

THE EFFECT OF FOREIGN POLICY TO NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: AN APPRAISAL OF GOODLUCK JONATHAN'S ADMINISTRATION.

By

Riyauddeen Zubairu Maitama

Department of Political Science

Bayero University, Kano.

Email: rzmaitama@gmail.com

Phone: 08037970725

Abstract

As recent studies shows, Nigerian's foreign policy has been in a constant state of flux as a result of internal and external dynamics inherent in the government. Although, the formation of Nigeria foreign policy has gone through 14 different administrations in the past 57 years, out of which 35 years was under military regimes. Consequently, there has been a plethora of conceptual, ideological and psychological postulation of policies in Nigeria's foreign policy machinery, most of which were born out of a crave and selfish hunger for an identity that would leave a lasting impression about the various administration or regime in question. The objective of this research paper is to find out reasons for the failures in Nigeria's foreign policies over the years. the research also provide answers as to why there is continued insistence on Afro-centric foreign policy by past administration in Nigeria, and it critically assess President Jonathan's foreign policy and its impact on national development. The framework of analysis adopted by this research paper is Personality model of foreign policy. The theory assumes that the success or failure of foreign policy is not usually a result of weakness of the nation, but more as a consequences of the far-or-short sightedness of the man or leader behind the foreign policy. Thus, Folarin (2013) opined that, a leader's personality is a decisive element in the making of foreign policy and that it matters very much who is there at a given moment. The research conclude that Nigeria's foreign policy is afro-centric in nature, very broad in its goals and it is being determined by socio-political factors that are both internal and external to Nigerian environment. It is imperative that Nigerian government must address the underlying causes and provides realistic ideas and solutions that will tackle the inherent socio-political contradictions in Nigeria as way of enhancing the image of the country within the international system.

Keywords: Foreign Policy, Development, Personality

INTRODUCTION

A country's foreign policy consists of self-interest strategies chosen by the state to safeguard its national interests and to achieve its goals within the international relations milieu. It is the aggregate of a country's national interest which results from the interaction of internal and external forces as perceived by the foreign policy decision makers. The approaches used are strategically employed to interact with other countries. In recent times however, due to the deepening level of globalization and transnational activities, relations and interactions have been known to exist between state and non- state actors in the international political arena. These relations in their own way have influenced several foreign policies between nation states (Garuba, 2008).

Nigeria's foreign policy since independence has been viewed from different perspectives (Aluko, 1981); Macridis (1985), Anyaele, (2005) in recent times. One of the most prevailing perspectives of her foreign policy is that "it is chameleon in nature", (Anyaele, 2005) a foreign policy constantly in a state of flux as a result of internal and external dynamics inherent in any given administration or regime. Some writers (Garuba, 2008, Gambari, 1989 and Folarin, 2013) however maintained that irrespective of the frequent changes, the substance of Nigeria's foreign policy has remained the same. The later parts of this study will however argue otherwise. Buttressing the

above point, (Anyaele, 2005:2) upholds the view that "the protection of our national interest has remained the permanent focus of Nigeria's foreign policy, but the strategies for such protection have varied from one regime / government to another". The formation and execution of Nigeria's foreign policy from independence has been carried out in no fewer than fourteen different administrations through the external affairs ministry. From Tafawa Balewa's administration in 1960 to President Obasanjo's administration in 2003; from the administration of President Musa Yar'Adua, President Goodluck Jonathan to the current administration of President Muhammadu Buhari. These various administrations-including the different military regimes which took over administrative power in Nigeria for over a cumulative period of 35 years, of the entire 57 years of the existence of Nigeria's foreign policy- claimed to pursue the same national interest with regards to the nation's foreign policy. The consequence of the flaxy nature of Nigeria's foreign policy, has been a plethora of conceptual ideological transitions in Nigeria's foreign policy machinery (Pine, 2011). Studies conducted in (Aluko, 1981); (Vision 2020 Report, 2009); (Pine, 2011); (Akinboye, 2013); indicate that past administrations strove towards an epistemological construction and definition of the thrust of Nigeria's foreign policy. These conceptualizations are often regime specific and born out of a psychological and selfish hunger of various

administrations or regimes to carve an identity which will leave a lasting impression in the minds of Nigerians. To this end, (Pine, 2011) laments: "...these ideologies are not necessarily products of deep and profound philosophical reflections".

Objectives

- To find out reasons for the failures in Nigeria's foreign policies over the years.
- To provide answers as to why there is continued insistence on Afro-centric foreign policy by past administration in Nigeria, and
- To critically assess President Jonathan's foreign policy and its impact on national development

Methodology

The work relies on secondary source of data which is qualitative in nature. The study involves archival analysis to examine the relevant literatures on the various concepts dwelt on. Data for the analysis were sourced from newspapers, relevant books, journals, publication and from the internet.

Conceptual and Theoretical Issues

In order to analyse the effect of Nigeria foreign policy on national development, it is appropriate to clarify concepts that are salient to this discourse. The following concepts are to be clarified such as foreign policy, National interest, State, Diplomacy.

Foreign Policy

This is a concept that is central to international relations according to Northedge (1968) foreign policy is the inter play between the outside and inside. While Frankel, (1973), opined that foreign policy is a dynamic process of interaction between the changing domestic demands and the changing international environment. Furthermore, Rourke (2008) opined that, foreign policy is the goal sought, values, set decisions made and actions taken by states and national societies and it constitutes an attempts to design, manage and control the foreign relations of national societies. On a general note, foreign policy is an instrument by which nations use to influence their relations with other states and to achieve their objectives within the global system.

National Interest

National interest is the sum total of the goals of sovereign state, it is the primary motivation for foreign policy formulation and implementation as a guide for actors and policy makers According to Ogwu (1986) national interest serves as a convenient base to encompass all strategies employed in the international interaction of states to ensure the preservation of the states and to ensure the preservation of the stated goals of society. Thus, National Interest represents those values, goals, means and beliefs that can ensure a nation's self – dignity and its security.

State

State is a central feature of modern society which is characterized by four main elements population, territory, government and sovereignty. Roberts, (1971) conceptualized state as territorial area in which a population is governed by a set of political authorities and which successfully claims the compliance of the citizenry for its laws and is able to secure such compliance by its monopolistic control of legitimate force.

Diplomacy

Diplomacy is a concept that is synonymous with international relations and it is the most effective instruments of conducting relations with other independent states. Anifowose and Enemuo (1999) posited that, diplomacy is the conduct of interstate relations by means of negotiations.

Theoretical Framework

The personality model of foreign policy is the basis of analysis of the issue in this discourse. Scholars have the notion that there is no universal definition of personality. Ngara, (2013) defines personality as the totality of an individual's behaviour and emotional characteristics. While, American Psychological Association (2011) viewed personality as individual difference in characteristics patterns of thinking, feeling and behaving.

The course of history of a nation is determined by the decisions of political

leaders. Leaders and the kind of leadership they have shape the way in way in which foreign policies are made and the consequent behavior of state in world politics. Kegley and Wittkopf (1999) did a great deal of work on personality and foreign policy. They argue that state action is nothing but the preferences, actions and initiatives of the highest political office holder. This explains why name of past Nigerian leaders are attached to foreign policies that were initiated and implemented at the time they rule. In the realm of foreign policy analysis, the influence and the impact of personality on decision making is contentious but also important in nature. The role of personality in foreign policy encompasses cognitive processes, background, personal characteristics, motives and beliefs and assumes that decision making is the result of individual, that is, it is individuals who make decisions and not states (Ajayi, 2005).

It is imperative to note that the success or failure of foreign policy is not usually a result of weakness of the nation, but more as a consequences of the far-or-short sightedness of the man or leader behind the foreign policy. Thus, Folarin (2013) opined that, a leader's personality is a decisive element in the making of foreign policy and that it matters very much who is there at a given moment.

Murtala/Obasanjos' foreign policy achieved overwhelming success for Nigeria due to

dynamic, assertive, principle and pro-active nature of these military leaders. Their reign remained and marked the golden era of Nigeria foreign policy. A lot of milestones were set in terms of foreign policy articulation and implementation. Conversely, Jonathan's foreign policy marked a low – down turn in Nigeria external relations, he was a passive leader and this passitive nature reflected in Nigeria's foreign policy posture. Thus Nigeria was not accorded the kind of status it deserved due to lack of action internationally by Jonathan's administration (Nwankwo, 2013).

The personality in foreign policy decision – making is a useful model and highly relevant as a basis of theoretical analysis of international relations and decisions taken by foreign policy actors. Furthermore, it will enrich the knowledge of students, scholars and practitioners of international relations bearing in mind that in analyzing a social phenomenon, theoretical model serves as lenses through which all the issues involved in particular social phenomenon can be analyzed.

Nigeria's International Image: Issues at stake

A country's standing in the international system although dependent on some other factors, is highly dependent on her image perception being positive or negative. A good image results in respect, influence and prestige. While, a bad or negative

perception of a country's image implies that such a country lacks respect, influence and prestige in the international system (Egwemi, 2010:131).

Ojo and Aghedo (2013:85) remarked that Nigeria's reputation is at its lowest ebb. Building on the works of some analysts and public commentators, they arguably described Nigerians in general terms as criminally minded. While they blamed this on the behaviour of a few Nigerians whose activities undermine the country, they also attributed this image deficit to the negative stereotyping of the country by some foreign media (Ojo and Aghedo, 2013:88).

These accusations have wider ramifications and consequences on the image of the country. However, Ojo and Aghedo (2013:90-91) are of the opinion that there are deliberate attempts to positively build the country's image. They named successes in survival instincts; a love for life; good followership/imitation; prowess in soccer, UN peacekeeping initiatives and decorations of Nigerian officers for meritorious service; resourceful and enterprising people; and youthful interest in education. The above factors import that “Nigeria is not all a gory picture of crime and violence, but also of creativity, skills, and enduring legacies of universal acclaim” (Ojo and Aghedo, 2013:91).

Bamiduro and Aremu (2012:11) expressed opinions that are similar to Ojo and Aghedo

(2013) by underscoring that:

Nigeria's disfigured image in the global village has become an insignia of dishonesty, dishonour and disrespect; this is outright humiliation of a nation of almost 150 million people. Majority of Nigerians are industrious, God-fearing and law abiding people. But a tiny minority is destroying the image of the country and the governance ineptitude is adding salt to the injury.

They posited that the positivities in the Nigerian state far exceed the negativities from the foregoing averment, and as such recommend that, via credible, free and fair elections; invigorated/consistent anti-graft drive (without political interference); youth empowerment; promotion of entrepreneurship and financial support; and finally, the adoption of good leadership styles characterized by honesty, faithfulness, transparency, love and justice, the image of the country can be promoted (Bamiduro and Aremu, 2012:20).

Akinboye (2013) opined that Nigeria had indeed been battling with image crisis for the past three decades. He identified the major issue inhibiting the image to be corruption and stated that until the government shows seriousness in fighting corruption, Nigeria will not be taken

seriously at the international level. He also identified terrorism and insurgency to be other sources of the image crisis in Nigeria, alluding that until the fundamental domestic sources of Nigeria's image crisis have been tackled, Nigeria's aspiration to be a regional influential nation will remain an illusion.

This position taken by Akinboye (2013) converges with Corruption Perception Index by Transparency International (2013); wherein it was recorded that on a scale of 0 (perceived to be highly corrupt) to 100 (perceived to be highly clean), Nigeria scored 25% in contrast to her 27% score in 2012. This score was derived from 9 surveys carried out in 2013. This ranked her 144th out of 177 countries globally (*Transparency International*, 2013). This factor as revealed by Transparency International gives a perception to the world that Nigeria is indeed a highly corrupt country and when this is the case, the image of the country becomes negative to the rest of the world.

Evolution of Nigerian Foreign Policy

Nigeria's image crisis has historical foundation and dynamics (Ajayi, 2005:50). This section becomes relevant as it explores Nigeria's image since 1960 in order to identify and highlights the turning points in Nigeria's image and foreign policy.

First Republic

Tafawa Balewa, through his pioneering foreign policy anchored on Afrocentricism,

was able to lay the foundation for Nigeria's roles and influences in international politics which; ultimately helped to give a credible image for the country in the comity of nations (Ajayi, 2005). The expulsion of apartheid South Africa, breaking of ties with France and participation in the Non-aligned movement rang positive bells towards Nigeria's image abroad (Folarin, 2013:21).

Second Republic

The expelling of illegal aliens from Nigeria, in the guise of national interest, was an action that was indeed inimical to the country's development. Over two to three million illegal immigrants were given fourteen days to leave the country. This action alone created a bad image for Nigeria abroad (Lukpata, 2013:65). Thus, Shagari's administration was described as inhumane, callous and irresponsible. It did incalculable damage to Nigeria's reputation and standing among the Great Powers and the developing world.

This action was so disappointing that even the opposition parties and senior officials in the Ministry of External Affairs were frustrated because most of their efforts in building a positive image for Nigeria had gone down the drain as a result (Abegunrin, 2003:107). Nigeria also lost her reputation in this period as a frontline state fighting against the apartheid in South Africa because the administration was not as active and concerned as the previous administrations (Folarin, 2013:22).

The manner in which the management of Nigeria's presence in international organizations was organized, appeared very appalling and had made null the efforts that previous administrations had exerted to making the Nigerian image a good one on a regional and sub-regional scale (Garuba, 2008:8).

Military Rule

The civil war of 1967-1970, and the discovery of oil conditioned the Gowon era to a large extent. However, Nigeria was still active in the international system as evident in the recognition of China, the formation of ECOWAS, Niger Basin Commission and the Chad Basin Commission (Folarin, 2013:22). Nigeria's efforts under Gowon against apartheid, crimes against humanity, anti-colonial and anti-racial policies were indeed commendable (Ajayi, 2005:52)

The Murtala/Obasanjo regime was radical against colonialism and racism. Nigeria, under their administrations engaged in a large number of peace keeping missions and was more alert to issues of injustice mostly in Africa by promoting the causes of freedom fighters and Pan Africanism (Ajayi, 2005:52; Garuba, 2008:6). Generally, under their administrations, the country's image can be said to have been very favourable.

The Buhari-Idiagbon regime made efforts at restoring the battered image of Nigeria after Shagari's tenure by ushering in an anti-drug

and anti-corruption policy to brighten the country's image (Folarin, 2013:22). This regime was able to gain direction in tackling the country's economic problems and debt incurred by Shagari's administration. The regime was credited in 1984 for having paid promptly for all imports with foreign exchange earned by the nation and did not borrow from any international financial institution. This factor was able to re-establish Nigeria's image in the foreign market (Ali, 2013:3).

Babangida's regime started by claiming that, it was an offshoot of the Murtala social revolution that was later intensified by Buhari, but it instead rubbished their efforts by reinstating dismissed officials and returning all that were confiscated, deported Keeling from Nigeria, a Financial Times journalist for investigating and reporting on the Gulf War oil windfall corruption (Ojukwu and Shopeju, 2010:19). Emordi (2008:6 in Ali, 2013:5) stated that "Babangida's administration institutionalized corruption as if it was a cardinal state policy". This compounded the moral image of the country as a very corrupt country.

Prospective investors found it hard to do business in the country, because of the bribes and kickbacks to the bureaucrats. The lack of credibility in the transition programme and the eventual annulment of the June 12, 1993 elections increased the downward plunge of the country's

credibility owing to the fact that international observers deemed the elections to be the most peaceful and fairest elections ever conducted in Nigeria. The regime was also acclaimed to have had disregard for human rights and was autocratic in his approach (Ajayi, 2005:52).

The height of the decline in Nigeria's international image occurred during the late General Abacha regime. He disbanded all democratic institutions, assassinated a number of pro-democracy activists, and killed opponents and protesters. He had complete disregard for human rights and the opinion of the international community (Folarin, 2013:22). Things got worse with the execution of Ken Saro-Wiwa and his eight Ogoni kinsmen in November 1995, which put his regime at odds with the world, particularly the United Nations, the European Union and the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth in particular, outrightly suspended Nigeria from its membership because it considered all of Abacha's conduct a gross violation of its 1991 Harare Declaration of Commonwealth Principles (Josiah, 2008 in Folarin, 2013:23)

The administration initiated some measures to curb corruption like the War Against Indiscipline and Corruption (WAIC), but this was an irony in itself as his government itself was characterized by general mismanagement, "corruption of monumental dimension" (Emma, 2009 in

Chukwuemeka, Bartholomew and Ugwu, 2012:71). The level of corruption was so much that it led to the ostracising of Nigeria from the comity of nations, and Nigeria became a pariah state. His administration almost emptied the government's treasury and after his death, over \$600 million and £75 million pounds were recovered from his family (Chukwuemeka, Bartholomew and Ugwu, 2012:71).

Fourth Republic

President Olusegun Obasanjo, at inauguration in May, 1999, inherited a nation with a battered image and without credibility externally. 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 organizations like the ECOWAS, African Union (AU) and G-77. Nigeria also hosted several international summits including those of the Commonwealth Heads of State and Government and the AU in 2004, the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) in 2005, and ECOWAS since 1999. The country had also hosted the All Africa Games in 2004. Obasanjo had been the guest of honour to the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) in May 2004. All these showed that the international community had begun to have confidence again in Nigeria (Ajayi, 2005).

Nigeria was able to recover most of the

stolen funds in foreign banks located in Belgium, Switzerland, Britain, America and Germany. He held periodic meetings with the Nigerians in the countries that he visited from time to time in order to discuss issues of common interest and update them on government policies, as well as possible ways they can help move the country forward. He helped Nigeria regain her lost status of being the hub of air and sea transportation in Africa which was severely affected during the Abacha regime. Nigeria in this period also played a frontline role in the relations between the G8 and other developed countries. She also played a central role in the formation of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) and African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM). Obasanjo, through a US-contracted military outfit, restructured the Nigerian Military Professionals Resource Incorporation (MPRI) (Garuba, 2008:15-16).

Obasanjo's tenure recorded remarkable achievements in the areas of peace and security. There were active engagements in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Darfur (Sudan), where it sent peacekeeping troops; the country has also held peace talks between the Sudanese government and the warring factions in Abuja. The government had equally demonstrated efforts on the restoration of peace in Liberia and Sierra Leone. In Liberia, it sponsored Nigeria's former leader General Abdulsalami Abubakar

through ECOWAS to lead the peace process that got Charles Taylor to relinquish power, while it facilitated the second track of peace and reconciliation in Sierra Leone, in collaboration with ECOWAS and its member-states (Garuba, 2008:17).

Obasanjo's government also championed projects such as Gulf of Guinea Commission, attempted to strengthen bilateral relations with Cameroun with which it settled the long dispute over Bakassi through the Nigeria-Cameroun Border Commission and the Republic of Benin with which it tried to address issues of cross-border crimes (Garuba, 2008:17-18).

The country and her leadership enjoyed accommodation and tolerance by the international community but the ordinary citizens are often made to suffer personality pillage, inhumane treatments and abuse of fundamental human rights at embassies and off-shore. Nigeria's image crisis at the level of individual Nigerians, rather than the state, is yet to be resolved despite the president's shuttle diplomacy. Other issues which engender and sustain such image problem externally include internal insecurity, poor infrastructural base, perpetration of financial crimes and lack of organization and discipline. As much as these may be perceived as internal problems, stating these internal challenges is important because foreign policy is a reflection of domestic policies externally (Ajayi, 2005:57).

Yar'Adua/Jonathan Administration (2007-2014)

The election that brought President Yar'Adua into power was reported by international observers as being flawed. The European Union specifically criticised the 2007 elections as being seriously faulty and did not meet the required international standards. This issue contributed to a decline in the country's image. The democratic credibility of the country had become questionable as a result (Yagboyaju, 2011:99).

At the time President Yar'Adua came into office, it was worthy of note that his health had been severely threatened. While he was trying to manage his ill-health, Yar'Adua made no provisions for the Vice President to act in his absence. Thus: The consequence was that the ship of the Nigerian state was sailing rudderless on the international waters of foreign policy... Without functional institutions and without a leader, Nigeria's foreign relations and indeed the State of Nigeria also went into coma when Yar'Adua went into coma in Saudi Arabian hospital. Nigeria failed to show up at important international meetings, lost many positions in multilateral associations, forsook obligations, and found herself in a situation where many of her allies started wondering what had gone wrong with Nigeria (Nwankwo, 2013:215).

More than external challenges, it is the internal challenges that are dampening

Nigeria's attainment of great power status which Vision 20:2020 envisages. Key internal challenges include poor governance, insecurity of lives and property, irregular power supply, low quality public service delivery and rating of the nation's educational institutions; poor capacity to innovate; the unimpressive quality of its democracy and the inability to build consensus and resolve conflicts. More specifically, the insurgency in the North, the collapse of public education, growing unemployment, oil dependent economy, dilapidated economic infrastructure among others are major issues that deserve attention, if not radical government intervention (Olutokun, 2013; Okere, 2012 in Nwankwo, 2013:218).

It has become very obvious that crime and corruption are the bane of Nigeria's development. The current Boko Haram insurgency in the north-eastern part of the country speaks volume. These social problems, no doubt, have battered the country's image. Many foreign companies have had to withdraw their operations from Nigeria because of crime, corruption and insecurity. For those that managed to stay, doing business in the country has become very expensive. Therefore, there is urgent need for a holistic effort by the government, corporate bodies and individuals to stamp out the evils of insecurity, crime and corruption so that the country is relatively safe for both Nigerians and foreigners (Ajaebili, 2011:218).

Internationally, the pervasive corruption in Nigeria has tarnished the image of the country and has resulted in foreign nationals exercising extreme caution in entering into business transactions with Nigerians, thereby weakening the economic sector (Chukwuemeka, Bartholomew and Ugwu, 2012:68).

Foreign Policy Under Jonathan's Administration: Strength or weakness?

The foreign policy position of the administration of President Goodluck Jonathan who succeeded the late Yar'Adua is generally perceived as a continuation of the foreign policy thrust of his predecessor. In his capacity as the acting President, Jonathan embarked on a number of diplomatic shuttles, as part of a deliberate attempt to reassure the world that Nigeria was well and secured despite the internal political challenges especially with the challenges of succession it was going through. Nigeria literally returned to the international arena. One of the shuttles took him to the USA where he met with his American counterpart which enabled the delisting of Nigeria from the discriminatory rule of the Department of Homeland Security on special screening of passengers on international flights to the United States that specifically targeted Nigerians (consequent upon the Christmas day attempted bombing a US airline by a Nigerian Umar Abdulmutallab).

Also, Jonathan recalled Nigeria's

ambassador to Libya in protest of suggestion by Muammar Gaddafi that Nigeria should separate into a Muslim North State and a Christian South. The action was aimed at checkmating the excesses of the then Libyan leader and sending a strong signal that Nigeria can no longer tolerate such undue interference in the nation's internal affairs from any State.

The relationship between Nigeria and US continued to improve under Jonathan. This is most exemplified in the signing of the first US–Nigeria Bi-national Commission. This as noted aimed to establish a mechanism for sustained, bilateral, high-level dialogue to promote and increase diplomatic, economic and security co-operation between the two countries. The Commission's main focus was Nigeria's domestic priorities. These key domestic priorities include good governance, electoral reform and preparations, transparency and anti-corruption, energy (electricity supply) reform and investment, as well as food and agricultural development, which were all key components of what Jonathan, termed his transformation agenda.

In fact, he engineered a purposeful mobilisation and instrumentalisation of Nigerians in Diaspora for national development. Not only did the administration encourage the formation of the Nigerians in Diaspora Organisation (NIDO) in all countries where there are Nigerians, it went further to establish a

Diaspora Commission to take charge of the affairs of Nigerians in Diasporas and ensure their effective instrumentalisation. His prompt response to the denigrating deportation of Nigerians by South Africa sent a very strong signal that Nigeria “has come of age” and that any attempt to denigrate her will have consequences. The diplomatic way president Jonathan was able to manage the said Nigeria-South Africa face-off was highly welcomed by Nigerians. He was also quick to order the evacuation of Nigerians trapped in the crisis torn countries like Libya in 2011 and Egypt in January 2012. In fact Nigeria was the first to airlift her citizens from Egypt. In January 2012 Nigeria hosted the fifth Nigeria/EU dialogue aimed at streamlining migration in a globalizing world and in the interest of all parties. This affirmative action's projected vividly the citizen centred focus of Nigeria's Foreign Policy.

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, 2013).

For the first time, there were conscious efforts by Nigeria to ensure that her sacrifices of lives and resources towards restoring peace to many countries in Africa no longer go without commensurate national benefit. It marked a paradigm shift in Nigeria's foreign policy. However,

focusing on Nigeria's domestic priorities did not mean abandonment of African issues. It is on this commitment that the regime and through its leadership in ECOWAS effectively managed the ouster of Laurent Gbagbo of Cote D'Ivoire when he refused to hand over power, after the 2010 Presidential elections in that country. Similar crisis of self-perpetuation in office in Niger was also condemned by the Jonathan's administration.

CORRUPTION AND RECKLESS SPENDING UNDER JONATHAN ADMINISTRATION: SOME FACTS

Inflating Cost Of Governance

President Jonathan is largely touted as running an extravagant government judging by the amount devoted to feeding, refreshments, entertainments and other incidental expenses like trips among others. The near – N1 billion allocated for the same purpose in the 2012 budget generated a swirl of controversy big enough to force the presidency to order a reduction. In the 2013 budget, the president has tried to come down a bit with allocation, particularly in the area of expenses on food, refreshments and welfare for the State House, the Vice-president and other ministries. The total allocation to the presidency in the 2013 budget proposal is N35, 545,673,132, with total personnel cost put at N 11,476,593,929. Total over-head is N11,569,079,204, with total recurrent put at N23,045,673,132 while total capital

stands at N12,500,000,000. out of this, the presidency budgeted N327,154,931 for refreshment and meals and another N406,738,969 to purchase foodstuff, just as Vice-President Namadi Sambo would spend N112,500,000 to purchase food for the 2013 fiscal year another N123,406,499 on refreshment and N7,020,750 to purchase cooking gas. When added, the total for the presidency meals is not too far from the N1 billion budgets of 2012. The presidency has, however, always argued that the allocation include budget for meals and drinks served during the different ceremonies and events at the State House and feeding of cabinet ministers during the weekly cabinet meetings. Even in spite of the boast about improved electricity supply across the country, the presidency, it appears, is not ready to take chances on the possibility of outage. Hence in 2013, it proposed to spend N72, 510,832 to fuel its generators while it will also spend N553, 056,411 for honorarium and sitting allowances (Onyishi, & Eme, 2013).

Inflating the cost of foreign trips

Just like other areas, President Jonathan spent billions of naira on foreign trips in 2012 despite his earlier promise to cut down these expenses, even as he is planning on spending a whopping N2.6 billion next year on foreign trips. The nation can authoritatively report that the president together with his entourage have spent nothing less that N3.354 billion since 2010 on foreign trips. The president within the

first 11 months of this year flew out at least 20 times.

In September alone, the president traveled out of the country four times, including his trips to Addis Ababa. Within the first nine months when he first became president, he spent N970, 891 million on foreign travels (Yusuf,2012:60). The budget did not however, state explicitly the figures for his travels. But investigations have shown that President Jonathan spent N1.7 billion on foreign trips this year alone (The Nation Editorial,2012:39).

In 2012, N684.74 million was budgeted for foreign travels alone. During his presidency, the president was reported to have flown to different destinations in Africa, Europe, Asia, North America, and South America. In 2011, he visited numerous countries including, United States, France, Uganda, Australia, Ghana, Chad, Equatorial Guinea, and Ethiopia among others. The president travels with his entourage, top aides, and officials of the presidential villa are usual faces on such trips; ministries applicable to the purpose of his overseas trips also send delegations. In recent times the President travels with two members of the National Assembly (one from each chamber), depending on the purpose of his visit. Sahara reporters had in June claimed that Jonathan traveled to Rio de Janeiro, Brazil for the United Nations' Earth Summit with 116 government officials (Yusuf,2012:61). Although the

President rebuffed the figures but he never gave out the exact figure. Jonathan had said in a national broadcast in January, "I have directed that overseas travels by all political office holders, including the president, should be reduced to the barest minimum. The size of delegations on foreign trips will also be drastically reduced; only trips that are absolutely necessary will be approved" (Yusuf,2012:61).

The cost of maintaining Presidential Aircraft Fleet

Information obtained from government aviation agencies and airline operators by Anofi & Oluwasegun (2012:57) also revealed that the Goodluck Jonathan led administration spend an estimated N9.08 billion annually on the Presidential Air Fleet (PAF). PAF has the third largest fleet of aircraft in the country. According to findings, the PAF contains a total of 10 aircraft, coming closely behind aerocontractors airline, which has total of 14 aircraft. Arik Air, the largest commercial airline in the country, has a fleet of 23 aircraft. Figures obtained from the Nigerian Airspace Management Agency (NAMA), Federal Airports Authority of Nigeria (FAAN), and the Nigerian Civil Aviation Authority (NCAA) revealed that N9.08 billion is spent to maintain the 10 presidential jets every year. The PAF include two Falcon 7x jets, two Falcon 900 jets, Gulfstream 550, one Boeing 737 BBJ (Nigerian Air Force 001 or Eagle One), and Gulfstream IVSP. Others are one

Gulfstream V, Cessna Citation 2 aircraft and Hawker siddeley 125-800 jet. According to a former minister of Information, Professor, Dora Akunyili, each of the two falcon 7x jets purchased in 2010 costs \$51.1 million, while the Gulfstream 550 cost \$53.3 million (Durojaiye,2012:23). The factory price of other aircraft in the fleet could not be easily obtained online. However, airline CEOs put the average price of Falcon 900 at \$35 million, Gulfstream IVSP as \$40 million, Gulfstream V at \$45 million; Boeing 737 BBJ at \$58 million, Cessna Citation is \$7 million and hawker siddeley 125-800 at \$15 million. This brings a combined estimated value of Nigeria's PAF to \$390.5 million (N60.53: billion) (Durojaiye,2012:23).

According to airline chief executives and industry experts, airlines, airlines spend between 15 and 20 per cent of the cost of an aircraft on its operation yearly. They say that averagely, a little less than one-fifth of the cost of the plane is spent every year on insurance, flight and cabin crew, maintenance, fuelling, catering and training. Going by the fact that at least 15 per cent of this amount is spent annually on operating the PAF, it means about \$58.57 million (N9.08 n billion) is spent annually on running the planes (Durojaiye,2012:23). Nigeria happens to be one of few countries of the world with a large PAF. Most major countries in Europe and Asia maintain mostly two aircraft in their presidential air fleet, according to Wikipedia (2012). According to the website, Japan maintains

only two Boeing 747-400 planes in its presidential air fleet. The two aircraft, mostly for the prime minister, the emperor, empress and other members of the imperial family, is operated by the Japan air Self-Defence Force. The aircraft were constructed at the Boeing factory at the same time as the United States' Air Force One. Both Japanese aircraft were delivered in 1990. Wikipedia also confirms that The Netherlands Government operates only two aircraft, one Fokker 70 and one Gulfstream IV, as a means of transport for the Dutch Royal family and government officials, such as the Prime Minister and other Ministers. They are used, also, to attend international conferences, and also for private trips by the Queen and the Prince of Orange (Durojaiye, 2012:23). For long haul trips, the Royal Dutch Airline is used. Often the upper deck of a Boeing 747 is used. The Queen of England, Queen Elizabeth 11 and Prime Minister, David Cameron, often go on British Airways chartered flights for long trips. UK's Cameron was recently criticized by the UK media for chartering a foreign plane instead of a British's. Countries like Ghana, Algeria and a host of others in Europe maintain only one aircraft in their PAF (Onyishi, & Eme, 2013)..

Process of awarding Contracts by FEC Under Jonathan

As part of the endless spending spree, information obtained from the website of the Bureau of Public Procurement (BPP), BusinessDay(2012) and Ikuomola, 2012

a&b, and Onogu (2012) show that the federal government awarded contracts worth about N1.187 trillion between August 10, 2011 and November 28, 2012. The figure represents the total value of over 140 contracts spread across various sectors of the economy. A breakdown of the contract showed that between August 10 and February 15, the federal government awarded contracts worth over N700 billion, while in the months from May 30 to November 28, it awarded contracts in excess of N400 billion. As the government continues to award contracts, in its quest “to better” the lot of Nigerians, however, there has been skepticism as to whether the contracts would be executed and if executed, whether they would be effective, especially as a number of them have continued to generate controversy. In June this year, Vice-President Namadi Sambo had himself said over 12,000 federal projects with N7.8 trillion had been abandoned.

The vice president had warned that the trend would no longer be tolerated on June 21 when he inaugurated the committee on guideline for the management and implementation of federal infrastructure projects in Abuja. Though warned that, “in line with the transformation agenda, the federal government has decided that federal projects would no longer be done haphazardly or arbitrarily” (Businessday, 2012:39). Nigerians have continued to complain of the trend. In November 20 12,

the Federal Executive Council (FEC) approved no fewer than 25 contracts s the total number of contracts awarded between May and November were worth more than N200 billion. Among them was a contract worth N54.4 billion for the provision of complementary engineering infrastructure facilities to the Federal Capital City. The contract for the rehabilitation of railway track network – Eastern Line (Port Harcourt – Maiduguri), which is worth N67.3 billion was also among those awarded in November. Also, in November contracts worth N4.3 billion were awarded for the design, manufacture, supply and commission of two sets of five-car diesel multiple units, each with a capacity of 540 passengers and additional six numbers of 68-seater passenger coaches. Other contracts awarded in 2012 included a N2.7 billion contract for the construction of Nkporo-Abirba-Ohafia Road in Abia state to Messrs Dutum Construction

(Nigeria) Limited. The contract, awarded on May 30 is expected to be completed 18 months from the date. On June 13, 2012, the FEC approved a contract worth N 90.6 million for a major overhaul and restoration of Plant Unit GT17 at Ughelli Power Plc (Onyishi, & Eme, 2013)..

Over a month later, on July 25, 2012, it reviewed the contract sum for the rehabilitation of phase I of the ministry of Finance office, to N2, 263,231,068, with the contract expected to be completed in 56

weeks. Three months later, with many more contracts approved in the time, the FEC awarded a contract worth N1.49b for the completion of the construction of the Zik Mausoleum at Onitsha Anambra State. A review of the contracts awarded by the Jonathan administration between May 30 and November 28 this year showed that at least five consultancy contracts, worth NE.36 billion were awarded. These included the contract for the supervision consultancy services for reclamation work on the Abam-Nnuju-Igbiri-Oba-Ojimba-Okujagu-Ama Water front and back swamps, which was worth N383.3 million. On August 8, a contract was awarded for transaction advisory for Design, Build, Finance and Operate on the 2nd Niger Bridge, which links Anambra and Delta States, The contract was worth N325.6 million on the same day, the FEC also awarded a contract worth N297.7 million for transport advisory services for Design, Build, Finance and Operate on Apakun-Murtala Mohammed International Airport Road. Two more consultancy contracts were awarded on November 28. the first, which is for the provision of consultancy services for the improvement of power supply at Murtala Muhammad International Airport, Lagos, was worth N233.8 million, while the second-a contract for consultancy services (supervision) for the construction of Inland River Port at Jamata, Lokoja- was worth N121.1 million. For the same period-May to November, the FEC favoured short-term projects. Of the 47 awarded contracts

reviewed for the period, 29 (62 per cent) were contracts with completion duration of between one and 12 months. Contracts to be completed between 13 and 20 months were nine, as were those with completion duration of 21 months and above. The regular approval of contracts by the FEC has not been without criticism with many Nigerians accusing the executive of turning the weekly meeting into a platform for the award of contracts rather than an avenue for discussing serious national issues. In March this year, the house of representatives had also slammed the approval of contracts by the FEC, describing such actions as illegal. At the time, the Chairman of the House Committee on Public Procurement, Mrs. Jumoke Okoya-Thomas, had reportedly said the FEC was usurping the powers of the National Councils on procurement as stipulated by law. In the months that followed, the FEC has gone on to approve contracts in excess of N700 billion and the debate has shifted from the legality of the contracts approved by the council to the relevance of the contracts and the council's ability to ensure the approved contracts are executed properly if at all they are executed (Onyishi, & Eme, 2013).

A Critique of Nigeria's Foreign Policy Thrust under President Goodluck Jonathan's Administration.

After President Goodluck completed the tenure of former President Umaru Musa Yar-Adua, he (Jonathan) then contested and won the April 2011 presidential election

with massive support and expectations among many Nigerians. The president development emphasis was anchored on transformation programme which according to him was to totally transform every decaying sector in Nigeria. It was also the time Nigeria was witnessing high level of insecurity occasioned by the activities of Boko – Haram in the North East, corruption and youth's restiveness among other problems. All these factors contributed negatively to the global perception of Nigeria and Nigerians. In order to address these problems, President Goodluck Jonathan's foreign policy direction focused on investment and economic co-operation within the global community. This according to Obuoforib (2014) was made now during the May 29 inaugural and acceptance speech of the President thus: Nigeria's new foreign policy direction is now on investment and economic co-operation which thus ties Foreign Policy to the country's domestic agenda, a radical departure from the old one which has Africa as the centre piece. The new foreign policy lay more emphasis on investment rather than political drive as it is the only avenue to deliver the dividends of democracy to the electorate. The new posture of government is that – while we retain the leadership role in our sub-region, and while we play our leadership role on the continent by taking the lead in all major issues on the continent, the Foreign Policy direction will also be used to propel the economic and industrial development of our country.

To back his words with actions the president gave new directives to the nation's various diplomatic missions to consider themselves as the operators of the foreign policy in practical terms. They were urged to look for opportunities, ventures, programmes that they could bring to Nigeria to give the new focus a success. The hallmark of Jonathan's foreign policy based to his 2011 inaugural address was to priorities domestic concerns as he clearly stated that, the present administration's foreign policy of externalising domestic priorities. The concern therefore is that even within the sub-region there should be a new thinking on sub-regional integration based on inputs from the people as against past efforts which was the exclusive handwork as well as aspiration of the past leaders.

Indeed, to the best of his abilities, Goodluck Jonathan renewed diplomatic and bilateral relationship with many countries. He also addressed international gathering to help Nigeria in fighting Bokom Haram terrorist activities and corruption. He also urged Europe and Asian giants to invest in Nigeria's private sector especially in the key areas of energy, downstream sector and agriculture. According to Ajaebili (2013) President Jonathan stress that, “Therefore, there is urgent need for a holistic effort by the government, corporate bodies and individuals to stamp out the evils of insecurity, crime and corruption so that the country is relatively safe for both Nigerians and foreigners”.

Internationally, the pervasive corruption in Nigeria had tarnished the image of the country and has resulted in foreign nationals exercising extreme caution in entering into business transactions with Nigerians, thereby weakening the economic sector. President Goodluck did not actually succeed in implementing foreign policy as evidenced from USA government refusing to sell weapons to Nigeria, and the South Africa government also sizing Nigeria money meant to purchase weapons to fight Boko Haram among other diplomatic skirmishes globally. Similarly, many Nigerians were executed in countries like Indonesia, Philippines, Australia and unprovoked attacks on Nigerian national and massive deportation of Nigerians across the globe.

In general, The Jonathan's administration, like many other administrations in Nigeria has never lacked in good policies. The problem of Nigeria's foreign policy that is affecting the country's image is not in formulation, but in implementation as noted by Nwankwo. It therefore means, Nigerian Foreign Policy under Jonathans' administration failed to have meaningful impact on the global community.

Inherent Challenges Affecting Nigeria Foreign Policy

Foreign policies are systematic way that a sovereign nation can use to deal with matters that may arise with its interactions with other independent states and other non-

states actors. It is pertinent to note that Nigeria has not fared better in the conduct of its foreign policy for the larger part of its fifty five years of existence as sovereign state. In retrospect Teniola (2013) addressed Nigeria's foreign policy succinctly that a bold foreign policy has become major mishap in the face of grave internal problems confronting Nigeria today, in the global scene, Nigeria has become very inactive.

Furthermore, Asobie (2010) came up with questions that are challenging in nature such as how the changes in the international system in the last fifty year been perceived and interpreted by policy makers? How has Nigeria's national interest been defined, in the contexts of those changes? What specific policies have been formulated and implemented to respond to the changes? What has been impact of the changes and Nigeria's responses on Nigeria's national development? The posers raised by Asobie Assisi are part of the challenges inherent in Nigeria Foreign policy

In addition, the appointment of non career officers as diplomats especially political appointees to serves as ambassadors and high commissioners is counter-productive at implementing effectively foreign policy objectives of Nigerian government outside it shores due to misplacement of government priorities by these set of ambassadors. In addition, it affects negatively the morales of career officers in the ministry of external affairs.

Persistent economic hardship and downslide of oil price globally is an impeding factor in the implementation of foreign policy objectives by Nigerian government due to the mono-cultural and oil driven nature of Nigerian economy. Nigeria attained a dynamic and pragmatic foreign policy during the period of oil boom in the 1970s. Thus, if the structure of states economy is strong, diversify and stable, it will serve as a major determinants of states behavior vis-à-vis its relations within the international system.

Repositioning Nigerian Foreign Policy for Development

From the above analysis, we have observed with keen interest the complex relationships between foreign policy, international image and national transformation as they affect Nigeria. It is evident that foreign policy, when conceived as the way a country relates with its external environment, has serious implications for the country's international image. In other words, foreign relations invariably dictate how foreigners are received and treated by host countries. On the other hand, the feed-back mechanism embedded in the foreign policy formulation and implementation process can help to drive national development.

Hence, the earlier allusion by Ate (2012) that national economic transformation is the prioritization of foreign policy and diversification of resources on cultivating special bilateral and multilateral

relationships that are considered critical to the realization of the strategic vision of development becomes apt. In essence, the critical linkage between domestic processes (politics, economics, social, cultural, religion and so on) and the external situation towards which foreign policy is focused provides an illumination into how foreign policy, when carefully articulated can promote a country's international image and foster its national transformation.

Adelusi and Oluwashakin (2014:135) had argued that the linkage between domestic processes and external relations provides a specific context which identifies the extent to which specific issues can positively or negatively exert influence on achievement of a given policy. They contended that foreign policy constitutes a force for positive international image, indeed, a force for positive change, which should be maximally harnessed for national development and transformation. It therefore, suffices to mention that an engagement of a robust foreign policy position invariably promotes international respectability among the comity of nations and positively affects a country's national transformation agenda.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The paper has examined the issue of the objectives of Nigeria foreign policy and its implementations and the inherent challenges facing it in the last fifty five years. It is obvious that Nigeria foreign

policy is afro-centric in nature, very broad in its goals and it is being determined by socio-political factors that are both internal and external to Nigerian environment.

It is imperative that Nigerian government must address the underlying causes and provides realistic ideas and solutions that will tackle the inherent socio-political contradictions in Nigeria as way of enhancing the image of the country within the international system.

Furthermore, it is imperative that foreign affairs institutions and missions abroad should make it imperative to advance Nigeria's foreign policy objectives with consistency in line with stipulated constitutional goals of Nigeria vis-a-vis international system. In this light, foreign policy institutions and diplomats should key into the assertion of Uhomoibhi and Iweriebor (2015) the need to dedicate to the realization through the vigorous pursuit of the vital national interests of the federal republic of Nigeria through the formulation, articulation and implementation of Nigeria's foreign policy objectives for the benefits of Nigeria and its citizens by building the capacity to be a major role player in world affairs and earning the respect of the people of Africa and the larger international community. On a final note Nigeria foreign policy objectives and its implementation should inculcate the adoption of combination of economic diplomacy and preventive diplomacy as

foreign policy instruments as a means or tools of repositioning Nigerian foreign policy to cope with the developmental challenges of the twenty first century's

The inability of Nigeria foreign policy makers and actors to key into the globally acknowledged preventive diplomacy in the realization of de-escalation of violence especially in northern Eastern Nigeria bearing the contiguous nature of the zone with Cameroon, Chad and Niger republic is a reflection of lack of pro-active policies and measures by Nigerian government thus it should embrace preventive diplomacy bearing in mind realities of time. Albert (2012) acknowledged that, preventive diplomacy means an action to prevent disputes from arising between parties, to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts and to limit the spread of the latter when they occur.

In conclusion, there is the need to link Nigeria national interest in line with our foreign policy objectives, our national interests should supercede other external considerations and remain imperatives, the focus should be on the gains or the advantages that Nigeria will derive as a nation in its foreign policy implementation. Thus, in the comments of Obadiah, M. quoting from the study of Wogu et, al (2015) the centerpiece of any country's foreign policy ought to be that country itself if it seriously considers itself a rational actor on the world stage...Every single action shall

be adjudged by how much it advances our national power and influence and how much it advances our interest and objectives

References

- Abegunrin, O. (2003). *Nigerian Foreign Policy under Military Rule*. Lagos: Greenwood Publishing Group
- Adelusi, O.P and Oluwashakin, A (2014) "Foreign Policy and Nigerians in Diaspora: An Analysis of President Goodluck Jonathan's Foreign Policy Review (2011)", in Chibuzo N. Nwoke and Ogaba Oche (eds.) *Contemporary Challenges in Nigeria, Africa and the World*. Lagos: The Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA). Pp. 131-152
- Ajayi, K (2005). "Nigeria's Foreign Policy and Image Crisis", *African Journal of Public Administration and Management*, Volume XIV (2), July, pp. 50-63
- Ajaebili, C. (2011). "The Option of Economic Diplomacy in Nigeria's Foreign Policy", *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, Volume 1 (17), Special Issue, November, pp. 277-280
- Albert, I. O. et al., (2012). *Peace, security and Development in Nigeria*, John Archers (Publishers) Limited, Ibadan p.9.
- Akinboye, S. (2013). *Beautiful Abroad but Ugly at Home: Issues and Contradictions in Nigeria's Foreign Policy* being an Inaugural Lecture delivered at University of Lagos, Nigeria, July 17th
- Ali, A. (2013). "Leadership and Socio-economic Challenges in Nigeria", *Singaporean Journal of Business Economics and Management Studies*, Volume 1 (9), pp. 1-8
- Aluko .O. (1981) "Essays On Nigerian foreign Policy. London: George Allen and Unwin Publishers
- American Psychological Association (2011) "personality" Washington DC Analysis of Obasanjo's foreign policy as military Head of State and Civilian Presidents. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, VOL3, No19, November 2013.
- Anifowose, R. and Enemuo, F. (1999). *Elements of Politics*, first Edition, Malthouse Press Limited Lagos, P. 351.
- Anofi, D. and Oluwa Segun, V. (2010), "Reps Quiz Minister over \$500 million Aviation Loan," *The Nation*, Wednesday, December 12, P.57.
- Anyaele, (2005) *Nigerian Foreign Policy in Ogo & Emakpo (eds) The Evolution of Nigeria's Foreign policy*. <http://www.shvoong.com/books/1239-evolution-nigerian-foreign-policy/#ixzz2Q7miHmtr>.
- Ate, B.E (2012) "Nigeria-US Relations: A New Partnership for Nigeria's Economic Transformation" in Thomas A. Imobighe and Warisu O. Alli (eds.) *Perspectives on Nigeria's National Politics and External Relations: Essays in Honour of Professor A. Bolaji Akinyemi*. Ibadan: University Press PLC. Pp. 301-322

- Bamiduro, J. and M. Aremu (2012). "Assessment of the need for and Effectiveness of Rebranding in Nigeria", *International Journal of Management and Administrative Sciences*, Volume 1, Number 4, January, pp. 11-22
- Business Day Editorial (2012), "Nigeria's Changing Debt Profile," *Business Day*, Monday, December 10, P. 14.
- Chukwuemeka, E., U. Bartholomew and J. Ugwu (2012). "Curbing Corruption in Nigeria: The imperatives of Good Leadership", *Singaporean Journal of Business Economics and Management Studies*, Volume 1 (1), pp. 61-81
- Egwemi, V. (2010). "Managing Nigeria's Image Crisis: Akunyili's Rebranding Programme to the Rescue?" *Current Research Journal of Economic Theory*, Vol. 2(3), pp.131-135.
- Folarin, S. F. (2013) Nigeria and the Dilemma of Global Relevance, *Foreign Policy*
- Under Military Dictatorship (1993 - 1997), *Ota Covenant Journal of Politics and International Affairs*.
- Frankel, J. (1963). *The Making of Foreign Policy* Oxford University Press, London
- Gambari. I (1989) *Theory and reality in policy making Nigeria after the first Republic*, New Jersey Humanity Press in Enigma G. E. fifty years of Nigeria's Foreign Policy: A critical Review
- Garuba, D. (2008). "Keys to facilitate the monitoring of the Spanish Foreign Policy and the International Relations in 2007 – Country Profile: Nigeria and its regional context Annex Foreign Policy", *CIDOB International Yearbook*, Barcelona: Spain
- Ikuomola, V. (2012a), "Federal Government Awards N 28 billion Contract," *The Nation*, Thursday, November 25, Pp. 1,4, 63.
- Ikuomola, V. (2012b), "Contracts Bazaar...any hope for the Poor," *The Nation*, Monday, December 3, Pp. 2-3.
- Kegley, C. W and Witt, Kopt, E. R. (1999). *World Politics, Trends and Transformation*, New York. Worth Publishers.
- Lukpata, V. (2013). "National Interest and National Development in Nigeria", *International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research (IJPAMR)*, Volume 2 (1), pp. 63-68
- Machridis, R. C. (1985). *Foreign Policy in World Politics* (Ed), Prentice-Hall. INC, Englewood Cliffs. N.J. pp. xi- xiii
- Ngara, C.O. (2013) *Personality and Nigeria's Foreign Policy, A Comparative Analysis OF Obasanjo'S Foreign Policy as Military Head of State and Civilian President*. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*.
- Northedge, F. S. (1968). *Foreign Policies of the Power*, Faber and Faers London.

- Nwankwo, O. (2013). "Shifting the Paradigm in Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Goodluck Jonathan and Nigeria's Vision 20:2020", *Social Sciences*, Volume 2 (6), pp.212-221, Science Publishing Group
- Nwankwo, O. (2013). "Shifting the Paradigm in Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Goodluck Jonathan and Nigeria's Vision 20:2020", *Social Sciences*, Volume 2 (6), pp.212-221, Science Publishing Group
- Ogwu, U. J. (1986). *Nigerian Foreign Policy Alternative Futures*, Nigerian Institute of International Affairs in Cooperation with Macmillan Nigerian Publishers Lts, Lagos, P.7
- Ojo, G. and I. Aghedo (2013). "Image Rebranding in a Fragile State: The Case of Nigeria", *The Korean Journal of Policy Studies*, Volume 28, Number 2, pp.81-107, GSPA, Seoul National University.
- Onogu, S. (2012), 'Senators Reject N 9 Billion more for VP's House, The Nation, Friday, December 7, Pp. 1, 4 and 63.
- Onyishi, T. O. & Eme, O. I. (2013). "The Presidency And Cost Of Governance In Nigeria: A Case Of Jonathan's Administration" *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review (OMAN Chapter)* Vol. 3, No.2; pp. 20-43
- Pine, A. (2011). *Nigeria Foreign Policy, 1960-2011*. Modern Ghana News, an Internet Publication. <http://www.modernghana.com/news/354233/1/>. The Guardian, (1999:29/8) on line, (<http://www.ngguardiannews.com/ editorial/en/59501.htm>).
- Rourke, J.T. (2008). *Interventional Policies on the World Stage*, New York. McGraw Hill Higher Education. Sourced from WWW. Ijhsnet. Com, international journal of Humanities and social sciences VOL 3 No19, November 2013.
- Teniola, E. (2013). *Lost in the Global Radar* The Guadian, Lagos, May 3rd, P. 5.
- The Nation Editorial (2012), "Expensive Campaign: N6.2 billion is too much to Publicise PIB" The Nation, Tuesday, December, 11, P. 19
- Transparency International (2013). *Corruption Perception Index 2013*. Retrieved from http://www.transparency.org/news/feature/cpi_2013_now_is_the_time_for_action Data accessed on 24th January, 2014
- Uhomoibhi, M. and Iweriebor, E. (2015). *The Affirmative Promotion and Administration of Nigeria Foreign Policy*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Abuja, P. 21
- Vision 2020 Report Programme, (2009) National Technical Working Group on Foreign Policy, Abjua
- Wogu, I.A., Sholarin, M.A. and Chidozie, F.C. (2015). *A Critical Evaluation of Nigeria's Foreign Policy at 53*, Research on Humanities and social sciences. Source from www.liste.org
- Yagboyaju, D. (2011). "Nigeria's Fourth Republic and the Challenge of a Faltering Democratization" *African Studies Quarterly*, Volume 12, Issue 3, Summer, pp. 93-106