peacekeeping missions even beyond West African region. Nigeria's humanitarian efforts have tended to be coordinated under the auspices of international organizations where it has remained an active participant. It is currently one of the UN's largest peacekeeper contributors and has almost singlehandedly spearheaded ECOWAS peacekeeping missions in the past (Oni, 2002; Adebajo, 2013).

3.3 Conclusion

The discussion provided above shows how Nigerian foreign policy has been influenced by factors external to the Nigerian state. These factors include its position in the international system, the prevalent power structure, its membership in international organizations and dominant international norms such as that of human rights which underlie peacekeeping missions.

It is important to note that these external factors, ubiquitous as they may be, do not in of themselves determine Nigerian foreign policy. Rather, they only enable and constrain the range of actions available to policy-makers. In order to definitively determine the country's foreign policy, they work in conjunction with other factors inside the Nigerian state itself. These internal factors are the concern of the next chapter.

Chapter 4

INTERNAL INFLUENCE ON NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

This chapter provides an overview of how factors within the state itself come to influence Nigerian foreign policy. Following an outline of possible internal influences and how they may come to affect individual states' foreign policies is an exploration of how select domestic influences have affected Nigeria's foreign policy choices in particular overtime.

4.1 Internal Influence on Foreign Policy

Internal determinants of foreign policy are those that relate to differences in states' particular attributes. These tend to have a great impact on a state's foreign policy decision making cutting across different levels of analysis: individual, society, and state.

4.1.1 The Individual Level of Analysis

As Rose (1998) reminds us, "foreign policy choices are made by actual political leaders and elites" (p. 147). Therefore, these leaders' perceptions of policy-related events and perhaps most importantly, their perceptions of the options available to them in response to said events, exert an often immeasurable influence on their foreign policy choices.

The influence of individual leaders on the formulation of a state's foreign policy cannot be overstated as it is through their perceptions that various other incentives to

action are filtered i.e. individual leaders' worldviews and beliefs affect how they perceive domestic and international constraints on their range of foreign policy options. So, while numerous foreign policy actions might be explained by any number of other factors, some may be accounted for by differences in the policy preferences and decision-making styles of individual leaders (Greenstein, 1967). One example of such a scenario lies in Britain's decision to join the U.S.-led Iraq war under Tony Blair.

Using Leadership Trait Analysis, Dyson (2006) set out to investigate how former British Prime Minister Tony Blair's personality and particular leadership style shaped Britain's involvement in the Iraq war. He found that Blair's personality did indeed play a deterministic role for Britain's foreign policy decisions at least where the Iraq war was concerned. As famously recanted by a senior cabinet minister at the time: "had anyone else been leader, we would not have fought alongside Bush" (Stephens 2004, p. 234).

4.1.2 The Society Level of Analysis

Domestic sources of foreign policy at this level of analysis are concerned with the attributes and influences emanating from a state's domestic society and its constituting structure. These sources include general role perceptions held by the citizens, public opinion trends, the state of the domestic economy, the influence of the press, historical/cultural factors and so on. It is important to note that rather than being exclusive to one another, these sources tend to be interrelated.

4.1.2.1 Role Perceptions and Foreign Policy

Domestic role perceptions refer to normative beliefs held by members of society regarding their country and how they expect it to behave internationally. These role

perceptions are the result of culturally disseminated stereotypes that constitute what is known as the 'national self-image' (Hirshberg 1993, p. 78). These stereotypes tend to be idealistic in that they paint the country and its citizens in an irrevocably positive light. Consequently, the national self-image of a given society is often accompanied by a negative mirror image of those outside the nation (the out-group).

Such negative perception of out-groups in relation to the members of the nation influences foreign policy in that the public might be more receptive of aggressive foreign policy choices thus giving the state's decision-making apparatus more freedom to pursue such policies. Bar-Tal and Antebi (1992), using this logic and that of the siege-mentality, argue that in societies suffering from the latter (characterized by a heavy distrust of out-groups), the government might be given more leeway to act actively and pro-actively to the end of protecting the 'good nation' from other 'evil nations'.

According to Neack (2008), even the positive sentiments embodied by national self-image can have positive as well as negative repercussions. On the one hand, a self-image based on notions of the 'goodness' of the country, such as those held by Canada and the Netherlands, often corresponds to foreign policy decisions that reinforce the attendant role perceptions as shown by these countries' involvement in peacekeeping and arbitration activities. Conversely, as Hirshberg (1993) proves in the case of the US, a positive patriotic self-image can influence how the public views the government's foreign policy decisions thus allowing to act less than ideally more often.

Regardless of their consequences for foreign policy, these images and role perception are the result of societal socializations processes and are based on other domestic factors such as the history and culture of the society itself.

In conclusion, national self-image may affect the foreign policy of a state through role perceptions in one of two mutually constituting ways: the role expectations espoused by society itself as embodied by public opinion or other means and how the decision-making apparatus of the state (and the individuals that comprise them) views the role of the state and what they perceive societal perceptions of that role to be.

4.1.2.2 Culture and History

The collective culture and history of society may also influence a state's foreign policy even outside of its involvement in the development of a shared national self-image.

As Muriithi (2012) points out, a unified common culture and history allows for the attainment of consistent foreign policy objectives as the similar cultural [and implicitly normative] beliefs of the majority of society's members ensures support. Conversely, in more diverse societies, competing views prevent the state from having such an effective foreign policy (pp. 2-3).

Rosenau (1976) went further in telling us that the influence of culture on foreign policy goes beyond societal unity and its impact on policy formulation to involve "shared norms and practices of society...[which] *shape* the plans that are made and the activities that are undertaken" (p. 22; emphasis added) in regards to a state's foreign policy.

4.1.2.3 Public Opinion and Foreign Policy

Public opinion – opinions widely shared by members of the public on specific policy issues – is another domestic variable widely accepted to influence states' foreign policies. Supporters of this notion believe that public opinion's impact on a state's policy choices are measurable and that leaders tend to formulate their policies accordingly (Neack 2008, p. 115).

Using the US as an example, Holsti (1996) argued that although the American policy elite was inclined to internationalist policies [at the time at least], the public was less so effectively restraining the options available to policy-makers in that regard. Holsti does however raise a point that requires particular attention. Rather than claim that policy-makers respond directly to public opinion, Holsti's argument is that foreign policy is limited instead by policymakers' *perceptions* of what they expect the public will tolerate. This relates to the earlier discussion about how individual leaders' perceptions matter for foreign policy.

While the argument might be made that public opinion matters only in democratic states as the high level of accountability makes policy-makers more sensitive to public opinion, Neack (2008) makes the argument that public opinion also matters in non-democracies as well. She underscores that all types of leaders (democratic or non-democratic) have to give consideration to the resources in control of their opponent and that public opinion constitutes one of such resources. Using the example of Arab states (drawing from the work of Shibley Telhami on some Arab countries and the West Bank in 1990 and 1991), Neack underscores that government legitimacy in Arab states is obtained from the mass public's perception of the

adherence of a particular regime to two powerful transnational symbols--support for Palestinian right to self-determination and statehood as well as anti-colonialism.

She does however concede that the effects manifest themselves differently in democracies than they do in non-democracies (p. 116). On a concluding note, public opinion matter for non-democracies as well because even as the public is less involved in governance as in a democracy, even non-democratic governments have to remain wary of widespread public dissent, which could have irreversible consequences as the case of the Arab Spring shows.

4.1.2.4 Media and Foreign Policy

The effect of media outlets on the formulation of a state's foreign policy is best exemplified by what political scientists have come to term 'the CNN effect'. This term is used to refer to the influence of media outfits (such as CNN, Al Jazeera, and others) on policymakers as well as public opinion.

Regarding the first causal chain involving media and policymakers, the argument here is not that the latter are blind followers of whatever information is presented in the news but that they can hardly out rightly ignore it. As Zingarelli (2010) succinctly put it, while the degree to which policymakers respond to media impetus will forever be difficult to determine, the CNN effect does exist and attention must be paid to this increasingly salient factor.

The second causal chain, that linking media and public opinion, is hardly a causal chain in of itself for the simple reason that the public's influence on foreign policy is indirect. Instead, the media's influence on public opinion is translated into public pressure on policymakers, which then manifests itself as actual policy. Evidence of

this lies in the US' 1992 intervention in Somalia which was to a large extent the result of media coverage emphasizing the suffering of the people, which "usurped traditional policy making channels" (Robinson 1999, p. 302).

Simply put, media attention on a particular foreign policy issue can influence how policymakers react to said issue. This media influence may manifest itself in one of four ways: by *accelerating* the pace of policy-decision-making; by acting as an *impediment* to questionable military ventures; by *agenda-setting* when the government has yet to settle on a course of action by increasing an issues salience in the eyes of the public whose pressure can effectively 'force' the government's hand to take action, particularly in humanitarian cases; and lastly, by *challenging* policymakers to get involved in alleviating human suffering during war and other crises even when no national interest is at stake (Bahador, 2007) as in the Somali case mentioned above.

Interestingly, while media influence on policy is often understood purely in the terms outlined above, the media may also be used in 'manufacturing consent' for extant policy-decisions. In such instances the process is reversed and the media is influenced by the government. Media reports either conform to the 'official agenda' of the state executive, or to the interests of society's political elite (Robinson 1999, pp. 303-304).

Overall, it seems that the media's role vis-à-vis foreign policy involves either pressuring policymakers by mobilizing the public or by helping said policy-makers garner public support (see Neack 2008, pp. 121-125).

4.1.2.5 Other Societal Influences on Foreign Policy

In addition to the influences outlined above, numerous other societal factors play a part in the foreign policy of a state and while an exhaustive list is beyond the scope of this thesis, some warrant at least some mention.

These other factors include: the level of technology, where technologically advanced states are allowed to pursue more assertive foreign policies and are also allowed to influence other state's policies due to technological transfers; the level of economic development, as less advanced economies tend to play a smaller role on the international arena; and social structure, the influence of which is similar to that of culture in that a more balanced society leads to a more cohesive foreign policy (see Muriithi, 2012).

4.1.3 The State Level of Analysis

Domestic sources of foreign policy at this level of analysis are concerned with internal influences that are a consequence of the state's governmental apparatus itself. These factors include the type of political system employed and the nature of the regime in power which in turn determine the level of political accountability of the leaders.

4.1.3.1 Nature of the Political System and Foreign Policy

The influence of the political system on foreign policy is implicit in Rosenau's inclusion of political accountability as one of the genotypes to be used in the determining the dominant foreign policy sources of a particular state (Rosenau, 1966).

In the earlier discussion regarding the role of public opinion and foreign policy, it was mentioned that the effects of public opinion on policy formulation differed for democracies and non-democracies. Differences between democratic and non-democratic systems extend beyond how they respond to public opinion and somewhat affect their foreign policy in its entirety. For example, authoritarian systems tend to respond to foreign policy stimulus relatively quicker than in democratic systems as power is much more concentrated than in a democracy (Muriithi 2012, p. 4).

This is not to imply that the influence of the political system on foreign policy is restricted to the differences between democratic and non-democratic systems as differences may be found between democratic systems as well. Take a presidential system and a parliamentary system for example. By definition, the former is characterized by a separation of powers between the executive and the legislature while cooperation between these two branches of government is expected in the latter. Given that both arms of government change periodically through elections, the type of system in place (and the relationship between both arms) has implications for foreign policy continuity and change.

The logical conclusion therefore, is that the type of political system matters as it dictates the processes through which policy decisions are made (Neack 2008, p. 98). The political system also matters for what sort of foreign policy actions the state might be expected to take and theories such as that of the democratic peace have been developed based on this assumption. Additionally, Mansfield and Snyder (1995) have argued that burgeoning democracies are more prone to war than even autocratic states. They point out that budding democracies usually undergo a bumpy

transitional period characterised by a volatile mixture of mass politics and authoritarian elite politics, partial democratic control over foreign policy and democratization reversals. These characteristics make them more aggressive and war prone. Another reason for this is that as leaders in these democracies strive to consolidate their new-found power, they tend to project externally in an effort to cast a shadow on their domestic shortcomings, and also to boost domestic cohesiveness by forcing the public to rally round its wartime leader(s). Such motivations could manifest themselves in the sort of foreign policy actions such states take. Foreign policy formulation in such context will be largely influenced by and oriented towards external factors (rather than domestic issues) that would act as a rallying force for domestic support to the regime.

4.1.3.2 Political Accountability and Foreign Policy

Related to the type of political system in place and the attendant policy-making processes is the level of political accountability of the state, which also has an influence on its foreign policy. In open political systems, much attention is paid to the demands of societal groups regarding foreign policy decisions as opposed to closed systems where they are given much less importance.

Furthermore, as regimes in closed systems hardly come to power by means of election, they are hardly accountable to the public and less concerned with the motivation of re-election. Consequently, thus are less concerned with public opinion regarding foreign policy issues compared to democratically elected governments (Muriithi 2012, pp. 4-5) who are by definition accountable to the electorate.

4.1.3.4 The Diplomatic Institution and Foreign Policy

One final state-level influence on foreign policy that warrants particular attention is the diplomatic institution.

Diplomacy is the instrument through which state foreign policy decisions are carried out. The diplomatic institution however, may also act as an input since state leaders themselves hardly deal personally with leaders from every other state they have relations with. It is the diplomats that provide policymakers with reports about happenings in other states and thus are a valuable influence on foreign policy.

4.2 Internal Influence On Nigerian Foreign Policy

Over the years, Nigerian policy-makers have been influenced by a number of domestic factors in their formulation of the country's foreign policy. These influences span from the level of the individual leaders themselves up to the political system in place at the time.

4.2.1 Individual Influence on Nigerian Foreign Policy

The influence of Nigeria's leaders on the particular foreign policy initiatives undertaken during their time in office cannot be overstated, especially as leaders' personalities have been identified as ones of the key determinants of the Nigeria's foreign policy. In fact, understanding that state action boils down to the actions, initiatives, and preferences of whoever holds the highest political office provides an understanding of why past leaders' names are attached to the initiatives undertaken during their time in office (Kayode 2016, p. 4). This influence can be seen from the foreign policy of Prime Minister Balewa all the way down to President Jonathan and even incumbent President Buhari.

Even though foreign policy formulation was to be within the purview of the purview of the Ministry of External Affairs led by Jaja Wachukwu in the first republic, Balewa insisted on playing an active role thus relegating the ministry to the charge of implementation (Ogunbadejo 1979, p. 249). Balewa's kind-hearted trusting personality and his tendency to placate others meant that he was weary of using his power recklessly. Consequently, his foreign policy decisions (as with his domestic) tended to try to satisfy as many groups with divergent interests as could be managed (Inamete 2001, p. 39).

Evidence of this lies with Nigeria's moderate stance on the pertinent foreign policy issue-areas at the time including relations with neighbouring states and East-West relations within the context of the Cold War (Inamete 2001, p. 39). Despite the fact that a clear preference for the Western block was evident, Balewa remained in the non-aligned movement and did not display said preference as militantly as some other states had. Balewa's foreign policy was neither conservative nor militant. Clearly, his personality influenced the way in which he conducted foreign policy, as he tended to find a middle ground in instances of disagreement. A skill that proved useful when he helped negotiate a settlement to end the Congo civil war (Courtney, n.d.).

The personality factor in Nigerian foreign policy is also evident in the foreign policy of General Gowon. Albeit an army general, Nigeria became more assertive internationally under Gowon, a departure from the moderation that characterized Balewa's foreign policy (Talibu 2013, p. 86), which has been described as one of "diplomatic correctness" (Sinclair 1983, p. 5). Coupled with the fact that he was a Christian, Gowon's values no doubt played a role in his lavish spending on Nigeria's

neighbours and other black nations (Ojeh 2016, p. 204) as well as his reconciliatory attitude towards the states that had supported the secessionists during the civil war, some of whom he made state visits to once the war was over (Sinclair 1983, p. 5).

Similarly, the personalities of Generals Muhammed and Obasanjo also impacted their foreign policy, particularly in the case of the latter. Picking up the mantle following Muhammed's death six months after assuming office, Obasanjo steered Nigeria into a whole new dimension in international politics. Obasanjo's assertive personality proved deterministic for the country's foreign policy. This was evident during both his military and civilian rule (Durotoye, 2014; Ajetunmobi *et al.*, 2011). According to Itugbu (2017), a former foreign policy aide to Obasanjo during his civilian administration, Nigeria's foreign policy was extensively personalized and suffered from a "subjugation to the will of Obasanjo".

The lack of a concrete policy direction and pro-active behaviour that characterized the Shagari administration (Kayode 2016, p.6) may be blamed on Shagari's own timid and indecisive nature, which adversely affected foreign policy decision-making under his rule (Amdi n.d., p. 7). In fact, "Shagari failed to provide leadership in any meaningful sense of the word" (Pogson, 1994) in domestic as well as foreign policy.

Even the lowest point in Nigerian foreign policy history, that of General Sani Abacha, may be explained in part by his personality (Abdulrasheed *et al.*, 2016). A sceptical kinsman, Abacha's behaviour domestically and internationally were exclusory and isolationist respectively. While trying to consolidate domestic power in the hands of the Northern elite to which he belonged – hence his refusal to allow

the winner of the 1992 elections Chief MKO Abiola (a south-westerner) assume office (Omoruyi, 1999) – Abacha simultaneously acted internationally as though Nigeria could exist alone. He didn't make any major foreign visits and was especially belligerent in external relations (Kolawole 2005, p. 875). Furthermore, his decision to execute Ken Saro Wiwa and eight other Ogoni activists despite international pleas for clemency led to Nigeria's suspension from the commonwealth and a host of sanctions against from the US and the EU.

While the foreign policy of President Jonathan was particularly pro-active, as seen by his initiatives geared towards increasing cooperation amongst the policy making elite within his administration and other local organizations such as the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Jonathan's personal characteristics proved to be a stumbling block regarding the implementation of the resulting policy strategies (Jaji and Ayotunde 2016, p. 15). Jonathan's administration was internationally viewed as corrupt due to his fraternizing with questionable figures such as Diepreye Alamieyeseigha convicted of money laundering back in 2007. While active in terms of formulation, Jonathan displayed a degree of passivity when it came time for actual action (Kayode 2016, p. 4; Jaji and Ayotunde 2016, p. 15) and his administration was found to have had a negative effect on Nigeria's international image (Boma Lysa *et al.*, 2015).

Whereas Jonathan's passivity and personal relationships had a negative effect on the country's international image, the reverse is the case in regards to the foreign policy of the incumbent Buhari administration. Widely known to be of impenetrable moral upstanding, Buhari's foreign policy has been driven to a large extent by his zero-tolerance stance on corruption and the politicization of Islamic faith (to which he

subscribes) (Agbu, 2015). Buhari has been very active; making a number of state visits, both he and his foreign policy have been very much geared towards securing support for the war against Boko Haram and the repatriation of looted funds (Abdullahi, 2016).

The influence of personality on Nigerian foreign policy is not limited to the personalities themselves as other members of the political elite may also affect the foreign policy decisions of the country. One such individual is the former Foreign Minister under the Babangida regime, Bolaji Akinyemi, a self-identified realist who played a leading role in the establishment of the Concert of Medium Powers as well as introduced the concept of ‘Concentric Circles’ to guide Nigerian foreign policy (Salami 2013, p. 140). Akinyemi was so influential that his guiding philosophies became known as the Akinyemi Doctrine which rested on reciprocity and the principles of real politik (Ate 1987, p. 3).

On a concluding note, while evidence of the personalities of various Nigerian leaders on the nation’s foreign policy is hardly scarce (see Ogwu, 1986), “they do not solely explain the variance in decision outcomes...[and] require other factors to activate their expression and foreign policy determinants” (Ojieh 2016, p.197).

4.2.2 Societal Influence on Nigerian Foreign Policy

Various societal factors have come to influence Nigerian foreign policy overtime, some (e.g. economy) more than others (e.g. public opinion and the media). According to Lawal and Daiyabu (2015), successive Nigerian governments have been motivated in their foreign policy by a need to attract other nations to the country’s rich economic and cultural potential (p. 5).

As the most populous black nation in the world and the most populous in Africa with a wealth of natural resources, Nigeria has always viewed itself as occupying a special position in the international system (Oni and Taiwo 2016, p. 67). This self-image, which has been termed one of 'big brotherism', the attendant role perceptions, as well as the nation's history of slavery and colonialism have played a key role both in shaping Nigeria's foreign policy, and ensuring its continuity. Evidence of this lies in the fact that Africa has remained the centrepiece of Nigerian foreign policy irrespective of changes in government and Nigeria, one of the champions of the anti-apartheid movement, has been involved in dispute settlement and peace-keeping on the continent at a cost of approximately \$10billion and 2,000 soldiers (Ade-Ibijola 2013, p. 567; 568). Oni and Taiwo (2016) opined that Nigeria's big-brotherism is predicated on the notion of becoming the continent's political and economic powerhouse (p. 64).

Nowhere is Nigeria's big-brotherism more evident than in West Africa where she championed the establishment of the Economic Community of West African States, the continent's largest regional organization, and has also played a major role in peacekeeping most notably in Liberia and Sierra Leone (Oni and Taiwo 2016, p. 63) even despite domestic public opposition (Obi 2008, p. 190). In order to allay suspicions about the country's intentions, which are often perceived as hegemonic in nature (Kolapo 2014, p. 3), Nigeria's position has been espoused as a "leader among equals" (Sinclair 1983, p. 10).

The Nigerian economy has also played a role in shaping the country's foreign policy. A single commodity oil-dependent economy, surpluses gained during the oil boom years allowed the country to act more assertively (Sinclair 1983, p. 7) and as the

recent slump in oil prices shows, a fall in oil prices reduces government revenue significantly and hinders the implementation of foreign policy objectives (Kayode 2016, p. 2; 11). The single commodity dependent nature of the economy has also somewhat made the country dependent on external powers, particularly those who purchase the bulk of its oil exports and those to which it is indebted (Ota and Ecoma 2015, p. 58).

Evidence of the economy's influence on Nigerian foreign policy initiatives may be found in the form of the Technical Aid Corps. A slump in oil prices during the Babangida regime inhibited the state's ability to be frivolous with foreign aid and in effort to counteract this; the Technical Aid Corps was born. It was intended to provide an alternative less-expensive means for Nigeria to send aid abroad through technical personnel rather than monetary gifts. The initiative remains an important element of Nigerian foreign policy to date and cops volunteers' services remain in high demand (Okunnu, 2010 in Oni and Taiwo 2016, p. 63).

Furthermore, the crippled economy met by the Obasanjo regime upon coming to power in 1999 meant that he had to embark on a mission seeking debt relief from the country's creditors. This became a key foreign policy objective born almost exclusively from domestic economic influence (albeit negative). The debt relief mission also affected foreign policy in that the country had to be sympathetic to the interests of creditor countries (Lamido 2012, p. 7).

The realm of domestic politics and context has also been known to shape Nigerian foreign policy (Lawal and Daiyabu 2015, p. 8). Former Foreign Minister under Obasanjo's first term as president, Dr. Sule Lamido, captured it best when he said

that upon coming into office, the most immediate foreign policy task of the Obasanjo administration was to repair the damage done by military rule [read the preceding Abacha regime] (Lamido 2012, p. 5). This task prevented the new administration from outlining any long-term foreign policy goals.

Arguably, one the most important domestic political events to ever shape Nigerian foreign policy is the civil war of 1967-1970 (Onoja 2008, p. 52). The experiences of the war led to a radical shift in foreign policy under Gowon. Hitherto Western-inclined despite claims of non-alignment, Nigeria's foreign policy was launched into a new age of nonalignment especially as most western powers were reluctant to support the federation while others (e.g. France) out rightly supported the secessionists (Obi 2008, p. 188). The civil war also highlighted a need to re-evaluate Nigeria's standing with her neighbours, particularly the francophone countries who had been especially hostile even before the war began. By the end of the war, Nigeria's foreign policy was reoriented to Afrocentrism away from the previous pro-West stance (Obi 2008, p. 188).

Domestic political influence on foreign policy is till prevalent in contemporary times. The various internal problems confronting the Nigerian state at present such as the insurgency in the North of the country and most recently, an economic recession, have also led it to be less active on the international level (Kayode 2016, p. 10). These events have however, led President Buhari himself to be more active internationally as he seeks external assistance, especially from the Lake Chad states, in defeating the Boko Haram insurgency and seeking investment in non-oil sectors of the domestic economy to alleviate the pressures caused by the recession (Polycarp, 2017).

Although the Nigerian state is comprised of hundreds of ethnic groups, each with a different cultural identity, some societal values transcend ethnic lines and are shared by the nation as a whole and have come to influence how the country conducts itself internationally. One such value is morality, which has remained a constant element of Nigerian foreign policy as it has continually advocated for the cause of oppressed peoples and the peaceful resolution of disputes (Ade-Ibijola 2013, p. 568; Sinclair 1983, p. 9).

The influence of culture on Nigerian foreign policy despite its merits also has a bad face. The prevalence of corruption and a culture of nepotism have historically been evident in the conduct of Nigeria's foreign policy. Numerous non-career officials have been appointed as ambassadors and high commissioners on the basis of personal relationships and connections rather than merit. This practice has proven counter-productive and affected the implementation of foreign policy directives (Kayode 2016, p. 11). This practice has however been less pervasive in recent years, especially since the Jonathan administration's intentional attempt to correct it.

The domestic need to maintain national unity and stability as a result of social/cultural diversity has also somewhat played a role in foreign policy formulation (Sinclair 1983, p. 6) where it has made consensus building difficult. According to Ake Claude, the Nigerian tendency to seek a common denominator on all issues is responsible for the persistent failures in its foreign policy and the originating diversity is also known to make public opinion incoherent and thus of limited influence (Onoja 2008, p. 43; 46).

4.2.3 State Influence on Nigerian Foreign Policy

Unlike other domestic influences on Nigerian foreign policy, those emanating from the governmental level have been less pervasive. Nonetheless, these influences do exist and are observable in the conduct of Nigeria's foreign policy overtime.

As Kayode (2016) notes, the nature of the domestic political leadership in Nigeria has been known to shape the country's foreign policy (p. 1) especially as successive governments' lack of sensitivity to popular pressures has made the foreign policy of the country elite and government-driven (Nuamah 2003, p. 6). It is apparent that the nation's foreign policy tended to be more assertive and independent under the military regimes than the civilian administrations with the latter also displaying a tendency to be more militantly anti-west. This can be explained, in part, by the nature of state-society relations under these two types of government.

As the military regimes were inherently autocratic, decision-makers were allowed to pursue an independent line with little regard for divergent interests both domestically and internationally. In contrast, the civilian administrations (save that of Obasanjo) were relatively more moderate as the inherent democratic element meant that various stakeholder concerns had to be taken into account in the conduct of Nigeria's foreign policy. The military regime's tendency to act forcefully especially damaged the country's standing internationally, most notably under its last military ruler General Abacha (Lamido 2012, p. 4).

The prevalence of corruption amongst members of the government bureaucracy has also negatively affected the conduct of the nation's foreign policy on a governmental level as diplomatic appointments based on personal connections rather than merit

have been known to subjugate national interest to the personal interests of the country's political elite (Chidozie *et al.* 2014, p. 56).

On a concluding note, "it is clear that the institutions and processes of Nigeria's foreign policy formulation cannot be separated from...the character of the state or the worldview of its ruling elite" (Nuamah 2003, p. 5).

4.3 Conclusion

From the foregoing, it is evident that several factors inherent to Nigeria itself have contributed to shaping both its foreign policy formulation and implementation. These factors include: individual leaders' personalities and perspectives, the national self-image of Nigerians and the political elite, domestic politics, economy, and social structure, and the nature of the ruling government.

Chapter 5

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

This chapter provides an analysis of the data collected via interviews with particular authorities on Nigerian foreign policy. The data is taken both in isolation and as it relates to the research objectives and hypothesis of this thesis. The data is presented in the form of tables, the inferences/explanations for which follow.

5.1 Data Collection

The research protocol that guided the process of data collection is represented as follows:

1. Based on the discoveries of previous chapters, interview questions pertaining to Nigerian foreign policy were formulated.
2. A total of 13 Nigerian experts and decision-makers were contacted via email with the research questions.
3. The respondents' answers to the aforementioned questions were then saved in individual .docx files.
4. Each of the responses was then manually scrutinized by the researcher with the aim of determining –
 - 1. Specific factors mentioned by the relevant respondent; and
 - 2. Common themes among the responses
5. Specific factors, common themes, and certain guiding principles worthy of mention were subsequently organised into tables.

Table 1: List of Respondents in Alphabetic Order, and their Respective Positions

1. Kinkus Rimamfinten ACHI	Assistant Chief Accountant, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2. Igba John AUDU	Minister Councillor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
3. Zakariah IFU	Deputy Director Research & Statistics, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
4. Zarah MANDARA	Assistant Chief Legislative Officer, National Assembly
5. Augustine Nyam PETER	Principal Accountant, National Assembly
6. Bauka Andembutop REAGAN	Senior Accountant, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
7. Sharkdam WAPMUK	Research Fellow & Head, Division of African Politics and Integration, Nigerian Institute of International Affairs

In line with the objectives of the thesis, 5 comprehensive interview questions² were developed on the basis of a review of the extant literature covering the internal and external sources of foreign policy, the relationship between internal and external factors, Nigerian foreign policy, and the resulting, albeit premature, expectations regarding what factors are expected to be determinant for Nigerian foreign policy. The questions were subsequently sent to public servants either (in)directly involved in foreign policy processes in Nigeria or expected to have considerable knowledge on the subject-matter by virtue of their position, as can be seen from the table above.

Initial contact was initiated by utilizing the researcher's already existing personal contacts. The list of prospective respondents was then expanded using a snow-ball

² The interview questions are included in Appendix 1.

strategy for a total of 13 people contacted via email. Some of those contacted responded that they would be unable to respond to the questions within the expected time-frame while some others claimed not to have enough knowledge to be helpful. Overall, of the 13, 7 responded to the interview questions, the first of which was sent out in May, 2017 with the last response received in July, 2017.

Following receipt of the seventh and last response, the researcher, with the research objectives in mind, embarked on the delicate process of manually explicating the factors highlighted by the individual respondents and themes common in their responses in addition to certain principles that were posited to have played a guiding role for Nigeria's foreign policy. Each response was subject to multiple readings in an effort to ensure as complete an understanding as possible.

5.2 Data Analysis

For the purpose of the tables, the following key is used to represent the individual respondents

Table 2: Respondents' Keys

RESPONDENTS NAME	KEY
1. Kinkus Rimamfinten ACHI	Ac
2. Igba John AUDU	Au
3. Zakariah IFU	I
4. Zarah MANDARA	M
5. Augustine Nyam PETER	P
6. Bauka Andembutop REAGAN	R
7. Sharkdam WAPMUK	W

Table 3: Select Factors and their Corresponding Respondents

FACTOR	RESPONDENTS
1. Regional Considerations (Continental & Sub-regional)	Ac, Au, I, M, P, R, W
2. Domestic Security Issues	Ac, Au, I, P, W
3. National Interest	Ac, Au, M, W
4. Decolonization and Liberation Movements	Au, M, R, W
5. Politics Between and Within Other States	I, M, P, W
6. International Security/Terrorism	Ac, Au, I, W
7. Domestic Politics/Power Struggles	Ac, P, W
8. National Identity/International Image	I, M, W
9. Domestic Economy (e.g. Debt relief)	Au, I, W
11. Relationships with Super/Emerging Powers	I, P, W

The table above present factors the respondents most commonly alluded to as being influential for Nigerian foreign policy; said factors have been arranged in order of frequency i.e. the number of respondents that mentioned them. As can be seen from the table, all of the respondents made mention of certain regional considerations of a continental and/or sub-regional (West Africa) nature that have formed the basis for NFP decisions in the past. Such considerations include Nigeria’s strive for regional hegemony, regional cooperation, its commitment to Africa as the centrepiece of its foreign policy etc. The fact that such regional considerations were alluded to by all of the respondents speaks to the importance of this factor for NFP.

Some respondents also made mention of domestic issues which have soared to the forefront of NFP priorities in recent years in light of the ongoing Boko Haram

insurgency in the country's North-East region and militant activity in the oil-rich Niger Delta region. This factor is particularly salient for the previous Jonathan and incumbent Buhari administrations who have sought international assistance (military and otherwise) to aid their battle against the rampant domestic security challenges. The case of the kidnapped Chibok girls is especially illustrative here as the international attention that followed was extremely influential for Nigerian foreign policy (see Wolfe, 2014). Related to this is number 6 on the table, which has also become increasingly important in recent years especially as Boko Haram's activities have spilled over to neighbouring Chad, Cameroon, and Niger, prompting the establishment of a joint military force involving the 4 countries with addition of Benin Republic (BBC, 2015).

'National Interest' was also mentioned severally as a factor influencing NFP. Little was said however about how this came to be determined although it is possible to conclude that said interest is domestically determined. While no longer as important, respondents also alluded to the influence decolonization and liberation movements have had on NFP in the past, particularly those in Africa (although Nigeria was also somewhat supportive of such movements outside the continent). For example, Nigeria was at the forefront of the anti-apartheid struggle in Southern Africa at the time.

Another factor the respondents mentioned concerns those collectively concerned with politics between and within other states which have come to influence NFP. The particular factors contained here include cold war politics, civil wars in other states (such as those in Liberia and Sierra Leone), disagreements between other states (such as that between Togo and Ghana), amongst others. Similarly, Nigeria's relationship

with superpowers and emerging powers were also said to have influenced its foreign policy as it navigates the international political climate.

Due to the level of cultural diversity present in Nigeria, domestic power struggles and politics in general were said to exert considerable influence on the nation's foreign policy as the different ethno-religious groups vie for power and particular policy formulators tend to shape NFP in such a manner that it strengthens their position on the domestic political scene.

Nigeria's image – both the internal national identity and the external image – was also said to be a factor influencing its foreign policy. As Africa's most populous country and with one of the continent's largest diaspora populations, Nigeria's self-identity as a big-brother on the continent has played in major role in foreign policy decision-making in the past, especially in the West African sub-region where it is undeniably the most powerful state and has historically acted as such. In the same vein, NFP has also been largely influenced by the nation's international image. This has not always been for the better as its reputation for rampant corruption and cyber-crime has often been detrimental to the attainment of its foreign policy objectives. The influence of this particular factor was especially important during the Abacha regime, when Nigeria was isolated internationally due to the brutality of the regime, and the proceeding Obasanjo administration, where repairing the nation's damaged image was a top priority.

Lastly, some respondents indicated that the domestic economy has also been historically pertinent for NFP. This is particularly true for periods when debt relief (Obasanjo administration), the repatriation of looted funds from foreign banks, and

offsetting the fall in oil prices – the primary source of revenue – (Buhari administration) have been a priority.

Other factors mentioned by the respondents include globalization, the country’s federal structure, leaders’ personality, its size and population, citizen protection/welfare, and climate change. These factors were alluded to by just one or two respondents.

Table 4: Select Themes Common Among the Respondents

COMMON THEME	RESPONDENTS
1. Low External Influence in NFP 1979-83	Ac, Au, I, M, P, R, W
2. Large External Influence in NFP 1983-93	Ac, Au, I, M, P, R, W
3. Element of Continuity Despite Changes in Specificities	Ac, Au, I, M, P, W
4. Large External Influence in NFP 1963-66	Ac, I, M, P, R, W
5. Large External Influence in NFP 1993-date	Ac, Au, I, M, R, W
6. Primacy of Internal Factors	Ac, Au, I, M, R, W
7. NFP as a Mix of Domestic and International Factors	Ac, I, M, P, W
8. Politically Differentiated FP Periods ³	Ac, Au, M, R, W
9. 1963-66 Was Defining For NFP	Ac, M, P, R, W
11. Low External Influence 1966-79	Ac, Au, M, R, W

XX

³ While the relevant respondents all mentioned that NFP could be split into politically differentiated time-periods, there were differences between them as to how these periods should be determined.

Table 4 presents themes most common to the respondents, some of which are the result of specific interview questions. As in the previous table, the themes are arranged in the table in order of frequency.

All of the respondents agreed that external influence on NFP between 1979 and 1983 was particularly significant. This was due to the anti-apartheid movement in Southern Africa that caused the nation to adopt an activist foreign policy stance. Similarly, they all agreed that external influence was also significant between 1983 and 1993. External influence during this period resulted from two sources. On the one hand, the demise of the Soviet Union and consequent end of the Cold War meant that Nigeria had to remain sensitive to external developments as a new world order was being fashioned; on the other hand, the IMF/World Bank-led structural adjustment programmes of the time also served to delimit the range of policy options available.

Six of the seven respondents agreed that external influence was also pervasive between 1963-1966 – within the context of the on-going Cold War, the Anglo-Nigerian Defence Pact, and the strive for unity among the wealth of newly-independent African states. There was limited agreement however, regarding the importance of these formative years for NFP in the long run, and the minimal influence of external factors between 1966 and 1979 (5 respondents each). Conversely, there was considerable agreement over the influence of external factors from 1993-date. According to one of the respondents, the period spanning 1993-1999 was characterised by

“[a] pressure to democratise, wave of democracy, peacekeeping in West African trouble spots e.g. Liberia and Sierra Leone, sanctions from developed

countries. From 1999 – foreign policy under democratic regime, redefinition of Nigeria’s global relations, debt diplomacy and forgiveness, relations with emerging economic powers such as China and India.” (S. Wapmuk, personal communication, June 13, 2017).

The respondents made mention of the fact that NFP has historically been the product of internal and external factors working in conjunction. Save for A. N. Peter, all of the respondents agreed that internal factors were overwhelmingly more deterministic for NFP than external factors. The diverse nature of the domestic socio-political scene was credited for this as policymakers are forced to consider internal factors first when making foreign policy decisions lest they upset the base. As Bauka Reagan eloquently put it:

domestic factors are dominant because it impinges on the very survival or existence of the regime in place. Given the background of political instability, Nigerian governments tend to give pre-eminence to internal challenges which they consider more important or crucial to their grip over power than international factors.” (B. Reagan, personal communication, June 16, 2017).

Finally, the majority of respondents mentioned that while there have been variations in specific policy objectives and focuses, there has been an element of continuity as the fundamentals of NFP have scarcely strayed from those outlined by Prime Minister Balewa upon the establishment of the first republic back in 1963. They also made mention of the fact that NFP could be split into politically differentiated time-periods although they differed on what basis this differentiation should occur e.g. while most respondents chose to use the conventional delineation that utilizes the

nation's different republics and military regimes, Wapmuk chose to split NFP into the Cold War and post-Cold War eras while Ifu chose to differentiate between the independence and post-independence periods.

Table 5: Principles Historically Known to Have Guided NFP According to the Respondents

PRINCIPLE	RESPONDENTS
1. Non-Alignment	Au, M, P, R, W
2. Peace/Unity in Africa	Au, M, R, W
3. Bi/Multilateralism	Ac, M, W

The 3 principles outlined above in Table 5 were found to have received repeated mention in the respondents' answers to the interview questions.

Gaining independence during the Cold War era, NFP at the time was significantly affected by policy makers' commitment to non-alignment with either of the blocs. It is noteworthy however, that the non-aligned stance of the Nigerian government was initially Western-oriented in reality and only became truly non-aligned in the 1980s.

As had been mentioned earlier in the thesis, Africa has historically been touted as the centrepiece of NFP. As such, NFP has remained driven by a desire for peace and unity in Africa. To this end, Nigeria has participated in and spearheaded a number of peacekeeping missions in addition to occasionally taking up the role of mediator in interstate conflicts.

Lastly, Nigeria has displayed a desire to operate internationally through bilateral and multilateral cooperation with other states. Its involvement in the Liberian and Sierra Leone civil wars for example, was conducted under the cover of ECOWAS, while that in Sudan was under the auspices of the African union. A look at Nigeria's foreign policy behaviour shows that very few major foreign policy activities have been undertaken unilaterally.

5.3 Discussion

From the foregoing, it is evident that NFP is the result of a number of factors, both internal and external to it. However, as the majority of respondents point out, and can be seen from the preceding chapters, internal factors tend to take precedence over external factors in Nigeria where foreign policy is concerned thus confirming the predictions made in Chapter 1 based on Rosenau's typology. Unfortunately, a more intricate exploration of specific factors and their respective deterministic capacity is beyond the scope of this thesis.

Regardless, it is possible to accept our earlier hypothesis that based on Nigeria's size, economy, and political system, internal factors should be more pervasive where foreign policy is concerned. Consequently, it is also possible to accept the thesis' second hypothesis that external factors should play a more supportive, secondary role for NFP.

At this juncture, it would be remiss not to caution that accepting that internal factors are dominant and external factors secondary for NFP is not to say that there has never been/will never be instances where external factors take prominence. Rather,

under normal conditions, Nigerian policymakers tend to pay more attention to internal factors when formulating the nation's foreign policy.

Overall, both internal and external factors tend to work in unison while guiding foreign policy behaviour even when one is overwhelmingly more salient. Take the case of NFP during the civil war years (1967-1970). While NFP during those years was undoubtedly driven by the war at home, it was also to a large extent responsive to external factors at the time, particularly as they related to the domestic situation. As an Anglophone country surrounded on all sides by Francophone countries at a time when the legacy of colonialism was still fresh, Nigeria was faced with a situation whereby France, who was in support of secessionist Biafra, used Nigeria's francophone neighbours to provide them with support. So, NFP then had to take both internal and external factors into consideration, thus illustrating the interplay between both domains.

Chapter 6

SUMMARY & CONCLUSION

Scholars have long been intrigued by the sources of state foreign policy. In particular, they have taken issue with what factors tend to be deterministic for state behaviour vis-à-vis their external relations as driven by their foreign policy. This thesis set out on this same task using the case of Africa's most populous country, Nigeria. Specifically, and in recognition of the fact that state foreign policy results from a variety of sources, it set out to determine whether factors internal or external to Nigeria itself drive/have historically driven Nigerian foreign policy.

To this end, the thesis drew upon a number of theoretical bases for its foundation. From Putnam (1988), it borrows and subsequently endorses the notion that foreign policy-makers engage in a two-level game that includes both the domestic and international political scenes; from neo-classical realist theory, it borrows the notion that systemic pressures on state foreign policy are filtered through domestic constraints and considerations (Rose, 1998); it uses the typology propounded by Rosenau (1966) to determine Nigeria's genotype so as to make preliminary predictions regarding what factors would be more influential for its foreign policy; and from Alons (2007), it takes up the charge of determining what whether internal or external foreign policy pressures are more prevalent by using the case of Nigeria.

Based on a review of the literature on the various sources of foreign policy, it was discovered that the external sources of foreign policy include (but are not necessarily limited to): the state's position in the international system, the international power structure, and the state's membership in international organizations and alliances. The internal sources, spanning different levels of analysis, include: the leaders themselves (individual level), role perception, culture and history, the media, and public opinion (societal level), the political system, political accountability, and the diplomatic institution (state level).

Nigeria's foreign policy through history was explored with the factors outlined above in mind with the aim of finding evidence of each having exerted an influence on NFP. Subsequently, a series of interview questions were developed and sent out to experts on NFP to help achieve the stated research objectives. The results of the interviews uncovered certain factors and principles the respondents claimed to have played an important role for NFP (see Tables 3 and 5 respectively). The revealed factors include regional considerations, domestic security issues, national interest,

Overall, most of the respondents indicated that internal factors have historically been more deterministic for NFP than external factors thus confirming earlier predictions and the thesis' hypotheses. The thesis concludes therefore that internal factors play a leading role where Nigerian foreign policy is concerned while external factors play a more supporting role.

6.1 Direction for Further Study

While this thesis has laid considerable groundwork in regards to Nigerian foreign policy, particularly the different internal and external factors that inform the nation's behaviour, little was done in respect to the degree of influence of specific factors.

As such, further study is needed to explore how and to what degree specific factors come to influence NFP. Subsequent studies should additionally strive to go beyond the realm of mere correlation and attempt to establish causality between said specific factors and particular foreign policy behaviour.

REFERENCES

- Abdulrasheed, A., Muda, M., & bin Ahmad, M. Z. (2016). Personality Factor in The Foreign Policy Making: A Case Study Of Nigeria Under General Sani Abacha Regime, 1993-1998. *International Journal of Management Research and Reviews*, 6(10), 1452.
- Ade-Ibijola, O. A. (2013). Overview of National Interest, Continuities and Flaws in Nigeria Foreign Policy. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 565.
- Adebajo, A. (2000). Nigeria: Africa's new gendarme? *Security Dialogue*, 31(2), 185-199.
- Ajetunmobi, R. O., Osunkoya, O. A., & Omotere, T. F. (2011). The Impact of President Olusegun Obasanjo's personality on Nigeria's foreign policy, 1999-2007. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(6), 308-315.
- Almond, G. A. (1960). *The American people and foreign policy*. Praeger.
- Alons, G. C. (2007). Predicting a State's Foreign Policy: State Preferences between Domestic and International Constraints. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 3(3), 211-232.
- Ate, B. E. (1987). *Decolonization and Dependence: the development of Nigerian-US relations, 1960-1984*. Westview Press.

- Bahador, B. (2007). *The CNN effect in action: How the news media pushed the West toward war in Kosovo*. Springer.
- Bar-Tal, D., & Antebi, D. (1992). Siege mentality in Israel. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 16(3), 251-275.
- Baum, M. A., & Potter, P. B. (2008). The relationships between mass media, public opinion, and foreign policy: Toward a theoretical synthesis. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11, 39-65.
- BBC (2015) Boko Haram Crisis: Nigeria to Lead Regional Force. *BBC News*. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-33097776>
- Brecher, M., Steinberg, B., & Stein, J. (1969). A framework for research on foreign policy behavior. *Journal of conflict resolution*, 13(1), 75-94.
- Cantir, C., & Kaarbo, J. (2012). Contested Roles and Domestic Politics: Reflections on Role Theory in Foreign Policy Analysis and IR Theory¹. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 8(1), 5-24.
- Caspary, W. R. (1970). The "Mood Theory": a study of public opinion and foreign policy. *American Political Science Review*, 64(02), 536-547.
- Durotoye, A. (2014). One Personality, Two Regimes: A Comparative Analysis of Nigeria's Foreign Policies under Olusegun Obasanjo. *International Affairs and Global Strategy*, 24, 22-33.

- Dyson, S. B. (2006). Personality and foreign policy: Tony Blair's Iraq decisions. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 2(3), 289-306.
- Fearon, J. D. (1998). Domestic politics, foreign policy, and theories of international relations. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 1(1), 289-313.
- Finnemore, M. (1993). International organizations as teachers of norms: the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and science policy. *International Organization*, 47(04), 565-597.
- Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). International norm dynamics and political change. *International organization*, 52(04), 887-917.
- Foyle, D. (2003). Foreign policy analysis and globalization: public opinion, world opinion, and the individual. *International Studies Review*, 5(2), 155-202.
- Garrison, J. A. (2003). Foreign Policy Analysis and Globalization: Public Opinion, World Opinion, and the Individual by Foyle¹. *International Studies Review*, 5(2), 155-202.
- Greenstein, F. I. (1967). The impact of personality on politics: An attempt to clear away underbrush. *American Political Science Review*, 61(03), 629-641.
- Hirshberg, M. S. (1993). The self-perpetuating national self-image: Cognitive biases in perceptions of international interventions. *Political Psychology*, 77-98.

- Holsti, K. J. (1970). National role conceptions in the study of foreign policy. *International Studies Quarterly*, 14(3), 233-309.
- Holsti, K. J. (1996). *The state, war, and the state of war* (No. 51). Cambridge University Press.
- Holsti, O. R. (1992). Public opinion and foreign policy: Challenges to the Almond-Lippmann consensus. *International studies quarterly*, 36(4), 439-466.
- Hudson, V. M. (2005). Foreign policy analysis: actor-specific theory and the ground of international relations. *Foreign policy analysis*, 1(1), 1-30.
- Huntington, S. P. (1999). The lonely superpower. *Foreign affairs*, 35-49.
- Inamete, U. B. (2001). *Foreign policy decision-making in Nigeria*. Susquehanna University Press.
- Itugbu, S. (2011). *Obasanjo, Nigeria and the World*.
- Jordaan, E. (2003). The concept of a middle power in international relations: distinguishing between emerging and traditional middle powers. *Politikon*, 30(1), 165-181.
- Kayode, I. B. (2016) Repositioning Nigeria Foreign Policy for National Development: Issues, Challenges And Policy Options. *Afro Asian Journal of Political Science*. 7(2), 1-14

Kolapo, T. (2014). Some Current Challenges to Nigeria's Foreign Policy Projections: The Way Forward. *African Journal of International Affairs & Development*, 17(2), 107.

Kolawole, D. (2005). From Isolation to Globalization: Transformation of Nigeria's Foreign Policy from the Abacha Regime to the Obasanjo Administration'. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(6), 873-879.

Korany, B., & Dessouki, A. H. (1984). *The Foreign Policies of Arab States*. Boulder, Col.

Lamido, S. (2012, October). *Challenges of foreign policy making and implementation in Nigeria: An insider's perspective*. In A Paper Presented at a Conference Organized by Society for International Relations Awareness,(SIRA) in Collaboration with Friedrich Elbert, Stiftung(FES) Nigeria @ Protea Hotel, Asokoro, Abuja, Nigeria, on 31st October.

Lawal, L. D., & Daiyabu, M. H. (2015). Developmental Diplomacy in a Globalised World: The Imperatives of Soft Power in Nigeria's External Relations under the Transformation Agenda of President Goodluck Jonathan. *International Affairs and Global Strategy*. 28, 5-12

Mansfield, E. D., & Snyder, J. (1995). Democratization and the Danger of War. *International security*, 20(1), 5-38.

- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics*. WW Norton & Company.
- Miller, W. E. (1967). Voting and foreign policy. In *Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy*, ed. James N. Rosenau, 213-30.
- Neack, L. (2008). *The new foreign policy: power seeking in a globalized era*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Noelle-Neumann, E. (1974). The spiral of silence a theory of public opinion. *Journal of communication*, 24(2), 43-51.
- Nuamah, R. (2003, July). *Nigeria's Foreign Policy after the Cold War: Domestic, Regional and External Influences*. In report of a seminar held at the Centre for African Studies, Oxford University (pp. 11-12).
- Obi, C. I. (2008). Nigeria's foreign policy and transnational security challenges in West Africa. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 26(2), 183-196.
- Ogunbadejo, O. (1980). Nigeria's Foreign Policy under Military Rule 1966–79. *International Journal*, 35(4), 748-765.
- Ogwu, U. J. (1986). *Nigerian Foreign Policy: Alternative Futures*. Nigerian Institute.

- Ojeh, C. O. (2016). Extraneous Considerations to the Personality Variables in Foreign Policy Decision-Making: Evidence from Nigeria. *Ufahamu: A Journal of African Studies*, 39(2).
- Omoruyi, O. (1999). *The tale of June 12: The betrayal of the democratic rights of Nigerians (1993)*. Press Alliance Network Limited.
- Oni, E. O., & Taiwo, A. M. (2016). Re-Thinking Nigeria's Foreign Policy Beyond "Big Brotherism" Towards Economic Diplomacy. *Canadian Social Science*, 12(10), 62-71.
- Oni, S. K. (Ed.). (2002). *The Nigerian Army in ECOMOG Operations: Liberia and Sierra Leone*. Sam Bookman Publishers for Nigerian Army Education Corps and School (NAECS).
- Ota, E. N., & Ecoma, C. S. (2015). Nigerian Foreign Policy in a Globalising World: The Imperative of a Paradigm Shift. *Journal of Asian Development*, 1(1), 55-65.
- Page, B. I. & Bouton, M. M. (2006). *The Foreign Policy Disconnect: What Americans Want from Our Leaders but Don't Get*.
- Putnam, R. D. (1988). Diplomacy and domestic politics: the logic of two-level games. *International organization*, 42(03), 427-460.

- Risse-Kappen, T. (1991). Public opinion, domestic structure, and foreign policy in liberal democracies. *World Politics*, 43(04), 479-512.
- Robinson, P. (1999). The CNN effect: can the news media drive foreign policy? *Review of international studies*, 25(02), 301-309.
- Rose, G. (1998). Neoclassical realism and theories of foreign policy. *World politics*, 51(01), 144-172.
- Rosenau, J. N. (1966). Pre-theories and theories of foreign policy. *Approaches to comparative and international politics*, 27.
- Rosenau, J. N. (1970). Foreign policy as adaptive behavior: some preliminary notes for a theoretical model. *Comparative Politics*, 2(3), 365-387.
- Soroka, S. N. (2003). Media, public opinion, and foreign policy. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 8(1), 27-48.
- Stephens, B. (2004). Upsetting Checks and Balances: The Bush Administration's Efforts to Limit Human Rights Litigation. *Harv. Human Rights. Journal*, 17, 169.
- Talibu, O. (2016). *Multilateralism and the hegemonic posture of a regional power: A case study of Nigeria, 1960-2015* (Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Utara Malaysia).

Waltz, K. (1979). *Theory of international relations*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Webley,

Wapmuk, S. (2012). The Changing Role of Non-State Actors in Foreign Policy Making, with Reference to Nigeria. *IUP Journal of International Relations*, 6(4), 7.

Wapmuk, S. (2017, June 13). Email.

Watts, M. (2004). Oil as money: the devil's excrement and the spectacle of black gold. *Reading Economic Geography*, 205-19.

Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics. *International organization*, 46(02), 391-425.

Wittkopf, E. R. (1990). *Faces of internationalism: Public opinion and American foreign policy*. Duke University Press.

Wolfe, L. (2014) The Lost Girls. *Foreign Policy*. 5th May. [Online]. Available at: <http://foreignpolicy.com/2014/05/05/the-lost-girls/>

Zingarelli, M. E. (2010). *The CNN effect and the Al Jazeera effect in global politics and society*.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Interview Questions

1. Could you please explain the evolution of Nigerian foreign policy?
 - What are the periods that are identifiably different from each other?
 - Would you agree that 1963-1966 was the defining moment for Nigerian foreign policy?
2. Do you think that international factors/powers had a large influence on Nigerian foreign policy during the following periods?
 - The first republic 1963-1966
 - First period of interim military rule 1966-1979
 - The second republic 1979-1983
 - The second period of interim military rule 1983-1993
 - The last period of interim military rule 1993-1999 and the fourth republic 1999 till date
3. How have Nigerian governments formulated their foreign policy in the past?
 - Do you think there is a big change in recent years?
4. It is generally believed that foreign policy is shaped by both domestic and international factors.
 - Which of these factors is dominant in Nigeria and why?
5. What are the international dynamics which contribute in shaping policy formulation and implementation in Nigeria?
6. Are there other experts or decision makers you could suggest I talk to or interview?

Appendix B: Interview Transcripts

**RESPONSE- QUESTIONS: BAUKA ANDEMBUTOP REAGAN Senior Accountant,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs**

1. Could you please explain the evolution of Nigerian foreign policy?

Nigerian Foreign policy at the dawn of independence was marked by a consensus over support to self-determination movements across Africa and panafricanism and the leadership role Nigeria had to play as Africa's largest state in the pursuit of African unity. This "African consciousness" was more dominant than a "Nigerian consciousness and Identity" due to the internal divisiveness among ethnically diverse federal states.

Over the years, while maintaining focus on regional integration, there has been a development of a Nigerian consciousness and identity and its ascendancy in its foreign policy objectives. This evolution was eloquent demonstration in the foreign policy priorities ranked in order of priority in the 1999 Constitution: "... the promotion and protection of national interest, African integration and unity, and international collaboration..."

• What are the periods that are identifiably different from each other?

With the exception of the current Buhari Regime, there has been 11 identifiably different periods or eras in Nigerian Foreign Policy namely: Balewa Era 1960 – 1966; the Ironsi Era – 1966; the Gowon Era 1966 – 1975; the Murtala/Obasanjo Era – 1975 – 1979; the Shagari Era – 1979 – 1983; the Buhari Era 1983 – 1985; the Babangida Era – 1985 - 1993; the Shonekan/Abacha Era – 1993 – 1998; the Abubakar Era 1998 – 1999; Obasanjo (civilian) Era 1999 – 2007; the Yar'Adua / Jonathan Era 2007 – 2010 and the Jonathan Era 2010 – 2015.

- **Would you agree that 1963-1966 was the defining moment for Nigerian foreign policy?**

I definitely agree. 1963- 1966 witnessed the birth of the first republic and it was during this period that the foundations of Nigerian Foreign Policy were laid.

2. **Do you think that international factors/powers had a large influence on Nigerian foreign policy during the following periods**

- **The first republic 1963-1966**

Yes, I think international factors/powers had a large influence on Nigerian foreign policy during the first republic. Nigerian foreign policy at this period was predominantly concerned with supporting independent movements and efforts towards Africa's unity. Nigeria also kept close ties with its former colonial master Britain whose influence on various aspects of Nigerian life (political system, education and judiciary) was still very strong. Nigeria also adhered to the non-alignment movement that was gaining grounds among newly independent states who opted for neutrality during the Cold war era.

- **First period of interim military rule 1966-1979**

No, I think international factors/powers played a very limited influence during this period. The military regimes were more concerned with consolidating political stability, and handling the civil war (Biafran War) that erupted in 1967.

- **The second republic 1979-1983**

No, international factors/powers did not have a large influence. The Shagari Regime was dormant and did little to promote Nigeria's foreign policy interest.

- **The second period of interim military rule 1983-1993**

International factors/powers had a large influence in the second interim military rule as both the Buhari and Babangida Regimes sought to reassert Nigeria's leadership role in the sub-regional (ECOWAS) and continental level.

- **The last interim military rule 1993-999 and the fourth republic 1999 till date**

International factor/powers also had a large influence during the last military rule. The Abacha Regime played an influential role in the restoration of peace in Liberia and the preservation of a civilian regime in Sierra Leone. From a negative end, Abacha's sordid human rights record led to the suspension of Nigeria from the Commonwealth and strained its relationship with the United States.

3. How have Nigerian governments formulated their foreign policy in the past?

Past Nigerian governments formulated their foreign policy taking into consideration domestic policy and the need to assert Nigeria's role as the dominant actor at the sub-regional and continental level. Most of them were pro-West and favoured efforts towards Africa's unity.

- **Do you think there is a big change in the recent years?**

I don't think there has been a radical change in recent years.

4. It is generally believed that foreign policy is shaped by both domestic and international factors.

- **Which of these factors is dominant in Nigeria and why?**

Domestic factors are dominant because it impinges on the very survival or existence of the regime in place. Given the background of political instability, Nigerian governments tend to give pre-eminence to internal challenges which they consider more important or crucial to their grip over power than international factors.

5. What are the international dynamics which contribute in shaping policy formulation and implementation in Nigeria?

At the continental level, the predominant dynamic is that of African Unity. This has been a cardinal foreign policy principle pursued by both civilian and military governments. Closely related to this is the goal of asserting Nigeria's dominance or hegemony at the sub-

regional (West Africa) and continental level (Africa). At the international scene, most Nigerian governments tend to be pro-West though still open to influence from China.

6. Are there other experts or decision makers you could suggest I talk to or interview?

Senior officials at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and researchers at the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA).

RESPONSE BY: ZAKARIAH IFU

Deputy Director,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

1. EVOLUTION OF NIGERIAN FOREIGN POLICY

The evolution of Nigerian Foreign Policy dates back to the period shortly after independence, when the Prime Minister, late Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa delivered his speech at the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) upon the admission of Nigeria as the 99th member of the United Nations. In the speech, Sir Balewa enunciated the fundamental principles of Nigerian Foreign Policy as follows:

- Support for Africa's unity and independence;
- Non interference and respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other states;
- Africa as the centre-piece of Nigeria's foreign policy;
- Non-aligned and peaceful settlement of international disputes; and
- Friendly regional and economic cooperation with other countries.

There has been no remarkable departure from these principles, as it still remains the guiding rule for the conduct of Nigeria's foreign relations, except for few conceptual transitions resulting from domestic and external influences.

1a. **INDEPENDENCE PERIOD**

Nigeria's foreign policy at independence was influenced by the nature of the international system into which Nigeria was born into. It was the period after the end of the World War II and the era of the Cold War rivalry between the two super powers at that time (United States and USSR). It was a reactionary foreign policy posture in response to global events of that period.

POST INDEPENDENCE

1a. this period was the proactive period of Nigeria's Foreign Policy engagements. Nigeria has enormous economic muscle to pursue her national interests as well as promote the prosperity of his citizens and other African countries.

2. INFLUENCE OF INTERNATIONAL FACTORS/POWERS ON NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

FIRST REPUBLIC: 1963-1966

To a large extent, international factors had a large influence on Nigeria's foreign policy during this period. It was the period of the cold war during which Nigeria became non-aligned in the cold war rivalry between the West and the East. It was also the period the wave of independence was sweeping through the African continent.

SECOND REPUBLIC: 1979-1983

ECOWAS was established during this period, in line with the foreign policy objectives of Nigeria, to promote friendly regional and economic cooperation with other countries. There were minimal external factors influencing Nigeria's foreign policy during this period.

SECOND REPUBLIC OF INTERIM MILITARY RULE: 1983-1993

Nigeria was able to engage in peacekeeping and peace-building activities through ECOMOG interventions in Liberia, Sierra Leone etc. President Ibrahim Babangida's foreign policy was anchored on "Economic Diplomacy" with a view to promoting export trade, investment and increased financial flows from friendly countries. It was the period of external influence by International Financial Institutions (IMF and World Bank) and the introduction of Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP).

INTERIM MILITARY RULE: 1993-1999/ FOURTH REPUBLIC: 1999-DATE

The military junta of General Sani Abacha faced international criticisms and sanctions over the killing of the Ogoni 9, Ken Saro Wiwa and others. Nigeria was declared a pariah state and the foreign policy engagements were focused on engaging the international community on the plan towards democratization and several misgivings about Nigeria. After the successful transition to civil rule, the foreign policy focus of the administration of President Olusegun Obasanjo was on "Citizens Diplomacy", which places Nigerians at the center of Nigeria's foreign policy and this has remain till date while also retaining other nobel initiatives too.

For the present administration of President Muhammadu Buhari, the domestic environment influenced the foreign policy thrust. The key priorities of the government are security, fight against corruption and improving the economy. These priorities are the major components of the country's foreign policy engagements.

3. FORMULATION OF FOREIGN POLICY

The President and Commander-in-Chief (C-in-C) is the chief foreign policy formulator while the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is responsible for its implementation. There have not been any significant changes over the years but only conceptual transitions from government to government as a result of each government trying to ascribe ownership to its foreign policy thrust.

4. FACTORS THAT SHAPE FOREIGN POLICY IN NIGERIA

Foreign policy is interplay of both domestic and external factors. This notion is not different in the case of Nigeria as foreign policy engagements are products of domestic and international activities.

The dominant factor in the case of Nigeria is domestic and the reason is that Nigeria believes its prosperity and that of its citizens is a key national interest and all foreign policy pursuits must seek to benefit Nigeria and its people.

5. INTERNATIONAL DYNAMICS THAT SHAPES FOREIGN POLICY FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION IN NIGERIA

Great powers politics, contemporary issues of international concerns and promotion of international peace and security are the international dynamics that shapes foreign policy formulation and implementation in Nigeria.

Also, the need to play a leadership role in the African continent has been a major factor for Nigeria foreign policy machinery.

RESPONSE BY: Sharkdam Wapmuk
Director,
Research and Studies Department,
Nigerian Institute of International Affairs,
Lagos, Nigeria.

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Could you please explain the evolution of Nigerian foreign policy?

The evolution of Nigeria's foreign policy is such a long history to be written in only few pages.

Nigerian foreign policy has evolved since the country became an independent sovereign state on 1st October, 1960. As an independent entity, Nigeria started playing on the world scene in 1960. During the Tafawa Balewa administration the type of foreign policy pursued by Nigeria was said to characterize by devotion to African issues. But the regime was accused of being pro-western. It took the events of the Nigerian civil war (1967 – 1970) to debunk this misplaced perception. For instance, Nigeria played an indecisive role in the Congo crisis of the early 1960s. Again Nigeria was the dissenting voice in 1965, when the Organization of African Unity Ministerial Council took the unanimous decision to break diplomatic relations with Britain if she failed to suppress the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia. Nigerian governments since the demise of the First Republic (1960 – 1966) have been more assertive in pursuing Nigeria's interest in Africa. The Yakubu Gowon's administration was more committed to liberation struggles in Africa through shuttle diplomacy. In the area of economic relations, Nigeria's efforts led to the formation of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in May 1975. Since then Nigeria has acted as the pivot of this Organization.

Though Nigeria had always asserted that Africa is the cornerstone of its foreign policy, it was only during the Murtala/Obasanjo regime that the country maintained a militant-oriented foreign policy which sought to dictate the pace and direction of progress on the continent. It was the resolute support of this regime of the MPLA (Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola) that led to Angola's independence in 1975. Demonstrating the same assertive Pan-African disposition, the Obasanjo regime opposed British arrogance over Zimbabwe's independence. This subsequently led to the nationalization of the Shell BP on the eve of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference held in Lusaka, Zambia in 1977. Under the civilian administration of Shehu Shagari, Nigeria still professed its commitment to Africa which she articulated as the strengthening of African solidarity, promotion of peace and stability in Africa, support of the rights of peoples to self-determination, and unwavering support for the eradication of apartheid in South Africa. The short but dynamic Buhari/Idiagbon interregnum, like the others, still professed Africa as the centre-piece of Nigeria's foreign policy and clearly articulated this in the Concentric Circles Theory. The Buhari regime apart from the serious efforts it made at the domestic milieu – economically and socially; it strove to improve relations with Nigeria's neighbours.

Under the Babangida administration, Nigeria spear-headed the formation of the ECOWAS Monitoring Group (ECOMOG), that intervened in the Liberian and Sierra Leone crises. Nigeria's mediatory role in conflict situations involving Sierra Leone-Liberia, Togo-Ghana, Burkina Faso-Mali and the Liberian crisis in many ways succeeded in averting damaging wars in the continent. It also introduced the

Technical Aid Corps (TAC) Scheme to assist African and black nations lacking in personnel with capacity building, and the programme has been sustained and been successful. Since then TAC has remained as one of the arrowheads of Nigeria's foreign relations. The Abacha government was largely preoccupied with maintaining power or regime survival, and therefore did little on the foreign scene apart from continuing with some of the foreign policy objectives pursued by the previous governments of Ernest Shonekan's (ING) and Ibrahim Babangida. Notable however, was that the government by its actions or inactions turned Nigeria into a pariah nation amongst the comity of nations as a result of its poor human rights records. As an act of survival made a policy shift away from the West to Asia courting countries like China, North Korea, and Libya. This situation was not to last for long, as a policy somersault occurred after the sudden demise of Sani Abacha, and the emergence of the General, Abdulsalami Abubakar. He quickly tried to stabilize the Nigerian polity by addressing and redressing where possible, the human rights abuses that occurred under the previous government. He began to woo the West again, and succeeded in getting their support and assistance for a political transition programme between 1998 and 1999. The outcome of this was the election of Olusegun Obasanjo as President of Nigeria.

Since Nigeria's return to civil governance, one of the most crucial dimensions of its national interest has been the consolidation of its hard-won democracy. Perhaps, it is the realization of the above imperatives that caused President Obasanjo to embark on numerous trips abroad. Though many observers of Nigeria's international relations were critical of this shuttle diplomacy, the government succeeded in improving the country's national image, attracting Foreign Direct Investments (FDI), and in recovering a significant portion of the looted monies lodged in foreign bank accounts. Further, His administration contributed immensely to the resolution of conflicts in Africa. Examples abound from Nigeria's interventions in Zimbabwe, Chad, Angola, Cameroun, Ethiopia-Eritrea, Somalia, Rwanda, Burundi, Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Togo, Cote d'Ivoire, Sao Tome and Principe and Sudan. President Obasanjo also represented the face of the new set of African leaders with a sense of history, a better view of the constraints and challenges facing Africa. This led to the creation of the African Union (AU) and NEPAD. Obasanjo also launched a campaign for debt relief, which was been globally acclaimed and yielded for Nigeria the cancellation of over \$18 billion of her debt to the Paris Club and later exit of Nigeria from its indebtedness to the London Club of Creditors. This achievement was roundly acknowledged and applauded. Obasanjo's government generally introduced measures to re-vitalize the economy in order to create an enabling environment that encourages investment.

The foreign policy thrust of the Yar' Adua/Jonathan administration is a logical continuation of the foreign policy under the previous government. Whereas, foreign policy under the Obasanjo government was aimed at rehabilitating Nigeria, and getting the country back into the committee of nations; under Yar' Adua it is focused on the protection of citizens interest (Agbu, 2008, p.12). There is no doubt that this presents a great challenge. The Jonathan administration focused on attraction of foreign direct investment (FDI) with a view to creating jobs and wealth creation. With respect to Nigeria's foreign policy at the terminal phase of the Jonathan administration, it is clear that the government had to confront many domestic challenges, among which insecurity especially in the North East stood out. The challenges of insecurity posed by the Boko Haram terrorism in the North-Eastern part of the country was a major source of concern for the government; no

doubt with serious implications on the country's quest for foreign direct investment (FDI); international image crises brought about by the missing Chibok girls. Nigeria faced a situation where it had to fight against insurgency and yet strong reluctance of Western countries, notably the United States to provide foreign military support and to sell military equipment to Nigeria to wage war on the Boko Haram. Another notable feature of the terminal phase of the Jonathan administration was the abrupt crash in international oil prices, which drastically reduced the national revenue and depleted foreign reserves. These developments undermined the country's capacity to pursue its foreign policy. Closely linked to the country's economic challenges is the problem of endemic and institutionalised corruption, a phenomenon which undermined national development, fostered negative image abroad and reduced the its ability to successfully wage the war against the Boko Haram.

Nigeria's foreign policy under Buhari is reflective of the domestic concerns including insecurity, corruption, economic dependency, power and energy crisis, high rate of unemployment, poor infrastructure, and health issues, amongst others. These stem from the fact a dynamic foreign policy requires a solid and functional domestic base. However, in the context of Nigeria's foreign policy, the domestic agenda that inevitably impinge on Nigeria's foreign policy are the need to combat terrorism and other sources of national insecurity, a sustained and dispassionate fight against corruption, and a purposeful economic action plan that will prioritise economic diversification with a specific focus on agriculture and solid minerals, infrastructural development. In the economic sphere, there is need for a foreign policy approach that is geared towards achieving the country's national interest. It is pertinent to utilise the goodwill that the country is currently enjoying under President Buhari to attract favourable economic relationships, including foreign direct investment (FDIs) and sustained capital inflows, especially with the volatility of oil prices and staggering budget deficits. So far, engagements with emerging powers such as China are beginning to yield positive dividends. In addition, greater opportunities abound for intra-African trade which could be tapped through increase engagements with African countries. So far, significant achievements have been recorded by the government of President Buhari in the area of security, specifically in the fight against the Boko Haram in the last one year. The President focused on strengthening relations with Nigeria's neighbours and to jointly fight the Boko Haram. This was done by relocating the Nigerian military command to Borno state, strengthening the Multinational Joint Task Force (MJTF) and placing same under the leadership of Nigeria. Furthermore, on combating insecurity, Buhari's foreign policy seeks to further strengthen cooperation and partnerships at the regional, continental and global levels. The security summit, recently organised by the office of the National Security Adviser, which was attended by France, USA, Britain, neighbouring countries and other major stakeholders attended speak to this point.

From the above, it is clear that the character of leadership as well as personality of the leader in power could attract goodwill and may also impact on the foreign policy drive of the administration. The perception of President Muhammadu Buhari as a disciplined, astute and courageous leader has so far garnered goodwill for the country leading to engagements with the international community in the areas of security, trade and investment, anti-corruption and energy, amongst others. Nigeria's foreign policy under President Muhammadu Buhari, even though devoid of the usual official sloganeering, can be said to be anchored on the three pillars that constitute the domestic priority programmes of the administration. These priority areas include: combating insecurity, the fight against corruption, the rejuvenation of the ailing

domestic economy, and job creation. A careful reading of these issue areas reveals the administration's understanding of, and sensitivity to the nature and dynamics of the domestic and foreign policy challenges that it inherited from the previous administration, and its determination to employ the instrument of foreign policy and diplomacy in tackling these challenges.

- **What are the periods that are identifiably different from each other?**

The periods that are identifiably different from each other are

- a. Nigerian foreign policy during the cold war era and Nigerian foreign policy in the post cold war era
- b. we can also differentiate foreign policy under military rule and democratic administration especially from 1999
- c. Others have differentiated foreign policy / grouped discussion under specific administrations or regimes.eg first republic, second republic, third republic etc or 1960-63, 1963-1966, 1966-1979, 1979-1983, 1983-1993, 1999-2017.

- **Would you agree that 1963-1966 was the defining moment for Nigerian foreign policy?**

I strongly agree that the period 1963-1966 was a defining moment for Nigerian foreign policy. It was within this period that Nigeria's Foreign policy agenda and goals were set out in the First Republic by Prime Minister Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, who enunciated the cardinal principles guiding the country's foreign relations based on realities of the international environment at that time. These were:

- Respect for the legal equality, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all states;
- Respect for the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other states;
- Nonalignment, that is, Nigeria would not as a matter of routine policy align with any of the existing ideological military blocs of North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, NATO, which was Western and led by the United States, and the Warsaw Pact of the Communist states led by the Soviet Union;
- Nigeria would join international organizations that are functionally relevant to its needs
- Africa would be the centre-piece of its foreign policy

Significantly, some of these principles have remained valid today, and beyond for a variety of reasons.

2. Do you think that international factors/powers had a large influence on Nigerian foreign policy during the following periods

Yes international factors and powers had a large influence on Nigerian foreign policy during the periods indicated above. Few examples are cited for each period:

- The first republic 1963-1966- cold war environment, search for African unity under the Organisation of African unity; Anglo-Nigerian defense pact,
- First period of interim military rule 1966-1979 – the Nigerian civil war and external support for secessionist Biafra eg France, and some African countries eg Rhodesia, South Africa, Gabon, Tanzania, Zambia etc /lack of support from powerful countries eg Britain, USA etc. after the civil war, the integration project under ECOWAS, relations with neighbouring countries, ACP etc
- The second republic 1979-1983 – activist foreign policy in the frontline states of southern Africa
- The second period of interim military rule 1983-1993 – the structural adjustment programme of IMF/World Bank, the end of the cold war, new world order etc,
- The last interim military rule 1993-1999 and the fourth republic 1999 till date- pressure to democratise, wave of democracy, peacekeeping in west African trouble spots eg Liberia and Sierra Leone, sanctions from developed countries. from 1999 - foreign policy under democratic regime, redefinition of Nigeria's global relations, debt diplomacy and forgiveness, relations with emerging economic powers such as China and India.

3. How have Nigerian governments formulated their foreign policy in the past?

In the past, the Nigerian government had formulated its foreign policy via the bureaucratic framework managed by the Ministry of External Affairs, now Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA). In essence the MFA was directly responsible for foreign policy formulation and implementation. The key actors in this regard include the minister and his officials. Accordingly, foreign policy priorities may shift from government to government depending on the minister. Apart from the Minister, some Heads of state/presidents have played active roles in foreign policy arena defining the agenda, while the ministry keys in and implements. Examples include late prime minister Tafawa Balewa who was his own foreign affairs minister during the first republic. Also president Olusegun Obasanjo was active in the foreign policy making process. Major foreign policy think tanks have played major roles in the formulation and implementation of the country's foreign policy. This includes the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs that was established in 1961 and taken over by the Nigerian government in 1971 as a nursery of ideas and think tank in foreign policy.

In addition, foreign policy receives input from critical ministries, departments and agencies such as National Intelligence Agency, Ministry of Defense, Ministry of finance, the CBN, National planning commission, etc. Also involved are government officials, interest group leaders, academicians, top military officers, religious leaders, and journalists.

- **Do you think there is a big change in the recent years?**

Nigerian foreign policy has been characterised by elements of continuity and change. Accordingly, while foreign policy can be seen as a continuous process, occasional changes and adjustments do come along depending on the priorities of government in power. The government in power may choose to improve on the styles, methods and strategies to drive or achieve the foreign policy objectives and goals.

That is not to say that the priorities have been the same. Each government has had distinctive priorities and style. The consistency of Nigeria's foreign policy and its continuity by various regimes has been aptly described by Professor Gambari, former External Affairs Minister and Nigeria's Representative to UN as 'Three Concentric Circles'. The three concentric circles puts 'Nigeria's interest first, West Africa sub-region second, and the rest of Africa third'. To achieve this goal Nigeria has devoted both human and material resources towards in the pursuit of liberation, continental peace and enduring unity in Africa. By virtue of her size and population, Nigeria has always seen herself as a leader in Africa.

4. It is generally believed that foreign policy is shaped by both domestic and international factors.

- Which of these factors is dominant in Nigeria and why?

The dominant domestic factors in Nigerian foreign policy include, but not limited to:

- the geographical size of the country
- The domestic economy/resource endowment – the misuse of its resource endowment, particularly crude oil factor, population (more than 170 million)
- national question- contestation over power at the centre and sharing of national resources and
- its culture and history, which define the relationship between ethnic nationalities
- the practice of federalism
- leadership
- national security, particularly terrorism etc

The dominant external factors in Nigerian foreign policy include, but not limited to:

- the dynamic nature of the international system

- relations with superpowers and emerging powers eg USA, France, Russia, China, India etc
 - rise and fall of oil prices within the international market, which has direct implication on the Nigeria economy
 - Global issues such as Terrorism, climate change, debt, technology, international trade under the WTO etc
5. What are the international dynamics which contribute in shaping policy formulation and implementation in Nigeria?
- the cold war,
 - African liberation / African integration and development eg from LPA to NEPAD/APRM, OAU to AU etc
 - international conflicts and wars in Africa
 - terrorism
 - relations with the UN- quest for democratisation of the UN and its bodies etc
6. Are there other experts or decision makers you could suggest I talk to or interview?

RESPONSE BY: ZARAH MANDARA

Assist. Chief Legislative Officer, **National Assembly**

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Could you please explain the evolution of Nigerian foreign policy?

Though it is fair to say that Nigerian Foreign Policy has witnessed a constant shift in outlook and strategies over the year given the multiple regime change and focus, the substance and fundamental priorities have remain the same. Though each regime (military or civilian) attempted to carve its own identity in foreign policy and leave a lasting impression the main thrust of Nigerian policy has remain the pursuit of regional hegemony (playing a leadership role at the continental and sub-regional levels) and articulating its national interest in the international scene.

- **What are the periods that are identifiably different from each other?**

The periods can be divided between military and civilian regimes. Under this characterisation we can identify the following periods: the first republic (1963 – 1966); first military regime (1966 – 1975); second military regime (1975 – 1979); second republic (1979 – 1983); the third military regime (1983 – 1985); the fourth military regime (1985 – 1993); the fourth military regime (1993 – 1999) and the third republic (1999 – present).

- **Would you agree that 1963-1966 was the defining moment for Nigerian foreign policy?**

Yes. This period was of strategic importance because the Balewa Administration did much to lay the foundations of Nigerian Foreign Policy especially its role its leadership role at the continental level. Nigeria played a vital role in supporting anti-colonial liberation movements in Africa and expressed its support to the non-alignment movement.

2. Do you think that international factors/powers had a large influence on Nigerian foreign policy during the following periods

- **The first republic 1963-1966**

Yes. This was the period of decolonisation in Africa and support to anti-colonial movement as already mentioned became one of the major focuses of Nigeria's Foreign Policy

- **First period of interim military rule 1966-1979**

No. This period was more focus on the preservation of Nigeria's territorial integrity with the internal upheavals that rocked the nation.

- **The second republic 1979-1983**

Not much. The Shagari regime was more concentrated on internal politics especially grappling with the fall in fuel prices.

- **The second period of interim military rule 1983-1993**

Yes. Under General Buhari, Nigeria was much influenced and expressed its support to the fight against Apartheid in South Africa. Buhari's regime also weighed in on the rift between Morocco and Western Sahara by granting recognition to the Polisario government in Western Sahara (Saharawi Arab Democratic Republic).

- **The last interim military rule 1993-1999 and the fourth republic 1999 till date**

Yes both the last military regime and the fourth republic have been influenced by and sought to play an actively involved in sub-regional, continental, and international issues. Babangida was influential in the creation of the ECOWAS Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) which has played a significant role in sub-regional peace-keeping. Abacha was highly involved in the restoration of civilian governments in Liberia and Sierra Leone. Obasanjo on his part pursued and obtain debt cancellation from the Paris Club and also forged strong diplomatic and commercial ties with two emerging global powers, China and India.

3. How have Nigerian governments formulated their foreign policy in the past?

In the past, various regimes have tried to create their own identity and leave a mark on Nigerian Foreign policy. Their Foreign Policy objectives were both influenced by the internal or domestic and the international context at the time.

- **Do you think there is a big change in the recent years?**

Not very much though increase globalisation has meant Nigeria can no longer afford to content itself with internal or sub-regional politics embrace a more significant role in international politics.

4. It is generally believed that foreign policy is shaped by both domestic and international factors.

- **Which of these factors is dominant in Nigeria and why?**

Domestic factors. Domestic politics tend to play a preponderant role in the quest and consolidation of power in Nigeria and each regime usually makes sure it consolidates its grip on domestic affairs to ensure its stay in power.

5. What are the international dynamics which contribute in shaping policy formulation and implementation in Nigeria?

At the global level one can cite globalisation, climate change and free trade, and at the regional level continental (African Union) and sub-regional (ECOWAS) integration.

6. Are there other experts or decision makers you could suggest I talk to or interview?

Yes, senior staff at Nigeria's Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

RESPONSE BY: Kinkus Rimamfinten Achi
Assist. Chief Accountant
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Could you please explain the evolution of Nigerian foreign policy?

Nigerian foreign policy has been relatively stable since independence. Pro-Western tendencies; commitment to Africa's unity, regional cooperation and development and the articulation of Nigeria's national interests have been its fulcrum over the years. At independence and throughout most of the interim military regimes, Nigeria's foreign policy was much more dominated by internal factors. From the fourth republic till date Nigeria has been reasserting itself forcefully in the international scene.

What are the periods that are identifiably different from each other?

There are four identifiably different periods in Nigerian Foreign policy: the first republic (1963 - 1966); the first period of military rule (1966 - 1975); the second period of military rule (1975 - 1979) the second Republic (1979 - 1983); the third period of military rule (1983 - 1998); the third republic (1992 -1993) and the fourth republic (1999 - present).

- **Would you agree that 1963-1966 was the defining moment for Nigerian foreign policy?**

Yes, I definitely agree 1963 - 1966 was a defining moment in Nigerian Foreign policy. It marked the emergence of the first republic and the first experience in the formulation of foreign policy as a sovereign state. It was during this period that the key principles that have guided Nigeria's foreign policy over the years were enacted: African unity, regional cooperation and national interest.

2. Do you think that international factors/powers had a large influence on Nigerian foreign policy during the following periods

- **The first republic 1963-1966**

Yes, I think so. The period of the first republic (1963 - 1966) was marked by two major dynamics at the continental and international sphere that largely influenced Nigeria's foreign policy. At the continental level, it was the period of decolonisation and Nigeria included in its foreign policy objectives support

to independence movements in the continent. At the global level, it was the period of the Cold War and Nigeria opted for the policy of non-alignment.

- **First period of interim military rule 1966-1979**

I don't think international factors/powers had any large influence on Nigerian foreign policy during this period because of the country was embroiled in internal strife and political instability.

- **The second republic 1979-1983**

International factor/powers did not have much influence on Nigerian Foreign policy during the second republic. The Shagari government was very docile in the international scene. It little interest and support for both the regional organization (ECOWAS) and the continental organization (OAU).

- **The second period of interim military rule 1983-1993**

Yes. The second period of interim military rule came in at a crucial period in the continent and the sub-region that beckon on Nigeria's involvement. At the continental level, the struggle against Apartheid increasing in intensity and at the sub-regional level there was need for a force to intervene to handle crisis. These two issues influenced Nigerian Foreign policy at the time.

- **The last interim military rule 1993-999 and the fourth republic 1999 till date**

Yes, international factors/powers have greatly influenced Nigerian Foreign policy in the last interim military rule and the fourth republic. Under these regimes, Nigeria continued to play an influential role at the sub-regional (ECOWAS) and regional (OAU) levels.

3. How have Nigerian governments formulated their foreign policy in the past?

Past Nigerian governments have formulated their foreign policy by integrating domestic and international factors. At the beginning, continental (Africa) and sub-regional (West Africa) hegemony seem to have been the priority of foreign policy but with increase political stability, national interest and domestic issues played a greater role in shaping foreign policy.

- **Do you think there is a big change in the recent years?**

Not much. Domestic politics still has a greater influence over foreign policy and Nigeria's still has the quest for continental and sub-regional hegemony part of its foreign policy objectives. Military cooperation with neighbouring countries has also become a great priority with the frequent terrorist activities of the Boko Haram jihadist group.

4. It is generally believed that foreign policy is shaped by both domestic and international factors.

- **Which of these factors is dominant in Nigeria and why?**

Domestic factors are definitely more dominant than international factors. The reason can be sourced from the long history of civil unrest, the delicate and intricate regional and ethnic cleavages in the Federation and the need to put Nigeria's interest first before global, regional and sub-regional interests.

5. What are the international dynamics which contribute in shaping policy formulation and implementation in Nigeria?

Some of the international dynamics which contribute in shaping policy formulation and implementation in Nigeria mostly sub-regional development and stability in West Africa (ECOWAS), African Unity, solidarity and cooperation. Nigeria also plays an active role in international institutions (UN, IMF, World Bank, WTO) in addressing issues of global concerns. Bilateral relations with her neighbours and foreign partners are also strong factors influencing policy formulations and implementation.

6. Are there other experts or decision makers you could suggest I talk to or interview?

You may want to approach our Foreign Affairs officials, former ambassadors and international relations scholars.

**RESPONSE BY: Igba John Audu
Minister Councillor
Ministry of Foreign Affairs**

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Could you please explain the evolution of Nigerian foreign policy?

At the dawn of independence, Nigeria's Foreign policy was primarily characterised by a support to Africa independence movement, non-alignment, Africa's unity, regional cooperation and the peaceful settlement of dispute. Transitions between civil republics and military regimes did not fundamentally change the thrust of foreign policy but had an impact in its articulation and dynamism. Most Military regimes tend to focus primarily on domestic politics given the need to consolidate power while civil republics especially the first republic was concern with giving Nigeria a leadership role in the African continent.

- **What are the periods that are identifiably different from each other?**

Nigerian Foreign policy has passed through 12 governments which can be broadly categorised under two regime types: Republics and Military Regimes. Since independence, there have been three Republics (Balewa, Shagari, Abubakar - the present Buhari civilian era) and Six military regimes (Ironsi, Gowon, Murtala/Obasanjo, Buhari, Babangida and Abacha).

- **Would you agree that 1963-1966 was the defining moment for Nigerian foreign policy?**

No. In as much as the first republic can be said to be the foundational period, there was lack of dynamism, much internal bickering among politicians and a pro-Western foreign policy much in discordance with its non-alignment stance.

2. Do you think that international factors/powers had a large influence on Nigerian foreign policy during the following periods

- **The first republic 1963-1966**

No, I don't think international factors/powers had a large influence on Nigerian foreign policy during the first republic. Apart from its pro-British and Western ideological disposition the Balewa government was more or less passive in the international scene. It was more embroiled in domestic politics and nation-building of the budding nation.

- **First period of interim military rule 1966-1979**

The first period of interim military rule also witnessed a preponderant focus on domestic issues given the emergence of the Biafran War and the need to restore political stability. International factors/powers did not have much impact on Nigerian Foreign policy during this period.

- **The second republic 1979-1983**

I don't think international factors played a major role in Nigerian foreign policy. The Shagari regime like that of Balewa was very passive in the international scene.

- **The second period of interim military rule 1983-1993**

Yes, international factors/powers did play an influential role in the second period of interim military rule. Both Muhammed Buhari and Ibrahim Babangida took steps to address key regional and continental issues. Under Buhari, Nigeria supported the fight against the Apartheid Regime in South Africa. Babangida on his part restored Nigeria's leadership role in the ECOWAS sub-region.

- **The last interim military rule 1993-1999 and the fourth republic 1999 till date**

International factors/powers also played and continues to play an influential role both during the last military rule, the fourth republic till present date in Nigeria. The last military regime of General Sani Abacha like most of his military predecessors pursued a dynamic and assertive foreign policy in the African continent. Civilian regimes that followed have all sought to keep up with Nigeria's commitment to international institutions, bilateral and multi-lateral partners.

3. How have Nigerian governments formulated their foreign policy in the past?

In the past, most Nigerian government formulated their foreign policy taking into consideration more of the domestic or internal context than the international context. Most of them especially military regimes were first of all concerned with the consolidation of power within the country and ensuring political stability before addressing regional and international concerns.

- **Do you think there is a big change in the recent years?**

Yes, I think the restoration of republican government has given various civil regimes greater latitude to formulate foreign policy from a more general perspective without fears on domestic instability.

4. It is generally believed that foreign policy is shaped by both domestic and international factors.

- **Which of these factors is dominant in Nigeria and why?**

Domestic factors are more dominant to me than international factors in shaping Nigeria's Foreign policy. Though they have been much political stability in recent times, most Nigerian government are very much conscious of the volatility of domestic politics in a country where regional, ethnic and religious divide can easily degenerate to crisis when mishandled. National interest in this context becomes more important to successive regimes than regional or continental priorities.

5. What are the international dynamics which contribute in shaping policy formulation and implementation in Nigeria?

At the global level, policy formulation and implementation has been influenced by issues like climate change, debt relief and free trade. At the regional and continental level, the fight against the Boko Haram insurgency is by far the biggest dynamic influencing Nigerian Foreign policy formulation and implementation. Nigeria also remains committed to issues of sub-regional integration within ECOWAS and the agenda of the African Union.

6. Are there other experts or decision makers you could suggest I talk to or interview?

Yes, you can approach Diplomats and top level staff at Nigeria's Ministry of Foreign Affairs and scholars and researchers in Nigerian Foreign Policy in Nigerian Universities and abroad.

RESPONSE BY: AUGUSTINE NYAM PETER

Principal Accountant

National Assembly

Answers

1. The Nigerian foreign policy initially like most emerging independent countries essentially, tailored towards a commitment to African Brotherhood, developed within the Monrovia bloc philosophy. This philosophy tends to adopt non-aligned tradition as against the Casablanca that sought radical socialist posture. The African neighbourhood commitment and solidarity expressed in concentric circle, mirrored, Nigerian's immediate neighbours, Africa as the centrepiece and the rest of the world. This commitment is express in order of priority as expressed by the founding father.

The 1963 is truly a defining moment because it signified a fundamental transition from post independent political structure, headed by a representative of the Queen to a full republic with complete independence to run diplomatic outpost with no titular representation or any form of symbolic authority standing in for any foreign interest.

2. Foreign factors or international influences and developments had been important factors in shaping Nigeria's foreign policy. In the initial years before the republic, the 1955 Bandung conference in Indonesia had tremendous influence on the shaping of policy options that constituted the policy position of Nigeria. The cold war and other emerging economies have informed and shaped these foreign policy positions in 1963.

In the years following from 1979 -1983, Nigeria tends to move towards liberal capitalist policies, but with a domestic economy heavily dependent on imports. This

over dependence made the practical commitment to foreign policy centred in Africa very difficult if not impossible. Yes, in rhetoric, it was easy to chant the African centrepiece but in practice, she relied on Great Britain and America for a number of decisions. The policy was still the old African concern with new development arising from the emergence of ECOWAS in 1975. Greater priority shifted from the immediate neighbours to West African sub-region.

From 1983 to 1999, the most significant international factor that affected not just Nigeria but informed significant foreign policy changes, was the end of cold war and the intensification of American hegemony. This period also witnessed increased regionalization of the world. Nigeria's foreign policy remains the same with increased actions and activities within the ECOWAS sub-region. Equally important is Nigeria, adoption of Anti- Apartheid posture.

The independence of South Africa I 1994, informed a shift from the anti- racial campaign that found accommodation within the policy choice of Nigerian state, West Africa and the continent at large. Principally, these had been the key policy domains of Nigerian foreign policy from independence until date.

3. The Nigerian state formulated its foreign policies based on international and domestic events and developments. These events have changed considerably over time but these foreign policy positions, have not been able to keep pace with the changes. As we discuss with you now, Nigeria's foreign policy framework is still stuck in the three concentric circles of neighbours, Africa and the rest of the world. Specific elements of the policy may change and some rendered obsolete by the dynamics of international developments, like Anti- Apartheid, not relevant and cold war. In spite all these, the policy framework remains largely the same.

4. International factors remain more influential in shaping Nigeria's foreign policy. This is due to the fact, that foreign policies are in the first instance, a response of a country to its external environment. Even though some countries may prioritize and balance these domestic/international concerns, yet in the case of Nigeria, I strongly feel the external factors play more influence. This is obvious from the historical trajectory of the foreign policy options adopted over time, responding to significant international developments. A glance at these developments clearly reveals the influences of the developments: The non-aligned movement, the cold war, its demise, the formation of ECOWAS, the wars in Liberia and Sierra-Leone, the formation of ECOMOG, Anti-Apartheid and liberal campaign championed by US about democratic peace and good governance, sold through IMF and World bank
5. The domestic influences that informed and shaped the policy are the rise of the republic in 1963, the civil war, Military rule and democratic experience in Nigeria.
6. You can talk to career diplomats and the National Assembly committees on foreign Affairs.