

The Ecology of Public Policy: A Comparative Analysis of Nigeria's Foreign and Defence Policies Implementation in Africa

Umoh A. Kofi

Dept. of Political Science and Public Administration
University of Uyo, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria
e-mail: kofi umoh1@gmail.com

&

Cletus C. Nwadiogbu

Dept. of Political Science and Public Administration
University of Uyo, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State
e-mail: Cletus nwadiogbu@ gmail.com

Abstract

This paper examined the nature and effects of the Nigerian environment on the implementation of its foreign and defence policies. The major objectives of this endeavour were: to identify and highlight the socio-political forces impinging on foreign and defence policies implementation in Africa; and to assess the use of foreign and defence policy resources by successive Nigerian regimes in containing threats to its interests in Africa. The descriptive and focused comparative methods were adopted. Data for the study were derived mostly from existing sources such as journals, newspapers, magazines, scholarly texts, internet websites and other published materials. While realism and rational choice theories formed the bases for explication of foreign and defence policy issues, existing data were analysed qualitatively leading to contextual deductions. Findings revealed that the capacity of Nigeria's foreign and defence policies to adequately deal with threats to its interests in Africa is punctuated by prebendal politics, sectional interests and poor perception of these policies by successive Nigerian leaders. The low performances of these policies have, over time, translated into the inability of Nigeria to exude necessary power required to exact respect and reciprocal gestures from other states. From these findings, we recommended, among others, that as complements, Nigeria's foreign and defence policies should be reviewed objectively on economic and strategic considerations rather than on trivialities of Nigerian domestic environment. The Nigerian state should pursue an aggressive programme of nation-building, integration and political inclusion to achieve mental adjustment of its citizenry in order to break the barriers of ethnicity and sectional interests. Continued reliance on the present state of these policies will, in the near future, significantly diminish Nigeria's power and influence required to deal with potential threats from African and extra-African states.

Keywords: Ecology, Foreign Policy, Defence Policy, Policy Implementation, National Interest.

Introduction

Given that a typical political system is not suspended in the air but embedded in an environment, the peculiarity of the Nigerian socio-political environment has adversely impacted upon public policy making and implementation. Thus, there's no gainsaying the fact that public policies in Nigeria often appear lofty at the formulation stage but perform abysmally during implementation. This trend has been observed virtually in several policies implemented in Nigeria since independence.

Basically, it is not pedantic to attempt to interface the primary source of constraints to public policies with the consequence of Nigeria's pre-independence political antecedents. This maximally implies that at the dawn of October 1, 1960, Nigerian leaders and bureaucrats were

already consumed by the intrigues of the British colonial government which successfully bequeathed to them an insidious form of politics founded on ethnicity. In the course of nationhood, Nigerians, politicians, policy makers and implementers, over time, developed the behaviour of selfishness at the expense of public good. Latently and manifestly, an environment of tribalism, nepotism, bribery, corruption, fraud and general inefficiency was pervasively created to establish a regime of insidious, parochial and sectional politics. This vicious cycle has exerted negative consequences on the policy arena to the extent that newly recruited politicians, policy makers and implementers are encouraged by the system to internalise these unhealthy dispositions.

It is commonplace to note that in Nigeria most policies adopted by successive regimes or imported by political leaders are usually alien and sometimes imposed by international regimes like IMF, World Bank, international intergovernmental or supra-national organisations. Such policies, however lofty and intelligently crafted, suffer serious setbacks, especially, when the Nigerian factor (environment) impinges on it. At formulation stage, policy makers, who represent a special elite class, do well to ensure that their latent intents, selfish, kith and kin as well as sectional interests are tactically knitted into policies. During implementation on the other hand, policy implementers exploit available loop-holes to circumvent the process for personal and sectional aggrandizement against public interests. The consequences of these deviant behaviours in the policy arena invaluablely create a wide gap and total disconnect between policy formulation and implementation.

In a nutshell, while Chapters I (Sections 5(4a-b), 5) and 12(1, 3) and Chapter II (Sections 14 (2a-b) and 19 a-g) of the 1999 Constitution expressly provide for the implementation of Nigeria's foreign policy, Sections (217:1), (217: 2a-b), (5:4b) and 5(5) relate with the defence policy of Nigeria. Though intertwined and complementary, Nigeria's foreign and defence policies are no exceptions or immune from the hydra-headed monster of the Nigerian policy environment. The problems of these policies appear even more broadly compounded by the same environmental realities which also shape and determine other policies. For instance, Nigeria's foreign policy which has fundamentally remained the same since independence (though with minor modification) has left successive regimes either playing dangerous politics, paying lips service, confused about what constitute national interests or making questionable claims of policy achievements (Kofi, 2015). Basically, while foreign policy should be systematically designed due to its nature of being an objectively patterned activity with consciously prescribed modus operandi, the defence policy should unequivocally serve the locus for mustering military resources to protect territorial integrity, foster national security, as well as preserve what is presumed, vital national interests and prestige. These are usually so designed to be implemented with due diligence and unwavering commitment irrespective of the regime in power. Unfortunately, the implementation of these policies sometimes appear absurd and complicated due to ecological forces which largely dictate and constrain them. These existing constraining forces include ethnicity, corruption, impunity combined with regimes' obscured interpretation of what constitutes national interests, undue power tussle, idiosyncratic variables of political leaders and their world view.

Given the foregoing trends, issues of ethical concerns, public interests, objectivity and expertise which ought to guide policy implementation for general good and development, are, till date, often relegated to the background. It can be argued that the dismal performance of Nigeria's foreign and defence policies implementation is largely a function of the above-cited ecological constraints. However, this paper examines the extent to which the environment of policy implementation impacts on the performances of Nigeria's foreign and defence policies with the aid of major specific policy issue areas which serve as our litmus tests.

Conceptual Review

Foreign Policy

Foreign policy is viewed, conceptualised and interpreted in similar but variegated ways. Though multi-pronged and eclectic, foreign policy, in clear terms, serves a blueprint that expresses how a nation conducts and manages its relations with the outside world. Thus, Handrieder (1967:197) conceptualises foreign policy as “a coordinated strategy with which institutionally designated decision makers in a country seek to manipulate the international environment in order to achieve certain national objectives”. Thus, the environment of foreign policy comprises officially designated and recognised persons who are well versed with the art of manipulating the external variables for domestic advantages

In line with Handrieder, Rosenau (1971:241) views foreign policy as “series of discrete decisions and deliberate or purposive actions of government directed at the outside world”. Instructively, foreign policy is pre-determined, planned and directed to be goal-oriented. For Vital (1968:49), foreign policy is nothing but “...executive prerogative preserve” implying that it falls within the purview of the executive arm of government which largely influences and determines it. In Pratt's (1965:1) perspective, it comprises those “objectives that a nation seeks in its international relation and the means and the methods by which it pursues them”. According to Holsti (1992:82), foreign policy encapsulates ideas or actions designed by policy makers to solve a problem or promote some change in policies, attitudes or actions of another state or states...in international economy or physical environment of the world. Deductions from Pratt and Holsti assertions go to assert that foreign policy is systematically and deliberately pursued to achieve pre-announced goals.

Similar to Vital (1968) and Handrieder (1967), Rosenau (1967:34) posits that foreign policy is conducted by a distinct group of official and non-official elites distinguishable from other public officials in terms of their remoteness from the general public and the specialised role they play. Again from the perspective of Northedge (1974:12, 19), foreign policies are “...products of interaction between pressures internal and external to the state... the totality of the country's stake in the prevailing international system...” Here, the presupposition is that the external behaviour of a state is largely conditioned by domestic realities or pressures. Typical of these internal pressures was the abolition of Anglo-Nigeria Defence Pact with Britain in 1962.

On the other hand, Morgenthau (1978:5) inextricably links foreign policy with national interest as “one guiding star, one standard for thought (and) one rule for action” which leads statesmen to set national priorities. This further implies that foreign policy is an embodiment of national interests defined in terms of “the welfare of individuals and groups organised as a national society – security, sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence, economic development, enhanced status and national prestige”. To this end, foreign policy is a systematic course of action which is an embodiment of national interests, the means and methods for combining elements of national power for the achievement of set objectives.

Defence/National Interests/Security

Defence, national interests and national security are somewhat intertwined, complementary, eclectic and multi-dimensional, making it difficult to separate same into strands. These terms are so entangled like spiders' mesh or entangled strands with lots of nuances of expression, hence, the inability of scholars to clearly operationalise same without ambiguity.

As Asobie (1992:10) posits, “interests defined as power gives continuity and unity to seemingly diverse foreign policies of widely separated states and, at the same time, makes the evaluation of

the actions of statesmen at different point in history possible”. Basically, foreign policy has been widely acclaimed by scholars to be significantly shaped by national interests and largely determined by the perception and idiosyncratic variables of those in the policy environment. For instance, out of the fifteen (15) papers presented at a national seminar organised by the Ministry of Defence in 1988, eleven (11) interpreted defence and national security to mean Nigeria's foremost national interests (Asobie, 1992). It implies that if foreign policy is largely tailored by national interests interpreted to mean national security, political leaders can determine what constitutes national interests, whether right or wrong.

Generally, security remains one of the most valuable currencies for social existence. Every human formation desires some valuable degree of freedom from threats, the need to be independent, thrive economically, politically and otherwise undistracted and unperturbed. Bearing in mind that various forms of security such as food security, social security, industrial security, among others, exist, attention of most people are often drawn to physical security. This is why scholars like Brennen (1961:22) conceptualised national security as “the protection of national survival” which of course, is corroborated by Neuchterlein's (1973) conception of national survival instincts (interests) of states:

As a term that embodies the broad spectrum of the state, defence and national security become “...the aggregate of the security interests of all individuals, communities, ethnic groups, political entities and institutions that inhabit the territory...” (Azazi, 2011:92). Just as Neuchterlein's survival interests, vital interests is also regarded as major embodiment of national security given that it involves:

- i) self-preservation-maintenance of sovereignty and integrity;
- ii) defence of a country's independence; and
- iii) ensuring (socio-economic) wellbeing of the people (Nweke, 2012).

In a similar tune, Akpuru-Aja (2009) opines that national security provides the guarantee that a nation would not lose its sovereignty, independence and national interests of core values. Considering the forgoing perceptions and views, Bassey (1992:229-230), on the contrary, argues that:

Notwithstanding the imperatives of national security which include protection of life, property and economic resources of the country, the dominant “realist” conception (state centric) of security is largely anachronistic. This is so because any conception of security which ignores the broader existential or functional matrix (contextual and convergent) of the strategic environment is at best myopic

The above position therefore brings us to our concern that defence and national security are incontestably complex terrains because they encapsulate all aspects of social existence. In other words, security cannot be exhaustively operationalised without organically linking same to the society “since the setting of social relationship – including economic, technology, and human geography – shape the terms and parameters of states' security” (Bassey, 1992:230).

However, within the context of this study, Defence involves national security, the capacity of the Nigerian state to maintain and protect its domain, citizens, resources and integrity from internally or externally generated threats masterminded, directly or indirectly. It represents freedom from threats (physical, psychological or pre-emptive) enjoyed by the state which in both the short and long-run, will snowball into socio-political and economic stability – currencies for sustainable development (Kofi, 2015).

Theoretical Underpinnings

This paper adopts the theories of realism and neo-realism to explicate Nigeria's foreign and defence policies' dilemma. Classical realists like Thucydides, Niccolo Machiavelli, Hans Morgenthau, George Kennan, Reinhold Niebuhr, among others, developed and articulated the theory of realism. These scholars' interests were generated from their belief in the weird nature of humans, their selfishness and insatiable quest for power, which adversely affect statecraft, politics and the conduct of diplomacy. Veritable and typical trajectories that promoted realist obsession about international politics are the failure of idealism and penultimate outbreak of World War II which proved the belief in international system as a web of cooperation and rational decision making wrong.

Basically divergent in some gray areas, realists are unanimous in their assumption that politics and international system are perpetually anarchical and calamitous because conflicts and wars are engraved in human unrepentant quest for power (Waltz, 1979). In other words, international politics is said to be characterised by “high politics” given the centrality of the object of power as the currency for inter-state relations. In this wise, Machiavelli (1970:1) maintains that while engaging in politics, one must be circumspect and conscious of the fact that “all men are wicked and that they will always give vent to malignity that is in their minds when opportunity offers”. Corroborating this position, Morgenthau (1965) cited in Sorenson, 2007 avers that politics is characterised by pessimism about human behaviour, increasing self-centredness and changing interests. This implies that the natural character of humans also affects political leaders in the policy arena who exhibit the propensity to use statecraft in carrying out preemptive actions against other states. For this reason, states should be apprehensive, wary and hence, continually increase their military capacity for survival.

Given that ethics of international system conditioned by the weird character of states is different from private morality, Morgenthau (1973:9) posits that “...universal moral principles cannot be applied to the actions of state”. Kennan (1985), in the same direction, opines that governments owe their national societies the obligation of protecting their interests without recourse to morality. Also consolidating this position, Machiavelli (1972) asserts that political leaders have greater responsibilities than private citizens and so do not require morality to act when circumstances arise. A good state leader must strive to respond adequately to external stimuli, irrespective of moral consideration provided his action protects and promotes national interests.

However, since realism is inadequate in serving veritable frame for explaining the character, dynamics and nature of international system, we also resort to neo-realism. While realism views international politics as “high politics”, neo-realism presupposes same to be characterised by both “low and high politics”. The central thesis of neorealism is founded on the conception that the international system is not constantly in conflict as the realists believe but could sometimes be congenial with marked cooperation. Notable neorealists include Robert Keohane (1984/1989) and Robert Axelrod (1984). The duo developed three basic assumptions thus: the international system is anarchical; states are rationally egoistic; rational egoists (states) can cooperate in anarchical environment.

Realism and neo-realism which serve our theoretical frameworks present an expose of the challenges and tasks ahead of foreign and defence policies of states. In the case of Nigeria, the environmental factors have, ab-initio, diluted and weakened the potency of its foreign and defence policies. Secondly, influenced by intrigues and politics of the domestic environment, political leaders have been obsessed with implementing an out-dated Afro-centric policy, policy of good neighbourliness and “African Big Brother” without having clear understanding of the dynamics of realism and neorealism in international politics.

Against this backdrop, successive regimes in Nigeria have been hiding under the pretext of making Africa the centre-piece of their foreign policy demonstrated in substantial economic, financial and technical aids to African states, especially, its immediate neighbours. In return for this show of magnanimity since independence in 1960, there have been hostilities, conflicts, distrust and suspicion. Foreign and defence policies should be devoid of trivialities, sentiments and blind morality and as Morgenthau (1970:382) notes, “the actions of states are determined not by moral principles and moral commitment but by consideration of interests and power”. Available record shows that Nigeria's foreign and defence policies resources could not effectively contain most sabotages and preemptive attacks by African states like Chad, Cameroun, Benin Republic, Ghana, among others. The present Afrocentric and defence policies have turned Nigeria into a weakling and a toothless bull dog given the spate of unresolved challenges and worsening relations with African states.

Constitutional Foundations of Nigeria's Foreign and Defence policies

Section 19(a-e) of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999 expressly provides for Nigeria's foreign policy objectives thus:

- a) promotion and protection of the national interest;
- b) promotion of African integration and support for African Unity;
- c) promotion of international co-operation for the consolidation of universal peace and mutual respect among all nations and elimination of discrimination in all its manifestation;
- d) respect for international law and treaty obligations as well as seeking the settlement of international disputes by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration and adjudication; and
- e) promotion of a just world economic order.

On the other hand, it is pertinent to state that Nigeria never had a defence policy until 2004. Instructively therefore, it is worthy to note that the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999 provided the roadmap to the present defence policy. In this regard, Section (217:1) provides for the establishment of armed forces consisting of “an Army, a Navy, an Air Force and such other branches of the armed forces of the Federation as may be established by an Act of the National Assembly”. Again, Section 217(2a-b) further states, in the main that “the Federation shall, subject to an Act of the National Assembly made in that behalf, equip and maintain the armed forces as maybe considered adequate and effective for purposes of”:

- a. Defending Nigeria from external aggression
- b. Maintaining its territorial integrity and securing its borders from violation on land, sea or air;
- c. Suppressing insurrections and acting in aid of civil authorities to restore order when called upon to do so ...; and
- d. Performing such other functions as may be prescribed by an Act of National Assembly.

Giving direction to Nigeria's defence policy implementation is Section 5 (5) of the 1999 Constitution which clearly states in the main that:

...the President, in consultation with the National Defence Council, may deploy members of the armed forces of the Federation on a limited combat duty outside Nigeria if he is satisfied that the national security is under imminent threat or danger: Provided that the President shall, within seven days of actual combat engagement, seek the consent of the Senate and the Senate shall thereafter give or refuse the said consent within 14 days”. Again, “the President shall not declare a state of war between the federation and another country except with the sanction of a resolution of both Houses of the National Assembly sitting in a joint session” (Section 5, sub-section

4a); and “except the prior approval of the Senate, no member of the armed forces of the federation shall be deployed on combat duty outside Nigeria (Section 5, subsection 4b).

Instructively therefore, the President is explicitly barred from taking unilateral decisions relating to military engagement outside Nigeria, even on shortest term, without consultation with the National Defence Council while full ratification of the National Assembly is required by constitution in the event of prosecution of war. Having undergone several reviews, the content of the classified document is known only to the military establishments and the President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria who is empowered by the constitution to act as Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces. Incidentally, major highlights of the reviewed Nigeria's National Defence Policy, according to Umaru (2011:52), centres around the following:

- a. Strategic Review;
- b. Risk and Challenges;
- c. Strategic Response;
- d. Defence Management and Organisation;
- e. Resource Support; and
- f. Civil-Military Relation.

Expressly instructive from several reviews since 2004, is an indication of compounded constraints to an effective defence policy implementation arising from a mix of its official environment and the broad social setting. As an extremely classified policy, lack of public input apparently accounts for its incessant reviews unequivocally implying that it is grossly inadequate in content and capacity.

Nigeria's Foreign and Defence Policies: The Nexus and Divergence

While foreign policy remains extremely broad, it shapes and complements the defence policy configuring same within its broadsheet. Foreign policy as a broadsheet provides the methodologies for actualizing the defence policy in terms of:

- i) Using diplomacy to rally allies and isolate threats;
- ii) Maintaining effective armed forces;
- iii) Implementing civil defence emergency preparedness measures (including anti-terrorism legislation);
- iv) Ensuring intelligence services to detect or avoid threats and espionage, and to protect classified information; and
- v) Using intelligence services or secret police to protect the nation from internal conflicts (Azazi, 2011:93).

Basically Nigeria's foreign and defence policies are however interdependent and interconnected, indicating a great deal of similarities with differences thus:

Similarities	Differences
The raison d'être of Nigeria's foreign and defence policies are to protect national interests, maintain sovereignty and enhance national security for survival	While Nigeria's foreign policy was formulated at independence in 1960, the defence policy came to limelight in 2004.
These are twin towers that serve as cornerstones for state's action towards the domestic and external environment.	Foreign policy is broader, wider in scope and context than the defence policy. The defence policy is an important component of foreign policy.
Both policies recognize war as instrument of national policy. Therefore, the President by 1999 Constitution, in conjunction with the National Assembly and National Defence Council, can declare war.	While foreign policy amasses all known resources, be it political, economic, human or social, defence policy places premium on the use of military resources to achieve set objectives.
Both policies inextricably link the domestic with the external environment and vice-versa.	Nigeria's foreign policy is an open document while the defence policy is highly classified.
Both policies exploit the internal and external environment to achieve national stability and development.	In the foreign policy environment, principal actors are civilians while military officers, except the President, dominate the defence arena.
Military foreign policy is an integral part of the broader foreign policy.	Foreign policy has undergone less review than defence policy since 1960 and 2004 respectively.

Source: Author's Deductions

The foregoing are pointers to the fact that foreign and defence policies contain wide ranging elements that are sine qua non to the survival of any nation whether susceptible or not to internal and external threats. Foreign policy is said to provide a level playing field for exhausting standard diplomatic practices, same policy identifies war as instrument of national policy, if compelled, in the protection of national vital interests. Thus, national security finds expression in national interests as encapsulated in defence policy domiciled in foreign policy.

The Environment of Nigeria's Foreign and Defence Policies Implementation

Discourse on the environment of Nigeria's foreign and defence policies implementation takes two major perspectives, namely: the institutional and social settings. Thus, the interplay of official environment of these policies with pluralistic social matrix impinge on and as well, form the bases of state's action towards the inside and outside world.

First, a cursory look at the official environment of foreign policy implementation indicates that a large number of technocrats of diverse orientations interact at different levels to advise, interpret and implement Nigeria's foreign policy. These officials put together enhance "institutional

pluralism, divided responsibilities and political coordination at the highest administrative and political levels” (Akindele, 1990:107). Characteristically, in the present democratic dispensation, the President and Ministry of Foreign Affairs remain the epicenter of foreign policy implementation. The Ministries of Trade, Finance, Petroleum Resources, among others, which also perform implementation and advisory functions based on competence and jurisdiction, are coordinated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Second, the onus of implementing the defence policy lies with the President who is the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces and the Ministry of Defence. This implies that the officials of the defence policy environment are mostly military personnel and a small number of civilians (technocrats).

However, in the event of implementing foreign or defence policy, the President brings to bear his powers as enshrined in the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999. Though implementation processes are routinised, leadership styles, idiosyncrasies and personal interests of actors in foreign and defence policies environment maximally affect implementation. These vividly explain the sources of conflicts between the National Assembly and the President, policy outcomes and policy performance.

On a wider scale, the nature of the Nigerian society, to a large extent, determines “what to implement, how to implement and the interest to satisfy”. Stressing the primacy of social sources of states' action, Rosenau (1967:172) opined that:

...the composition structure and operation of a society are particularly relevant to the formulation or conduct of its foreign policies to the extent that what transpires within the society has a great deal of bearing on the conduct of its policies and its capacity to implement these policies.

The above is indicative of the impact of Nigeria's multicultural environment in constraining the development of the political will required to guide the conduct of foreign and defence policies. As Nweke (1992:37) points out, “cultural, social and structural pluralism” that characterises Nigeria domestic setting impinges on its foreign and defence policies in the sense that:

A diversity of beliefs, customs, values and roles constitute the condition of perpetual and institutional differences among Nigerians, especially those in public and decision making roles. Thus, each ethnic and religious group tends to define its position in political life in the context of its materials interests, ethno-religious identity and personality stereotypes. Here, the basic problem is identification more with the ethnic group within the country and with co-religionists outside the country...

By these ethno-linguistic, religious and cultural influences, appointment into key ministries of foreign affairs, defence and related establishments sometimes visibly manifest some sort of selective and ethno-religious sentiments. In the same vein, postings and promotions take similar pattern implying that implementation of policies in these important establishments invariably promote certain interests which are likely to be at variance with national interests. For instance, the 2017 recruitment into the Department of State Services (DSS), an establishment which has important link with foreign/defence policy environment was glaringly lop-sided, indicative of ethnic sentiments, interests and preferences of political leaders without recourse to equity, national spread and Federal Character Principles. Available record shows the recruitment of Cadets by state in Nigeria thus:

Table 2: Distribution of Cadet Recruitment into DSS by states in Nigeria

State	No. of Cadets	Geo-political Zone
Abia	07	Southeast
Adamawa	19	Northeast
Akwa Ibom	05	Southsouth
Anambra	10	Southeast
Bauchi	23	Northcentral
Bayelsa	07	Southsouth
Benue	09	Northcentral
Borno	16	Northeast
Cross River	09	Southsouth
Delta	08	Southsouth
Ebonyi	07	Southeast
Edo	06	Southsouth
Ekiti	12	Southwest
Enugu	09	Southeast
Gombe	14	Northeast
Imo	11	Southeast
Jigawa	14	Northeast
Kaduna	24	Northwest
Kano	25	Northwest
Katsina*	51	Northwest
Kebbi	16	Northwest
Kogi	11	Northcentral
Kwara	13	Northcentral
Lagos	07	Southwest
Nassarawa	11	Northcentral

State	No. of Cadets	Geo-political Zone
Niger	11	Northcentral
Ogun	08	Southwest
Ondo	09	Southwest
Osun	19	Southwest
Oyo	11	Southeast
Plateau	09	Northcentral
Rivers	07	Southsouth
Sokoto	15	Northwest
Taraba	16	Northeast
Yobe	12	Northeast
Zamfara	20	Northwest
Federal Capital Territory (FCT)	07	Northcentral

Source: Tell Magazine, May 15, 2017: 18

Table 2 reveals that the state of origin (Katsina) and Geopolitical zone (Northwest) of President Buhari and Director-General of DSS (Lawal Daura) had 51 and 167 recruited cadets respectively, being the highest. This is followed by Northeast Geopolitical zone (100) with the President wife's state (Adamawa) having the highest slot of 19 while the three (3) Southern Geopolitical zones (Southwest-57, Southeast-44 and Southsouth-42) were altogether allocated 143 slots. Instructively, states in the southern zones, especially, Akwa Ibom (the second largest oil revenue producing state was allocated 5 slots) are grossly marginalised and alienated from the Nigerian project. This scenario is a microcosm of the social reality of internalised psyche of personal and sectional aggrandizement that traverses all aspects of life in the Nigerian state. Given the manifest consequence of this social malady on the foreign and defence policies implementation, immense moral burden is placed on Nigerian leaders and policy implementers.

Having pervasively permeated and assumed the beacon of social foundations, ethnicity, nepotism and favouritism have been propagated and internalised by Nigerian citizens including leaders and policy implementers. This peculiar scenario, by implication, has created obsessions that typically render the original precepts and essence of public policies including Nigerian foreign and defence policies undoubtedly obscure. Under this circumstance, Nigerian leaders and policy implementers are compelled by social forces to consciously and/or unconsciously confuse parochial and sectional interests for public interests. This informs the rationale behind their confusion, delay and inaction when the Nigerian state's interests are threatened by external forces. Some ugly incidents that serve as litmus tests for Nigeria's foreign and defence Policies are shown thus:

Table 3: Nigeria's Foreign and Defence Policies at Work

State	Nature of Threat	Nigeria's Policy Responses
Equatorial Guinea	<p>Obnoxious labour policy, maltreatment and killing of Nigerians up to 1985.</p> <p>The covert plan of the government of Equatorial Guinea to allow Biafra and Apartheid South Africa to use its territory as base for military and strategic purposes against Nigeria in 1967 and early 1987 respectively.</p>	<p>Air-lifting of Nigerians. The Gowon's military admin. fostered closer relations as strategy to forestall future external use of the territory since it has exclusive maritime boundary with Nigeria.</p>
Cameroun	<p>The ambush and killing of five Nigerian soldiers at Iking, Cross River State by Camerounian Gendarmes in May 1981.</p> <p>The abduction and torture of six Nigerians by Camerounian Garndames in 1991.</p> <p>Incessant harassment, torture and killing of Nigerians of the oil rich Bakassi Peninsula extraction prior to and after the ceding of the region to Cameroun by the International Court of Justice.</p>	<p>The Shagari (civilian) and Babangida military administrations dispatched the military to disputed areas to deter intruders.</p> <p>Harassment and killing of Nigerians continues unabated till date. No concrete action by Nigerian govt.</p>
Chad	<p>Attempted illegal occupation of Nigeria Island of Lake Chad by Chadian forces in 1983.</p>	<p>The Buhari military govt. swiftly drafted soldiers to recover the disputed territory but associated issues still persists till date.</p>
Cameroun, Chad, Benin and Niger Republics	<p>Various trans -border crimes masterminded by some of Nigeria's immediate neighbours.</p> <p>Alleged negative role against integrative efforts in the ECOWAS sub-region</p>	<p>No long term measures except for periodic closure of borders during upsurge in trans -border crimes by erstwhile Obasanjo and present administration of Buhari.</p> <p>Nigerian govt. is totally handicapped in dealing with these countries especially due to its cultural affinity with them and their relations with France</p>

South Africa	Strained relations resulting in xenophobic attacks and killing of Nigerians	Crisis has receded but unresolved. Concrete policy action yet to be taken except for controversial air -lifting of Nigerians back home.
Ghana	Maltreatment of Nigerians/Bulldozing Nigerian Embassy extension building/obnoxious tax policies on Nigerian businesses	Action yet to be taken/ongoing
General Threats	Ongoing destruction of gargantuan national resources, both human and material, through unabated suicide bombings, brutal killings and abductions by Boko Haram. General ill-treatment of Nigerians in diaspora	Despite Nigerian military engagement and claims of technically defeating Boko Haram, attacks and killings still persist. Nigerians are still ill - treated around the world yet no concrete action from government.

Source: Author's Deductions, Daily Times, 31 May, 1981:1 and Kofi, 2015:691-692

From the foregoing, the Federal Government of Nigeria, Military or civilian, has either acted swiftly but temporarily in some cases like the Chadian incursion into Nigerian territory, others simply become bereft of ideas or develop “cold feet”. Actions or inactions to threats from African states explicitly depend on the extent to which downward trajectories of the Nigerian domestic environment have influenced the regime in power. Put clearly, the inefficacy of Nigerian foreign/defence policy resources in dealing with issue areas, from our deductions, are functions of ethnic hegemony on foreign and defence policies apparatus, regime's interpretation of what constitutes national interests and the leadership style of the political leader in power. In most cases, the reliance on opinion of ethnic group in power rather than general public opinion determines the line of action to be taken by the statecraft against perceived threats.

Conclusion

Having examined the fundamental issues surrounding Nigeria's foreign and defence policies implementation, it become expressively instructive to note that successive regimes in Nigeria have either treaded cautiously, timidly, confused or applied a bit of military force in some perceived assault on its national security (especially on border encroachment or incursion). These behaviours are significantly contingent upon four major factors: First, the policy environment of ethnicity, disaffection and favouritism bequeathed to Nigeria by the British colonial government, over time, propagated parochial sentiments and values that have correspondingly affected the implementation of Nigeria's foreign policy. Second, Nigeria's foreign policy has outlived its usefulness especially in an age of complex politico-economic order. Nigeria's foreign policy was vibrant in the immediate post-1960 period, a time when global obsession was to eradicate colonialism, apartheid and all forms of slavery. Third, having internalised primordial values of the social system, policy implementers in Nigeria become predisposed to consciously adjusting policy directions to suit their personal and sectional interests. Fourth, officials, who by favouritism or nepotism find themselves in the policy arena, often confuse personal and sectional interests for national interests.

By the above psyche therefore, while some successive Nigerian regimes have laid claims to having robust policies, others pay lip service to the claims of attaining regional power status yet get confused or fail to act when its citizens in diaspora are tortured, maimed, humiliated and eventually killed. For instance, past and present regimes in Nigeria, from the Tafawa Balewa to date, have done very little to protect the lives of its citizens in diaspora. From humiliation and killings in Malabo (1960s and 1970s) to the present horrendous killings of Nigerians in Bakassi Peninsula and some parts of Asia and xenophobic attacks in South Africa, the highest effort of Nigerian government has been crisis-ridden air-lifting exercises.

The above pathetic scenario brings to fore the conclusion that Nigeria's foreign and defence policies, have without equivocation, performed abysmally in view of several unresolved issues, some of which arose since independence. These policies lack the capacity to protect its citizens in diaspora. It is therefore paradoxical and of course contradictory for Nigeria to continue to parade itself as the giant of Africa and regional power when fellow African states, even weaker ones, continually threaten its national interests and integrity with impunity. However, Nigeria's image and influence are already waning among comity of states in the West African sub-region, Continental Africa and the world.

Recommendations

To reverse this trend, the following recommendations are made:

1. Nigerian government should, as a matter of contingency, revive, strengthen and effectively fund existing orientation agencies to aggressively educate, mobilize and re-orientate its citizens in order to stem the tide of ethnicity.
2. Nigerian government should fundamentally redesign its foreign and defence policies in line with current global realities, strategic partnership and economic considerations rather than on primordial and sectional interests.
3. The present Afrocentric policy, “big brother mentality” and policy of good neighbourliness should be re-constructed on “give-and-take bases” not on clueless humanitarian considerations and morality.
4. Nigerian government should vigorously seek to achieve stable domestic environment, sound economy, strong military, productive population, among others, to exude power and influence among comity of nations.
5. Nigerian citizens should, on their part, demand from government an enabling environment that will help them to participate effectively in the making of public policies.

References

- Akindele, R. (1990). The Formulation and Implementation of Nigeria's External Economic Policy: Institutional Structures and Processes. In: G. O. Olusanya and R. A. Akindele eds. *Foreign Policy Making and Implementation in Nigeria*. Lagos: NIIA and Vantage Publishers Int'l Ltd.
- Akpuru-Aja, A. (2009). *Policy and Strategic Studies*. Abakaliki: Willyrose and Appleseed Publishing Company.
- Aluko, O. (1981). *Essays on Nigeria's Foreign Policy*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Asobie, A. A. (1992). Decision-Making Models Revisited: An Analysis of the Application of Theories and Models of Foreign Policy Decision Making to the Study of Nigeria's Foreign Policy. In: B. E. Ate and B. A. Akinterinwa eds. *Nigeria and Its Immediate Neighbours: Constraints and Prospects of Sub-regional Security in the 1990s*, Lagos: NIIA. 10p.
- Axelrod, R. (1984). *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books
- Azazi, A. O. (2011). National Security and Defence. In: C. O. Bassey and C. Q. Dokubo eds., *Defence Policy of Nigeria: Capability and Context – A Reader*. Bloomington: Author House, 2011. 92p.
- Bassey, C. O. (1992). Defence and Strategic Policy in Nigeria's Relations with Its Immediate Neighbours. In: B. E. Ate and B. A. Akinterinwa eds. *Nigeria and Its Immediate Neighbours: Constraints and Prospect of Sub-regional Security in the 1990s*, Lagos: NIIA. 230p.
- Brennen, S. (1961). Foreign Policy. *Nigerian Journal of Social Sciences* (NJSS) Vol. 8 No.2 June 2
- Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999.
- Daily Times, "Editorials" Lagos, May 30, 1961.
- Daily Times, 31 May, 1981, Nweke (1981) and the Pioneer, May 27-June 2 In: B. E. Ate and B. A. Akinterinwa eds. *Nigeria and its Immediate Neighbours: Constraints and Prospects of Sub-Regional Security in the 1990s*. Lagos: NIIA.
- Gambari, I. (2004). *Obasanjo and the New Face of Nigerian Foreign Policy*. Kaduna: M. O. D. Publishers.
- Handrieder, W. F. (1967). Compatibility and Consensus: A Proposal for the Conceptual Linkage of External and Internal Dimensions of Foreign Policy. *American Political Science Review* CXL(4)971.
- Hassan, A. S. (1991). *Selected Themes in Nigeria's Foreign Policy and International Relations*. Ilorin: Haytee Books.
- Holsti, K, J, (1992). *International Politics: A Framework for Analysis*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India,
- Kennan, G. F. (1985). Morality and Foreign Policy. *Foreign Affairs*, 63
- Keohane, R. O. (1984). After Hegemony. In: Chris Brown and Kirsten Ainley *Understanding International Relations*. New York: Palgrave Mcmillan
- Keohane, R. O. (1989) International Institutions and State Power. In: Chris Brown and Kirsten Ainley *Understanding International Relations*. New York: Palgrave Mcmillan

- Kofi, U. (2015). Foreign Policy and National Security Constraints: Focus on Nigeria's Immediate Neighbours. In: Celestine Oyom Bassey and Uno Ijim Agbor eds. *Public Policy and Politics in Nigeria: A Critical Discourse*. Lagos: Concept Publications Ltd.
- Machiavelli, N. (1970). The Discourses. In: Scott Burchill et al eds. *Theories of International Relations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Machiavelli, N. (1972). The Prince. In: Scott Burchill et al eds. *Theories of International Relations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Morgenthau, H. (1965). Politics Among Nations In: Jackson, R. and Sorensen, G. *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Morgenthau, H. (1970). Truth and Power: Essays of a Decade. In: Scott Burchill et al eds. *Theories of International Relations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Morgenthau, H. (1972). Politics in the Twentieth Century: A Critical Examination of American Foreign Policy. In: Scott Burchill et al eds. *Theories of International Relations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Morgenthau, H. (1978) Politics Among Nations. Alfred Knopf, New York.
- Northedge, F. S. (1974). *The Foreign Policies of the Powers*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Nuechterlein, D. (1973). *United States National Interests in Changing World*. Kentucky: University Press.
- Nweke, A (2012). Nigeria's National Interests and Foreign Policy. In: Okon Eminue and M. Dickson, "Boko Haram and National Security Challenges, 2009-2012" *African Journal of Culture, Philosophy and Society*, 1(2):26
- Nweke, G. A. (1992). External Intervention in Africa Conflicts: France and Franco Speaking West Africa in the Nigerian Civil War, 1967-1970. In: B. E. Ate and B. A. Akinterinwa eds. *Nigeria and its Immediate Neighbours: Constraints and Prospects of Sub-regional Security in the 1990s*. Lagos: NIIA
- Olusanya, G. O. and Akindele, R. A. (1986). (eds.) *Nigeria's External Relations: The First Twenty-Five Years*. Ibadan: University Press.
- Pratt, J. W. (1965). *A History of the United States Foreign Policy*. Eaglewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Rosenau, A. (1967) *Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy*. New York: The Free Press.
- Tell Magazine "Oddities at Daura's DSS" May 15, 2017, 18p.
- Umaru, N. (2011). Formulation and Implementation of Defence Policy. In: C. O. Bassey and C. Q. Dokubo eds., *Defence Policy of Nigeria: Capability and Context – A Reader*. Bloomington: Author House, 2011. 52p.
- Vital, D. (1968). *The Making of British Foreign Policy*. London: Macmillan.
- Waltz, K (1979). Theory of International Politics. In: Hillary Ekenam *Theories of International Relations: from Classical Realism to Globalism*. Lagos AMBIX Publishers.