Revisiting International Diplomacy and the Issue of Domestic Environment in Post-Colonial Nigeria

Nwala, Paul PhD
Department of History & International Diplomacy,
Faculty of Humanities, Rivers State
University, Npolu-Oroworukwo, Port-Harcourt, Nigeria. +2348037750746,
princepaulnwala@gmail.com

Abstract

To a very large extent, it is worthy establishing the fact that the connection between politics domestically and international diplomacy in the post-colonial environment in Nigeria really left much to be desired. Invariably available studies have further largely gazed attention on how the domestic setting influences output of the foreign policy and international reaction(s) consequently from the other actors on the international podium. Advance argument of this paper is to see how international diplomacy stands amid the issue of domestic environment in Nigeria especially during the administration of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan. Understandably, Nigeria has large population as she is being referred to as Africa's most populous country, thus the country's population makes the linkages between her domestic milieu and international diplomacy worthy of continuing critical consideration in the area of research. Therefore, by interrogating relevant primary and secondary documents the main objective of this paper is to determine the character of the international diplomacy which Nigeria's domestic environment in the post-colonial era begets. More specifically the paper tries identifying some trajectories of these general tendencies during the tenure of administration of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan. The paper submits that post-colonial Nigeria's domestic environment has continued to weaken its giant-sized international capabilities and that domestic impairments have consequently continued to beget for the African giant state, making possible frequent scornful diplomatic relations from the other actors on the international scene. Lastly, there is need for a strong and altruistic leadership, as panaceas against disorder in the domestic environment of international diplomacy.

Key words: International diplomacy, Environment, Nigeria, Post-colonial

Introduction

The foreign policy behaviour of a state is a function of the underlying principles of the national interest. However, the approach towards achieving the aims and objectives of the national interest is conditioned by variables within, and external to the state. While the internal determinants can be shaped by the authorities, there is limited influence by any state to determine the external variables of the foreign policy arena. Like all other states, the approach to Nigeria's foreign policy has always been guided by conditions in the two environments. Popularly, it is ideal to be considerate when dealing with other nations of the world bearing in mind the incessant rise of global integration. Consequently, this paper therefore argues that the President Goodluck Jonathan's adoption of foreign policy posture of "Reciprocity" – The Way You Treat My Citizens Is The Way I Will Treat Your Citizens; is a rational policy posture as it certainly heightened respect both for Nigeria in the international arena and her citizens in Diaspora.

For the Goodluck Ebele Jonathan administration, the character of the domestic environment is the driving force of the foreign policy pursuits. This paper undertakes an assessment of the domestic environment against the purpose of Nigeria's foreign policy general tendencies during the tenure of administration of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan. The paper is structured into seven sections. Section one serves as the introduction; section two examines foreign policy of Nigeria in historical perspective; section three looks at the domestic and external environments connection; section four discusses President Jonathan and Nigeria domestic environment posture; section five reflects on Nigeria's international diplomacy and its achievements under President Jonathan; section six highlights Goodluck Jonathan's administration challenges within foreign policy context; while section seven of the paper offers the conclusion and recommendations.

Foreign Policy of Nigeria in Historical Perspective

Nigeria came into the world stage with a relatively intimidating stature with the country's numerical preponderance over all other states in Africa, and the quantity of natural resources within the state, it was presumed that Nigeria had the potentials to dominate global politics in favour of Africa in general, and for its own benefit in particular. Kolawole (2005, p.873) elaborates on this position thus: By her resources and size, according to Meierding (2007, p6). Nigeria was expected to

be at the front seat of Africa providing with others, the necessary leadership and weapons to fight the clutches of colonialism, neo-colonialism, under-development, poverty, famine and racial discrimination. From the benefits of hindsight, Nigeria's foreign policy record is a mixed bag of successes, dynamism and moderation. During the First Republic which lasted between independence in 1960 and early 1966, "the Nigerian government pursued modest foreign policy aims".

While some remarkable actions were taken to announce that Nigeria had come of age with its independence and sovereignty, there was also some other pressing issues that received pacifist and moderate reactions from the Nigerian government. The Nigerian government was a core member of the Monrovia Group that embraced the gradual approach to African unity, while some other states, led by Ghana were vociferous in their belief in the immediate political unification of African states (Kumssa & Jones 2015, p.16). The Nigerian policy position has variously been attributed to the Prime-Minister's personal idiosyncrasy. The pacifist and gradual orientation of the Prime-Minister was however curtailed from robbing off entirely on the foreign policy agenda of government. For instance, the informed public was instrumental to the 1961 action of the Nigerian government over the French detonation of atomic bombs in the Sahara (Nwahiri, 2010).

Odubajo, T. (2017) argued that military incursion in Nigerian politics, starting from January 15th 1966 opened a new vista for the country's foreign policy behaviour. Under the circumstances, the nature of military dictatorship put paid to the hitherto democratic processes of foreign policy formulation. The political arrangement privileged the military Head-of-State and Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces with the executive powers, and indeed, he could cause the initiation and implementation of policies with minimal recourse to individuals or state institutions. It meant a massive reduction in the influence of both the institutions of government and the articulate public in respect of foreign policy positions. However, the impact of the new orientation was not immediately felt because the political instability caused by the two coup d'état and the subsequent civil war of 1967-1970, left little room for foreign policy adventures.

For most part, the government's focus was the military security aspect of the nation's foreign policy. At war end however, Nigeria maintained her indissolubility, thereby remaining numerically preponderant, and had also become a major producer of crude-oil, in addition to other natural resources that abound on its territory. Thus, the post-war conditions provided the military leadership the leverage to turn Nigeria's potential greatness to real greatness through the foreign policy machinery. Nigeria's position as a leading member of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) became even more pronounced; a platform that the Nigerian government used to maximum effects in the pursuit of the commitment and dedication to the cause of the black race anywhere in the world. Furthermore, Nigeria emerged as "the undisputed political leader of its sub-region" (Meierding 2007, p.4).

Under the Gowon administration, Nigeria worked with other West African states to ensure the establishment of a viable regional organisation that would be to the benefit of all. The Economic Community of West Africa States (ECOWAS) emerged in 1975 as a result of the Nigerian government's diplomatic exertions (Anigekwu, 2002). The commitment towards the emancipation of the black race continued to feature prominently in the foreign policy agenda of the succeeding Muhammed/Obasanjo regime. The personalities of the two leaders, in addition to the immense resources that accrued from the sale of crude-oil to the international market gave Nigeria the impetus to play an impressive foreign policy role at this time. After the death of General Muhammed and the assumption of office of General Obasanjo as the Head- of-State, Nigeria's foreign policy received increased momentum.

The period between 1976 and 1979 is rightly described as the 'Golden Age' of Nigeria's foreign policy (Inamete 2001, p.103). Landmark decisions were made, not just for Nigeria's interests, but for the interest of the black race. The Afro-centric focus of Nigeria's foreign policy was quite pronounced during the period. For in- stance, Nigeria nationalized the assets of British Petroleum (Genova, 2010) and Barclays Bank (Osaghae 1998, p.107) as a response to the British government's clandestine sale of oil to the government of former Rhodesia. Be that as it may, "the Muhammed/Obasanjo administration (1975-79) pursued a purposeful, focused and positively aggressive foreign policy for Nigeria" (Kolawole 2005,

p.873). By 1979, a civilian government emerged at the end of a commendable transition to civil rule programme. By all accounts, the Shagari administration continued with the predecessor regime's policy of making Africa, the centre piece of Nigeria's foreign policy.

However, there is a consensus that the Obasanjo regime's achievements in foreign policy pursuits pale the Shagari regime's efforts into irrelevance. It is however imperative to consider the differences in both the domestic and external settings of foreign policy making under both administrations. In the case of the Shagari presidency, there were many more domestic variables that impacted on foreign policy making. Essentially, the dynamics of civilian politicking is distinct from conditions under military dictatorship. While decisions may be taken with fiat and under minimal consultation under military dictatorship, a democratically elected government would have to contend with numerous domestic factors (political parties, parliament, informed public, civil society organizations, etc) before arriving at the most acceptable interpretation of what stands for the national interest (Odubajo, 2017).

The challenge was compounded under the Shagari administration by the state of the national economy. Ogunna notes that the Shagari administration came into governance on the heels of "an economy and society that was badly distorted, disarticulated and crisis-ridden. The state, in spite of the 'benefits' of the civil war, was as unstable, pre-hegemonic and weak as ever". Furthermore, "foreign policy in the Second Republic was influenced by the high level of in- stability generated by cut-throat and bitter politicking, waste and misplaced priorities at the centre and states, corruption and bureaucratic inefficiency and ineffectiveness" (Ogunna, 1999). In the final analysis, Nigeria's foreign policy profile declined terribly during the period of the Shagari administration (1979-1983). As Onyeneho (2006) perceptively notes: "With the inevitable bursting of the bubble in the early 1980s the rentier state became a debtor state and the soldiers returned to abort the second Shagari presidency".

The return of the military in 1984 signaled the return of repression and dictatorship. Based on practical evidence of records of despoliation of the state, the Buhari administration focused most attention on revamping the economy and

changing the orientation and the value system of Nigerians. Although the Buhari regime of 1984-1985 was regarded as brutal and uncompromising in the execution of its domestic policies, it cannot however be accused of shying away from making difficult foreign policy decisions. For instance, in a repeat of the Shagari administration's position of expelling illegal aliens (most of which were West African citizens), the Buhari military regime equally adopted a protectionist move by expelling illegal migrants, mostly citizens of neighbouring West African states in 1985 (The Associated Press, 1985).

One of the remarkable decisions of Nigeria's foreign policy during the Buhari administration was the declaration as persona non grata and expulsion of the British High Commissioner to Nigeria, following developments after the 'Dikko Affair' (Igwe, 2006). By 27th August, 1985, a new government came into existence through a palace coup d'état that ended the Buhari regime. The Babangida regime ranks perhaps amongst the most ambitious in its handling of Nigeria's foreign policy. Though both the internal and external settings were quite distinct, yet the Babangida regime was determined to re-enact the glorious days of Nigeria's foreign policy by deepening Nigeria's Africa centred foreign policy agenda, and by extension, the survival and well-being of the black race. The foreign policy agenda was positioned to align with the challenges within the domestic arena.

The reversal of the downward slope of Nigeria's economy received tremendous attention and formed the basis for a very strong relationship with the West. The foreign policy thrust at this time was 'Economic Diplomacy' which was essentially tied to a programme of developing the domestic economy (Salami 2014). The Babangida administration also undertook some ambitious foreign policy adventures such as, the "Technical Aids Corps Scheme" (Adebanwi 2011, p.12) and the "Concert of Medium Powers" (Salami 2013). However, one of the most daring foreign policy steps of the government was the initiation of the idea, and the provision of human and material resources for ECOWAS' intervention in war-torn Liberia. The Nigerian government in partnership with other ECOWAS states, through the activation of the Protocol on Mutual Defence Assistance of 1981 set up an ECOWAS Military Observer Group, called the ECOWAS Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) to intervene for the purpose of restoring order in Liberia (Pitts, 1999).

This move, and others such as supporting Nigerians in their bid to take up international responsibilities, like Rilwanu Lukman as OPEC Chairman, Joe Garba as President of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and Emeka Anyaoku as the Secretary-General of the Commonwealth of Nations, all projected Nigeria's image positively on the global stage. In a dramatic twist, all the gains recorded on the foreign policy arena were frittered with the ambition of the Military President to continue his stay in power by truncating the highly expensive and long-drawn transition to civilian rule programme. With the unsuccessful attempt at the elongation of the regime, the Babangida administration only succeeded in battering the image of the military, and indeed, the image of the government of Nigeria. When a contrived Interim National Government (ING) was inaugurated in 1993, the international community was already displeased with the Nigerian government and all its creations.

It was apparent that the world would only deal with a Nigerian government that emerged from the will of the people through the ballot box. Thus, Nigeria's relationship with the rest of the world, especially the traditional friends in the West only got worse when on 17th November, 1993; General Abacha sacked the ING and took over the reins of governance. Arguably, Nigeria suffered the worst period of her foreign policy during the regime of General Abacha. The hostility from the international community made the government assume both a combative and defensive posture in the pursuit of its foreign policy agenda. Put succinctly, the period is remarkable for the highest regime of sanctions imposed on Nigeria, and particularly the members of the Nigerian military by the international community (Onoja 2006, p.117). The Abacha regime was determined to relate with the rest of the world on its own terms, thus, courting opprobrium for itself across the globe and eventually turning Nigeria to a "pariah state" (Ajayi 2005, p.54).

The government refused to budge under the pressure mounted by the West, essentially in respect of the withdrawal of the military from politics, and the handing over of government to the presumed winner of the June 12, 1993 Presidential Elections (Obadare, 1999). While the face-off lasted, the Abacha government continued to pursue a core agenda of Nigeria's foreign policy. Under the Abacha government, Nigeria made remarkable strides in peacekeeping efforts around West Africa; rein-stalling the democratically elected President of Sierra

Leone and intervening in the Liberian crisis, through the provision of human and material resources at the disposal of ECOMOG (Vann, 1998). Nigeria was still in the state of foreign policy uncertainties when General Abacha died on 8th June, 1998. Based on records of the immediate past, the international community continued to treat the Nigerian military government with apprehension and suspicion.

The succeeding General Abubakar regime had the unenviable burden of winning back the confidence of the rest of the world, starting with Nigeria's traditional friends. For this purpose, revolutionary and unprecedented steps were taken to stabilize the domestic political arena. In this regard, most political prisoners were freed; a step that provided the enabling environment for the enthronement of democracy. On May 29th, 1999 a new democratic government was sworn-in to commence the journey of the fourth republic. The Obasanjo administration was in office for two-terms of eight years (1999-2007). As a consequence of Nigeria's battered image, one of the government's first major responsibilities was a rebranded foreign policy attitude. According to Alao (2011, 6): "The desire to balance the domestic and external necessitated an initial foreign policy that required extensive outreach diplomacy during the early years of the Obasanjo administration". Banking on the President's immense goodwill around the globe, the era of a dynamic, flamboyant and adventurous foreign policy had surely returned to Nigeria.

On the basis of domestic conditions, the government based its foreign policy thrust on four main pillars. These were; debt cancellation, recovery of stolen wealth, reintegration of Nigeria into the comity of nations, and the attraction of foreign direct investment. These policies were vigorously pursued through 'Shuttle Diplomacy' anchored by a peripatetic President. This agenda did not however take away from Nigeria's regional interest and the Afro-centric focus of the country's foreign policy. Before the end of the first term of office of the Obasanjo regime, there were impressive results from these exertions. Nigeria had once again become an important player in global politics; substantial amount of stolen funds were being returned to Nigeria from where they were stashed, Nigeria's debt overhang was reduced by international creditors, and foreign direct investments became visible sights in Nigeria.

Similarly, Nigeria continued to play its big-brother role in the sub-region, first by helping to avert political crisis in Togo after the death of Gnassingbe Eyadema (Ebeku 2005, p.22), and restoring the democratic elected government of Sao Tome and Principe to power (Mordi et al. 2003). In addition, Nigeria continued to play its self-assigned role on the continent by cooperating with other states to facilitate the transformation of the erstwhile OAU to the African Union. Furthermore, the cooperation between the two aspiring regional hegemons led to the creation of the Africa Peer Re- view Mechanism (APRM) and the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). Indeed, it was obvious that a new administration would have a big task in maintaining the tempo created for Nigeria's foreign policy under the Obasanjo regime. On May 29th 2007, Umaru Yar'Adua was sworn-in as the President of Nigeria.

The initial jittery steps occasioned by the uncertainty of legitimacy did not help the direction of governance until the Supreme Court affirmed Yar'Adua's election as the President of Nigeria (Shehu & Benjamin, 2008). The foreign policy thrust of the Yar'Adua administration was 'Citizen Diplomacy' (Dickson, 2010). In effect, this was interpreted as the unalloyed commitment of government towards the safety and protection of Nigerian citizens anywhere in the world. This focus was prompted by the outcry against the poor treatment of Nigerian citizens in Diaspora. This thrust did not however disrupt the exercise of Nigeria's traditional responsibilities at the regional and continental levels. Upon Yar'Adua's untimely death in 2010, Vice-President, Goodluck Jonathan assumed office as the President for the duration of their joint-ticket.

At the expiration of the first-term, President Jonathan contested and won the Presidential Election in 2011, and thus, presided over Nigeria till 2015. Under the Jonathan administration, Nigeria made a reasonable showing on the global stage. Specifically, the administration based its foreign policy endeavours on improving the domestic challenges. The attainment of the objectives of the regime's foreign policy was embedded in the attainment of the domestic policy thrust — 'Trans-formation Agenda' (Jaji & Ayotunde, 2016). The government reached out to the rest of the world in seeking assistance for the development of the local economy. Also, strong positions were taken in respect of issues concerning the region and

the continent as a whole. Nigeria sided with the West in respect of the political crises in Cote d'Ivoire and Libya (Kalu, 2011).

Similarly, the government worked assiduously to ensure the delisting of Nigeria from the United States terror list (Odiogor, 2011). On the downside though, the inability of the government to crush the Boko Haram insurgents cast a dark cloud on the Jonathan administration's domestic and foreign policy agenda.

Domestic and External Environments Connection

Despite the various transformations that have occurred in the nature of relationships, the state remains the basic actor in the international system. With the advent of globalization, the relative rigidity of power, applied by realist scholars as the basis of international relations, continues to loosen, hence, the realization of a more liberal nature of relationships within the international system. Even within the context of globalization, the state continues as the main focus of analysis in international relations. Central to a state's inter- national life however, is a coherent and presumably well thought-out foreign policy agenda. Foreign policy can be described as the purposive activities of government, informed by both circumstances at home and abroad, but aimed at gaining advantages in the international system.

Akinterinwa, B. (2011) argued that foreign policy may be viewed as those official actions (and reactions) which sovereign states initiate (or receive and subsequently react to) for the purpose of altering or creating a condition (or problem) outside their territorial-sovereign boundaries. The main objective of foreign policy is to project, promote and protect the national interest of the state. In order to actualize the mandate, there are usually underlying principles that highlight the substance of the national interest. A number of these principles are generally fixed, with possibilities of infrequent reappraisal that may be caused by remarkable changes for or around the state. For instance, the post Second World-War guiding principles of the US national interest was reappraised after the cold-war, in order for the United States to pursue a foreign policy agenda that is relevant to the emergent unipolar New World Order.

For a respectable status in international relations, a state must conduct its foreign policy against the backdrop of influences from two critical environments. The foreign policy environment is "occupied by a range of significant actors, issues and interests, all of which give it a dynamism and life" (Webber & Smith 2013, p.30). Akinterinwa, B. (2011) poignantly notes: "It has become a virtual truism to point out that an actor's foreign policy actions and reactions are linked to a complex structure of internal and external factors". In effect, the environment is made of a two-edged sword driven by the circumstances around both the domestic and external environments of states (Breuning 2007, p.117). On a general note, the crux of foreign policy activities is to serve the purposes of the state essentially at the domestic level and in its interactions with the rest of the world. Both environments play key roles in determining the actions and inactions to be taken in serving the primary constituency (the domestic environment).

It is however imperative that states place higher premium on the influences from the external environment because of the limited capacity to control conditions out there. In contrast, it is relatively easier to direct the domestic environment in favour of the government, thus, leveraging on conditions in the domestic environment for the pursuit of foreign policy agenda. There are numerous variables that impact on the conditions of the internal environment of foreign policy making. These include; psychological factors, socio-political and economic conditions of the state, the foreign policy machinery at the level of bureaucracy, military capability, character of informed public, among others. The psychological factor deals essentially with the quality of leadership at the helm of decision-making. In most governmental systems, this is composed of a large pool of an admixture of professionals and political office holders that deliberate, and presumably decide on the best policy options for the state.

However, within the large pool, the personalities of the Head of the Foreign/External Ministry (Minister/Secretary of State) and the Head of State (President, Prime-Minister, etc) are crucial in very many circumstances. The idiosyncrasies of the Head of State, especially with the executive powers attached to the office, play a massive role in the country's foreign policy direction. The Executive Order signed by President Trump shortly after assumption of office relating to immigration in general, and the status of the citizens of some select

majority Muslim states in particular, is a clear exhibition of the import of leadership idiosyncrasy on foreign policy direction. Of equal importance is the issue of domestic political, social and economic conditions, in respect of foreign policy initiatives. The extent of the impact of these conditions are most felt when a state does not measure to acceptable standards among the comity of nations.

Hypothetically, a state contending against issues of political instability, social disharmony and economic underdevelopment, would not have the capability to extract concessions and make meaningful impact on the international system. This is the situation with perpetually war-torn countries of South Sudan and Central African Republic (until recently), whose capacity for equality in the international system has been greatly diminished by the subsisting conditions of their domestic environments. In effect, a state's status on the international arena is largely a function of the domestic conditions. At the level of externalities, states may be compelled to fashion their Domestic environmental variables and foreign policy articulation of the Buhari administration in Nigeria's Fourth Republic foreign policy direction in line with circumstances beyond their control.

The international system as the external environment of states is a vast space in which both state and non-state actors exist. Indeed, "all states are regarded as being fundamentally captured by the imperatives of the international system" Thus, each state may be compelled to respond to stimuli generated by any of the actors in the system. For instance, the phenomenon of international terrorism has informed radical reactions from presumed target states that are determined to protect their homelands. In the case of the United States and some European countries, especially France and Germany, have for some time beamed their foreign policy searchlights on ISIS and all other terrorist organizations around the world. Similarly, Nigeria has intensified cooperation with other members of the Lake Chad Basin Commission in order to end Boko Haram terrorist activities.

Another example is the Brexit vote of 2016, which triggered a reassessment of relations with Britain by a number of states in the light of the development, and how this would impact on the overall relationship with the European Union. The hazy nature of both conditions in and the consequences of foreign policy actions on the external environment pose grave difficulties for decision-makers. As noted

by Weber & Smith (2013, p.13): The attempt to influence behaviour across national boundaries where there are none of the supports provided by national law, culture or habits of obedience, where knowledge is restricted and where the consequences of actions are very difficult to estimate, gives a fundamental element of delicacy and risk which is absent from any other areas of policy making. For foreign policy decision-makers therefore, the two environments play critical roles in foreign policy formulation and implementation.

According to Webber & Smith (2013, p.30): One of the key tests of an effective foreign policy is thus the ways in which the foreign policy makers can appraise the shifting array of forces in the arena, respond to those forces and use the opportunities they create. Nigeria's case has been a tortuous journey of juxtaposing the underlying principles of the national interest, against the demands of internal and external pressures on foreign policy formulation and implementation.

President Jonathan and Nigeria's Domestic Environment Posture

Foreign policy is mainly about articulation and projecting of national interest in the international arena. This requires that a country should comport herself with dignity because, how you package yourself, determines how you are treated in the global politics. Just like in other countries, the basic consideration for foreign policy should be to encapsulate what are considered to be of national interest as the basis for relating with other nations, regions, and groups within the international community. It was on this premise that Nigeria's foreign policy under President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan which, apart from emphasizing the need for holding national interest paramount in her international relations, also has the principle of reciprocity as a cardinal feature, which came under harsh trial when the South Africa authorities deported about 125 Nigerians who landed at Johannesburg's OR Tambo International Airport aboard a South African Airways (SAA) flight and an Arik Air flight from Nigeria on the grounds that those Nigerians were carrying fake yellow cards.

In a swift reaction to the perceived unfair treatment meted out on Nigerian citizens, the authorities at Nigerians Murtala Mohammed International Airport, Lagos also deported over 80 South African citizens in batches under the same

protest of possessing invalid travel documents as well as vaccination cards as though in line with the new principles of reciprocity canvassed by Nigerian foreign policy makers (Ohiri, 2014). Under the policy, Nigeria's Foreign Affairs Minister, Ambassador Olugbenga Ashiru, explained: "the way you treat me is the way I will treat you. If you treat my people with dignity, I will treat your people with dignity. If you treat our people anyhow, we will do the same thing to your people". Again, he said "when you deport two Nigerians from your country on flimsy excuse, there will be appropriate reactions.

It might not be retaliation but just only a way of reciprocating in one way or the other. South African immigration authorities or official do not have a monopoly of deporting travelers". Ohiri (2014) retrospectively noted that analysts are of the view that foreign policy of the immediate post-colonial era has served the need of that time. Nigeria's post-independent foreign policy was considered to be more conciliatory and moralistic than realistic and so needed to be reappraised to bring it to per with the realities of today. Against this backdrop, President Jonathan observed that there are new realities in international relations. He pointed out that in as much as the whole of Africa has been liberated from the vestiges of colonialism, the cold war between the Eastern socialist bloc and the western capitalist bloc no longer exist, there are still new realities facing the world: the challenges poverty, civil war, terrorism, environmental degradation, threat of nuclear war, and so on.

According to him, for us to be relevant and focused, our foreign policy should stand on two principles, viz; the principle of reciprocity and economic diplomacy. He supported his view by saying that no nation assists the other without interest. Based on the reciprocity stand-point of Nigeria's foreign policy under Goodluck Jonathan's administration, some conscious and concerned citizen of Nigeria were looking out to see what the government will do as per the Ebola Virus Disease that came to Nigeria then. As quoted in Adeniyi, (2014), Dr. Horowitz, after reviewing more than 2,500 government documents and scientific reports, some gained through the freedom of information Act and never before revealed to the general public said "AIDS and Ebola viruses did not originate from monkeys let alone in the wild, they were bioengineered in American laboratories".

Factually, the virus seriously threatened the health sector of the Nigerian economy worst still; it threatened the administrative concentration of the Goodluck Ebele Jonathan's government. Many Nigerian still do not believe that Ebola virus surfaced. So also Nigerian press it down on South Africa to apologize unreservedly, and equally demand for disciplinary action on the South African port officials that perpetrated the inhuman act as well as refused to review the yellow card policy for the fact that the WHO had certified Nigerian yellow card, yellow fever-free.

Nevertheless, in September 2012, at a dinner organized in his honour by the Cooperate Council of Africa (CCA), a group of leading American Businessmen and Investors in New York, USA, President Jonathan declared that attracting Foreign Direct Investment to accelerate domestic growth and create more jobs for the teeming unemployed Nigerians was the major focus on Nigeria's foreign policy. He said that his administration wholly committed to promoting the development of a knowledge-economy that will enhance the security of lives and property, thereby accelerating growth to provide more employment and reduce youth restiveness. He further stated that attracting foreign investment to support the realization of the federal government's national transformation agenda was the topmost priority of Nigeria's diplomacy abroad.

President Jonathan that Nigeria foreign policy was anchored on the attraction of FDI. Under the new policy thrust, diplomatic missions abroad were directed to focus more on attracting investment to support the domestic programmes of government with a view to achieving not only vision 20:2020, but to bequeathing an enduring legacy of economic prosperity.

Nigeria's International Diplomacy and its Achievements under President Jonathan

Dr. Goodluck Ebele Jonathan assumed office as acting president of the Federal Republic of Nigeria on the 10 of February, 2010. This was in consonance with the motion passed by the Nigerian senate confirming the powers of Goodluck Ebele Jonathan to act as President of the Federation because President Yar'Adua went for medical treatment in Saudi Arabia in November 2009. In his maiden address to the nation, he promised to continue implementing the Seven Point Agenda

policy framework of President Yar'Adua. Goodluck Jonathan was sworn in as a democratically elected president of the country on the 29th day of May 2011and since then, his administration made commendable achievement through the foreign policy posture his administration adopted.

In as much as development, peace and stability in the context of international relations through the signing of certain agreements are best achieved by first; negotiating, and stipulating acceptable terms and conditions upon which the relationship will base. It requires the acceptance of the negotiating parties to be on equal footing and willing to give and take. It is on this note that President Jonathan observed that there are new realities facing the world in international relations and for us to be relevant and focused, our foreign policy should stand on two principles, viz; the principle of reciprocity and economic diplomacy. Akinterinwa (2011) supported by stating that "the President's foreign policy directive for the change in the modus of the country's foreign policy is very much in order. Our foreign policy should be reviewed. It is not that there is anything wrong per se (Ukwuije, 2015).

It is simply because Mr. President will want Nigeria's foreign policy to take into account situation changes in a global politics. The Foreign Affairs Minister, Dr. Olugbenga Ashiru echoed in a ministerial platform held in Abuja that the United Nations world report indicated that Nigeria recorded great improvement in foreign direct investment (FDI) flow into the country in 2012 at $8.9 billion, compared with $6.1 billion recorded in 2010. The Minister attributed the improvement to the strengthening of economic diplomacy by the Goodluck Ebele Jonathan administration. This inflow affected the transformation agenda of the administration by supporting the actualization of the economic programmes of the government. The list of his achievements cannot be comprehensively deduced thus:

1. Opening up of Nigerian to the global business community and becoming Africa's number one destination of foreign investors. In the 1st 6 months of 2014, a total of US $9.70 billion or #1.51 trillion lowed into the national economy as FDI.

2. Under the Goodluck Jonathans administration, Nigeria rebased its GDP for the first time in over a decade to become the largest economy in Africa, overtaking South Africa and Egypt in the process.
3. Proceeds from Nigeria's non-oil export rose to 2.97billion by the end of 2013, up from 2.3million in 2010.
4. Nigerians step closer to being fully integrated into the International E-Commerce Community when the approval and re-inclusion of Nigeria as one of the Pay-pal complement countries after being banned from using the service at the peak of the advanced fee fraud (419 scams). With pay-pal, Nigerians can now pay for goods and services online from anywhere in the world.
5. Goodluck Jonathan's administration was the one behind the arrival of the dead automotive industry in Nigeria. Global auto giants like Peugeot, Nissan, and Hyundai now either assemble or wholly manufacture small cars, sports utility vehicles, trucks, and buses at various locations in Nigeria. In addition to that, Innoson Vehicle Manufacturing Company (IVM), Nigeria flagship indigenous automaker, began the sale of their first made-in-Nigeria cars SUC's and SUV's in August 2014.
6. Under the Goodluck Jonathan's administration, Nigeria became the 1st country in W/Africa to host the World Economic Forum (WEF) in 2014. It was also the most successful WEF for Africa (WEFA) in history, boasting of a global reach of 2.1billion people according to estimates.
7. Arresting the outbreak of the deadly and highly contagious Ebola Virus Disease (EVD) in record time, though it unfortunately claimed some lives at the onset.
8. Nigeria is the world's largest producer of cassava with an output of over 45 million metric tons in 2014 according to Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO).
9. Due to favourable economic policies, internet penetration in Nigeria has now increased from about 45million in 2011 to 63million in 2014, overtaking such countries such like UK and France in the process. What this means is that more people now use the internet in Nigeria than in the UK and France.
10. South African Foreign Policy Initiative quoted a UN world report which indicated that Nigeria recorded great improvement in FDI in 2012 at 8.9 billion dollars.
11. Dr, Ashiru highlighted some of the achievements of the Goodluck Jonathan's administration that enjoyed foreign policy initiatives as its blood builder to

include the General Electric Company of U.S. investing over one billion US dollars in the construction of a factory in Calabar, to manufacture gas turbines for the power sector; not just for Nigeria, but for Africa. The factory will employ over 2,500 skilled workers and an equal number of unskilled workers, with wealth creation in the added value chain.

12. Procter and Gamble begun the construction of a factory in Agbara, Ogun State, to manufacture health materials, with the potential of creating well over one thousand skilled jobs and huge potential for wealth creation.
13. China granted a soft loan of 500 million US dollars for the construction of a light rail system in and around Abuja, also sponsoring the construction of a 50-bed hospital in Abuja.
14. Mexico granted Nigeria 54 million US dollars FDI to develop plantation for the- cultivation of pineapple and other crops for export to European Union (EU) markets (Ukwuije, 2015).

Goodluck Jonathan's Administration Challenges within Foreign Policy Context

One of the challenges of the Goodluck Jonathan's administration was the peace deal signed which brought about the pronouncement that "we will work with all stakeholders to ensure that whatever peace agreement that is signed is respected and we will also make sure all other parties, including the EU, US, and the UN will move speedily towards elections in Mali". This is because Nigeria is optimistic and in the driver's seat in the process of negotiation and move towards democratization of all the countries in West Africa. Another challenge faced by the Goodluck Jonathan's administration was that over 9,000 Nigerians are serving prison terms abroad. Out of this number, 752 are specifically serving prison terms in British prisons. Automatically, this has great effect on the human capital of the country that was relied on to synergize in order to ensure speedy and steady transformation process through collective participation in government policy implementation.

Ukwuije, C. B. (2015) stated that, Dr. Goodluck Jonathan headed a government of seriously chaotic and troubled country where political crises and electoral violence is the order of the day. Realities of bickering, assassination, kidnapping, and all other forms of uncivilized acts became a daily appearance in national dailies. This situation has dangerously heated-up the polity and as a result, it has reduced the

concentration of the government on policy formulation and implementation. Security monitoring has taken over the centre stage. The most disturbing and diver stating of all is the Boko Haram. An insurgence religious extremist who vowed to establish an Islamic entity in the Northern Nigeria. The Boko Haram Jihadists have demonstrated extreme viciousness in the method and scope of their attacks against defenseless civilians, religious bodies and the nation's security forces.

The unrelenting attacks in the Northeastern States of Bornu, Yobe, and Adamawa state have virtually grounded economic activities in the region and reduced the expected Foreign Direct Investment (FDI). Yet, the government do continuously made uncompromised effort to quench the activities of these Muslim fanatics without overlooking the principles of "political correctness" which implies avoiding language or behaviour that will deliberately offend a particular group of people.

Conclusion

President Goodluck Jonathan's foreign policy thrust took a different dimension looking back to the days of independence. Other nations became conscious of the way they treat us so that they don't take us for a ride. President Goodluck Jonathan's administration also converse for foreign investors because Foreign Direct Investment certainly improve the economy of a nation though much more better paying greater attention to the lives and properties of the citizens in their home country as this can still continue to grow the economy if well developed and properly managed.

Recommendations

1. Lot of things should be learnt in the international political arena and diplomats should increase their interest in learning those things which will invariable attract Foreign Direct Investment in to the country.
2. The productive and manufacturing sector of the economy should be strengthened so as to reduce dependency on Foreign Direct Investment.
3 Nigeria's post-independent foreign policy was considered to be more conciliatory and moralistic than realistic and so needed to be reappraised to bring it to per with the realities of today.

References

Adebanwi, W. (2011). "Globally Oriented Citizenship and International Voluntary Service: Interrogating Nigeria's Technical Aid Corps Scheme". Discussion Paper No. 71. Uppsala: Nordic African Institute.

Adeniyi, T. (2014), "HIV-AIDS & Ebola viruses are manmade". Sunday Sun Vol. 10 No 594, p.44

Ajayi, K. (2005). "Nigeria's Foreign Policy and Image Crisis". *AJPAM* XVI (2): pp.50-63.

Akinterinwa, B. (2011), "Nigerian Foreign Policy Must Reflect National Interest". The Nation Newspaper

Alao, A. (2011). "Nigeria and the Global Powers: Continuity and Change in Policy and Perceptions". Occasional Paper No. 96. South African Institute Domestic Environmental Variables and Foreign Policy Articulation of the Buhari Administration in Nigeria's Fourth Republic

Anigekwu, W. (2002). The Hegemonic Role of Nigeria in ECOWAS: A Comparative Analysis. New York: City College of New York.

Breuning, M. (2007). Foreign Policy Analysis: A Comparative Introduction. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dickson, M. (2010). "Citizen Diplomacy in President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua's Nigeria, 2007-2009: An Assessment". *International Journal of Politics and Good Governance* 1 (13): pp.1-13

Ebeku, K. (2005). "The Succession of Faure Gnassingbe to the Togolese Presidency: An International Law Perspective". Current African Issues No. 30. Uppsala: Nordic African Institute.

Genova, A. 2010. "Nigeria's Nationalization of British Petroleum". *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 43 (1): pp. 115-136.

Igwe, I. S. (2006), "The Principles & Practice of Nigerian Foreign Policy": A Critical Analysis Approach

Inamete, U. (2001). Foreign Policy Decision-Making in Nigeria. London: Associated University Press.

Jaji, R. & Ayotunde, A.(2016). "The Contours and Depth of Nigeria's Foreign Policy under Goodluck Jonathan". *International Affairs and Global Strategy* 48: pp .13-17.

Kalu, U. (2011). "Libya: Why Nigeria broke with Gadaffi". Vanguard. August 26. Available at http://www.vanguardngr.com/2011/08/libya-why-nigeria-broke-with-gaddafi (Accessed August 24, 2023).

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): pp.873-879

Kumssa, A. & John, J. (2015). "Post-independence African Policy: African Socialism and the Organization of African Unity". Public Administration Research 4 (1): pp.12-23.

Meierding, E. (2010). "IR Theory as Politics, International Politics as Theory: a Nigerian Case Study". African Nebula. Issue 2, September. Available at http://noble-world.biz/images/Meierding_Nigeria_IR_paper.pdf (Accessed August 20, 2023).

Mordi, R, Tobi, E, & Olalekan, O. (2003). "Nigeria Restores Sao Tome President". July 25. Available at http://nm.onlinenigeria.com/templates/?a=48 (Accessed August 15, 2023).

Nwahiri, A. (2010), "The Dynamics of Nigerian Foreign Policy (2nd ed). Owerri, Nation-wide Printers & Publishers Ltd.

Obadare, E. (1999). "Democratic Transition and Political Violence in Nigeria". Africa Development. XXIV (1&2): pp.199-219.

Odiogor, H. (2011), "US Removes Nigeria from Terror List". Vanguard. July 24. Available at http://www.vanguardngr.com/2011/07/us-removes-nigeria-from-terror- list (Accessed August 17, 2023).

Odubajo, T. (2017), Domestic Environmental Variables and Foreign Policy Articulation of The Buhari Administration in Nigeria's Fourth Republic *Austral: Brazilian Journal of Strategy & International Relations* v.6, n.11, Jan./Jun. p.73-96

Ohiri, C. (2014), "Nigeria's new foreign policy thrust under acid test". Retrieved on 04/08/2023 from http://www.nigerianorientnews.com/?P=1057

Onoja, A. (2006), "Toward the East in Search of New Friends: 'General Sani Abacha Foreign Policy in Perspective'". *Journal of the Historical Society of Nigeria* 16: pp.111-121

Onyeneho, E. (2006), "The Web of World Politics: Analyzing International Relations. Onitsha, Chamber Books Ltd.

Osaghae, E. (1998). Crippled Giant: Nigeria since Independence. London: Hurst & Company.

Pitts, M. (1999). "Sub-Regional Solutions for African Conflict: The ECOMOG Experience". *The Journal of Conflict Studies* 19 (1): pp.1-11

Salami, O. (2014). "The Prelude to Babangida Regime's Foreign Policy Initiatives". *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 5 (3): pp. 81-85

Shehu, M. & Benjamin, S. (2008). "Nigeria: S/Court Upholds Yar'Adua's Election". Daily Trust. December 13. Available at http://allafrica.com/stories/200812150326.html (Accessed August 19, 2023).

The Associated Press. (1985). "Expelled Foreigners Pouring Out of Nigeria". The New York Times. May 5. Available at http://www.nytimes.com/1985/05/05/world/expelled-foreigners-pouring-out-of-nigeria-by-the-associated-press.html. (Accessed August 25, 2023).

Ukwuije, C. B.(2015). Reflections Of Nigerian Foreign Policy Posture Under Musa Yar'adua and Goodluck Jonathan On National Progress and International Relations International Policy Brief Series *Education and Science Journal of Policy Review and Curriculum Development* Volume 5 Number 1.

Vann, B. (1998). "Nigerian Military Topples Sierra Leone Junta". February 21. Available at https:// www.wsws.org/en/articles/1998/02/sear-f21.htm (Accessed August 26, 2023).

Webber, M. & Michael, S. (2013). Foreign Policy in a Transformed World. New York: Routledge.