

Foreign Policy in an Era of Globalization: The Need for Nigeria to Refocus Its Priority

Hakeem Olatunji Tijani

Research Fellow, Social and Governance Policy Research Department, Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research (NISER), Oyo Road, Ojoo, Ibadan, Nigeria

Abstract

Globalization has undoubtedly brought some challenges such as polarization of wealth and poverty, elongation of gap between the North (Developed countries) and South (Developing countries), and erosion of part of powers and activities of the nation-states, it has therefore become imperative for states in the South including Nigeria to reassess its relations with other national governments and transnational actors as international organization and multinational corporations. This is with a view to repositioning itself for these challenges. In an era of globalization, these challenges have unnaturally downplayed multilateralism and in its stead uplifted unilateralism. This is because globalization has heralded such phenomena as marketization and territorialization. It has also evolved strong competition among nation-states. The onus is now on the states in the South including Nigeria to respond to these challenges. Again, such happenings in the international arena as nuclearism, Islamic fundamentalism and climate change phenomenon, which have wider implications for developing country as Nigeria have meant that Nigeria should refocus and reformulate its foreign policy purely from its national interests rather than through the prism of African-centered policy. The paper concludes that the polymorphism of events has made it imperative for Nigeria to work out a counteractive foreign policy that is capable of meeting the challenges posed by globalization.

Keywords: Globalization, Nigeria, Foreign Policy, Domestic Factors, External Factors

1. Introduction

With big problems as terrorism, climate change, religious fanaticism, *nuclearism* and *globalization impactism*¹ confronting developing country as Nigeria in the international arena in an era of globalization, it has become imperative for national governments to refocus their foreign policy in order to address these challenges. Thus, Nigeria, a developing country is in need of a refocused foreign policy in order to react to and proactively formulate policies against these problems. This is imperative as such phenomena as *denationalization*² and *de- and re-statization*³, to borrow from Jessop (2003), are devised for states to meet the challenges posed by globalization. This is necessitated by the dynamic nature of the contemporary international politics that comprises a whole series of problems mentioned above acting at the same time, but do not operate in the same direction. Again, for the reason that globalization has created two unequal worlds by polarizing wealth and poverty and making the rich countries become richer and the poor ones poorer (Aluko, 2000, Tooze, 1997:223, Thomas, 1997:456), it has become imperative for scholars of international relations especially experts on foreign policy to ponder on how to tone down the impacts of these challenges. This is because the impacts of globalization in the daily lives of the states, as evident in long-drawn-out state interconnectedness through increased global connectivity, especially in communication, readily expose states to the myriad of these happenings at the international arena.

Much as globalization has helped in bridging the gap between the developed countries and the less developed ones in such areas as removal of barriers in trades, information, and human mobility, with a view to mitigating the effect of these happenings on the developing countries including Nigeria, it has failed in making these countries grasp development. Even when a regional approach as the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), which is a replica of the European Union that is of significant contribution to the

¹*Globalization impactism* in this paper connotes the ambivalence of globalization as typified by the polarization of wealth and poverty. The 'ism' connotes the positive and negative impacts of globalization, which polarizes the North and the South. *Globalization impactism* signifies the benefits accruing to the developed countries at the expense of the developing ones. While the wealth of the developed countries increases and simultaneously reduces its poverty; ironically, in the developing countries, wealth is seriously decreasing, this consequently increases the poverty profile.

² Bob Jessop's piece *The Future of the State in an era of Globalisation*, explains the denationalization of statehood as the transfer of power previously located at the national territorial realm upwards to supra-regional or international body as the United Nations. At the downward level, power is transferred to the regional or local states and outwards to cross-national alliances. All of these points to making states formulate policies that can make states capable of meeting the challenges posed by globalization.

³ De- and Re-Statization, according to Bob Jessop's piece means transferring, or sharing the activities hitherto performed by the states to parastatals, non-governmental or not-for-profit actors. This is in a way to formulate policies that bring about good governance to alleviate the defects of globalization especially as it affects developing country as Nigeria.

development of Europe is adopted, it is cynical to see it turn around the structural and institutional decay in Africa. The establishment of New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) as a regional development strategy to meet the challenges posed by globalization may not achieve much for African countries (Adedeji, 2002; Tandon, 2002; Kofi and Desta, 2002; Olukoshi, 2002:25; Taylor, 2004).

With these inadequacies of a regional approach as NEPAD, which are evident in tying its success to the financial support by the western world (at the economic level) (Taylor, 2004) and the African traditional patrimonial system where all ruling relationships are personal relationships and the difference between the private and public spheres is non-existent (Tandon, 2002), it has become imperative for individual national governments in Africa to put in place strategies to counterbalance the defects of globalization. It is in this regard that Nigeria should deemphasize Africa as the centerpiece of its foreign policy. This is because though globalization has helped in making countries of the world come together, and make diversity in the states disappear through increased *territorialization*¹ as well as in human individuals through the improvements in communication technologies, it has failed in making countries in Africa formulate a good foreign policy in that globalization disconnects people from having participation in national economic and political affairs by substituting abstractedly configured "market" for the people (Aluko, 2000) thereby making people unable to have an input into policy formulation on external relations.

In an era of globalization, national governments do not have much influence in shaping their own destiny unlike in internationalization where they exert some influence and determine major actions. This inadequacy has therefore made it necessary for Nigeria to refocus its external relations within the context of globalization and pursue more of bilateral diplomacy than acceding to multilateral diplomacy in order to address pocket of poignant events occurring at the international arena that can affect the country.

2. Globalization, Unilateralism and Multilateralism in Foreign Policy

Globalization, according to Scholte (1997:14), is the "process whereby social relations acquire relatively distanceless and borderless qualities, so that human lives are increasingly played out in the world as a single place". It can be argued that social relations among countries and other actors such as international and supra-national organizations should become a sort of multilateral diplomacy for the reason that countries have to come together to address common problems. Ironically, multilateralism in an era of globalization has led to the states become more individualistic. This is because multilateral actions are informed by the peculiarities of individual countries' national interests. It is this window that explains what foreign policy is. Foreign policy is a set of political goals, which explains when, what and how interactions between a country and other actors such as national governments, multi-national corporations and international organizations – should be. White (1997:256) states that the making of foreign policy is the business of government hence, the primary responsibility of a country is to cater for its citizens. Therefore, foreign policy is designed to cater for the national interests that include provision of buoyant economy, protection of ideological goals and security. So, foreign policy in an era of globalization should understand these challenges. Haas (2002) hinges the successfulness of foreign policy on the understanding of the particular challenges of the day.

Globalization, which should make multilateralism possible, has, in its stead, replaced it with unilateralism, in which national governments pursue policies/actions on purely selfish considerations. For example, multilateralism could have prevented the seemingly endless war in Iraq, if only the United Nations could exert its influence as a supra-national organization in persuading the United States from taking a unilateral decision of going to war with Iraq over unfounded Weapons of Mass Destruction², which a former United States military chief in Iraq has warned is "a nightmare with no end in sight"³. The implication of this is that multilateralism has been downplayed while unilateralism has been uplifted in addressing the challenges posed by the impacts of globalization. It is in responding to these phenomena that Nigeria should pursue its external relations within the purview of its domestic challenges – religion bigotry, a blindingly economic imbroglio and blurry political order.

This also suggests that in spite of globalization making countries become borderless, a country should

¹ Territorialization denotes the borderless intrinsic value of globalization. Globalization has made countries of the world relate in a way that make territorial sovereignty with little or no importance.

² A United States chief weapons inspector in Iraq, Charles Duelfer's report stated that Saddam Hussein had no evidence of chemical, biological or nuclear arms after the Gulf War of 1991. The report found the Iraq's nuclear capability before the invasion as decaying rather than being preserved. The 1,000 page report disclosed that chances of finding Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) were less than five per cent. For further reading, see The Guardian's piece, *World Report: Bush defends Iraq war decision despite report*, Friday, October 8, 2004, p 9. www.nrguardiannews.com

³ Retired Lt. General Richard Sanchez, a former US military chief in Iraq describes the war in Iraq as a nightmare with no end in sight. He describes the US political leaders as incompetent and corrupted. He says that the American political leaders could have faced court martial for dereliction of duty if they were in the military. See The Guardian, *General dawns Iraq 'Nightmare'*, Sunday, October 14, 2007, P8. www.nrguardiannews.com

not bother less on domestic problems. In fact, formulation of a good foreign policy is done with a view to addressing the domestic problems. For example, the strategy of preemptive attack adopted by the United States in fighting terrorism after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, which is coined the *Bush Doctrine*, has, as one of the instruments, the establishment of the military bases in friendly countries it considers strategic enough to front the fight against terrorism or its potential enemies. The establishment of military base in Nigeria dubbed African Command (AFRICOM), which will be discussed later in this paper, is an elongation of domestic policy of the United States in protecting its national interests.

This polymorphism of events therefore makes it imperative for a developing country such as Nigeria to formulate a counteractive foreign policy that is capable of meeting these challenges posed by globalization. This is because happenings at the international arena as terrorism, Islamic fundamentalism, *nuclearism* and climate change phenomenon etc. have wider implications for developing countries including Nigeria. So, Nigerian foreign policy is as good or bad as its capability to meet these challenges. Formulating a good counteractive foreign policy is therefore contingent upon how those experts, bureaucrats, ministries and agencies that are statutorily responsible for the formulation of foreign policy are able to articulate the issues before them adequately and consequently put up a comprehensive foreign policy, taking into consideration the multifarious nature of the events that shape them. These events emanate from both internal and external factors. This is so because of indivisibility of reality between the internal and external factors because each of these factors is reinforced by one another.

3. Globalization and its impact on Nigeria's Development

Globalization makes the Northern and Southern states to be institutionally different and has thereby made developing country as Nigeria unable to achieve Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Globalization leads to polarization of wealth and poverty. Thomas (1997:456), quoting Brown and Kane (1995:46), reveals the impacts of globalization on poor countries when he states that in 1960, 70.2 percent of the global income was for the few richest group of 20 percent of the global population while a meager 2.3 percent was for the tiny poorest group of 20 percent of the global population. In the 1970s, the percentage of the global income to the few richest group increased to 73.9 percent while that of the poorest 20 percent of the global population remained at 2.3 percent. In the 1980s, the percentage of the richest 20 percent of the global population went higher to 76.3 percent but, the poorest 20 percent of the global population went down to alarming 1.7 percent. The story was the same in the 1990s as the richest 20 percent had 82.8 percent while the poorest 20 percent of the world had 1.3 percent. Thus, the ratio of richest to poorest in 1960, 1970, 1980 and 1990 were 30:1, 32:1, 45:1 and 64:1 respectively.

A Governor of a state in the most troubled region of Nigeria, Niger Delta, Rotimi Amechi of Rivers State, states in his piece, *Globalization and its impact on the Niger Delta*, quoting Martin Khor, that world exports rose from \$61 billion in 1950 to \$315 billion in 1970 and \$3,447 billion in 1990. He also puts it that "between 1973 and 1992, there has been an increase in foreign exchange trade, which when compared to the current volume of foreign exchange would be tremendous". "The volume traded in the world foreign exchange market grew from a daily average of \$15 billion in 1973 to over \$900 billion in 1992 and now far exceeds \$1,000 billion". Amechi laments that this development has not impacted positively on the poor people of the world (Guardian, 1 May 2008, p54). The corollary of this is that a developing country such as Nigeria may find it difficult to attain the level of development set by Millennium Development Goals. This is because the polarization of wealth and poverty, as globalization portends, would further under-develop developing country as Nigeria. This is so in as much as development is a fluid, and dynamic concept that flows from one end to another, expectedly, from the 'developer' to the 'developee'. It should make the latter better than he was before development was introduced. However, in the contemporary world, the reality is that the interaction between the 'developer' and the 'developee' is such that leaves the 'developee' worse than he was before the contact.

It is a fall out of this development that globalization provides different outcomes for developed countries and developing countries when the same developmental intervention as Millennium Development Goals is adopted. Globalization disconnects people from participation in national economic and political affairs by subsisting "market" for the people (Aluko, 2000). This inadequacy is attributed to the low institutional capacity of a developing country as Nigeria and also responsible for the myriad of problems inhibiting the realization of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in developing countries. The states of the North have made themselves flexible and available for changes while the states of the South are still walloping in the whimsies of the past.

4. Factors inhibiting against Nigeria's Foreign Policy

Nigeria's external relations is conditioned by many factors - domestic and external – religious, Nigeria's legacy as a British colonized country, African-centred foreign policy and membership of international organization. These factors have had tremendous impact on Nigeria's foreign policy from the Independence era to the present.

Okoosi (1997:21) axiomatically captures what foreign policy is by paraphrasing the interconnectedness of domestic and external factors of foreign policy. She puts it that that “the foreign policy of nations evolves and develops over time and with regimes, fired by foreign international experience and series of domestic events”. International Peace Academy (2003) observes that Nigeria’s foreign policy is best explained within the sphere of a “Concentric Circles” of domestic, regional and external influences. At the domestic level we have the elites driving the foreign policy as they deem it fit.

4.1 *An elite driven foreign policy*

An elite driven foreign policy means that the real issues as security crisis, food crisis, the effect of climate change, poverty, mismanagement of resources and corruption that have ravaged the country are not taken into consideration when foreign policies are being formulated. Personality takes the centre stage in formulating foreign policy for Nigeria as each leader tries to bring out his self-opinionated ideas into foreign policy formulation. This makes the Nigeria’s foreign policy lacking in consistency and focus for good governance. For example, from the dictatorial regimes of late Generals Abacha and Babangida to the civilian regime of Obasanjo, the ruler was equal to the bureaucracy, the bureaucracy was equal to the state and the state was equal to the ruler. Formulation of foreign policy was done to the wishes of the leaders. The presumptuousness in the Nigeria’s foreign policy as witnessed in the policy makers dancing to the tune of the leaders is not in line with the tune of international politics. Decision making in international relations should take into consideration the reality on the ground and not the whims of the leaders. In the reasoning of Harold and Margaret Sprout (1967), it is the operational environment that determines the psychological realm of decision-making. In other words, a foreign policy maker does not react to his milieu as he perceives it, but respond to the situation on the ground. They put it succinctly:

What matters in the explanation of decisions and policies is how the actor imagined his environment to be, not how it actually was, whereas what matters in the explanation of accomplishments is how the environment tactually was, not how the actor imagined it to be (Sprout and Sprout, 1967:90).

The above disconnection between the environment and foreign policy makers has had implication for a meaningful foreign policy formulation that can meet such a challenge of globalization as polarization of wealth and poverty. Understanding the connection between the two is necessary for effective formulation of foreign policies that can have direct impact on the life of the people. It is this that can turn around the dwindling economy.

4.2 *Nigeria’s Foreign Policy and the Dwindling Economy*

The Nigeria’s economy is a failing economy as it relies much on oil for its revenue. This has made it difficult for Nigeria to have a comprehensive foreign policy. Presently, Nigeria’s economy heavily depends on the oil and gas sector, which contributes 99 percent of export revenues and 85 percent of government revenues. In 2008, due to the unrest in the Niger Delta, which has affected the oil exploration and production (E&P), about 18 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) was contributed. The agricultural sector contributed immensely as it recorded 42 percent of GDP (The World Bank Group, 2009).The seemingly endless crisis in Niger Delta (which has taken criminal dimension as hostage taking, oil pipeline vandalization, and bunkering), has really compounded the problem. Despite the country’s substantial oil wealth, corruption remains a problem and poverty is widespread. Nigeria has the second highest GDP in Africa (US\$166.78 billion in 2007), but it ranks poorly on the United Nations’ Human Development Index, which measures countries’ levels of development (Nigeria is ranked 158 out of 177 in the world, and 32 out of 51 African countries). Forest (1977) dubs Nigeria’s economic profile a *rentier* economy because of its unfavorable derivation of revenues from taxes or rents rather than on productive activities. Worse still, the oil money has not affected an average Nigerian meaningfully as corruption and mismanagement of money have made the resources look more of a misfortune. Heinrich Boll Foundation, (2004:4) dubs this misfortune a *resource curse*:

...corruption increases instead of pursuing productive work of self- help, everybody begins to stare at what the state, fed fat and even obese by oil rents, has to deliver. Thus, competition for the rent increases as well – and often enough, politics turns violent as a result. In effect, wealth in natural resources, combined with a weak economy and poor governance, turns into what has been called the “resources curse”: a wholesale destruction of economic, social and political structures, including the undermining of a country’s institutional setup, leading to poverty rather than development (Heinrich Boll Foundation, 2004:4).

With a *rentier* or *cursed* economy, a country becomes *disconnected* in terms of policy both institutionally and structurally. The institutional disconnection is evident in all ramifications of Nigerian institutions. The judicial institution is almost collapsed as the judges have been accused and found guilty of corruption. This occurs due to the lack of firm policy on judicial operations. National Judicial Council is poorly composed to coordinate effective judicial policy. Between 1999 and 2004, at least five senior judges were

reported to have been dismissed over corruption cases (Wole Olanipekun, Newswatch, 04 October 2008). Also, there is interference in judicial decisions involving the highest hierarchy of the judicial institution. The former President of Court of Appeal, Justice Isa Ayo Salami accused the former Chief Justice of Nigeria, Justice Katsina Alu of wanting to pervert the course of law in an election petition tribunal (United States Department of State, 2013:19). Again, the political institutions do not have the wherewithal to consolidate democracy; political parties are too weak to recruit competent individuals for political leadership. Yet again, the economic institution is at the doldrums. There is no guarantee for protection of property and contractual rights. All of these factors have implication for policy as it becomes manipulated by the elites to favour their selfish interests. So, Nigeria is only not a *rentier* or *cursed* state, it has also deteriorated to become a *disconnected* state. This has impaired the formulation of a comprehensive foreign policy. A disconnected state like Nigeria is disconnected from its domestic problems and therefore unable to focus the locus of the underpinning factors threatening the formulation of external policies. A few examples of this disconnectedness suffice to illustrate this point. First, Nigeria initially contemplated seeking external assistance, particularly in engaging the services of the British military, to help quench militant violence in the Niger Delta. This would have made it possible for external forces like Britain, whose oil companies are one of the major players in the oil exploration in the region, capitalize on this and manipulate this opportunity for their selfish national interests. It could have been a serious security risk for Nigeria more so that the product and the region concerned is the 'life-wire' of Nigeria. The real reason would not be disclosed by these powerful countries. In its stead, a good reason would be provided for assisting in restoring security in the Niger Delta. This could affect the propensities of making a thorough foreign policy formulation as it would be difficult to analytically establish a nexus between a cause and an effect of an event, a deterministic tool needed to capture the interface of causes and events.

Okoosi (1997:21) axiomatically captures what foreign policy is by paraphrasing the interconnectedness of domestic and external factors of foreign policy. She puts it that that "the foreign policy of nations evolves and develops over time and with regimes, fired by foreign international experience and series of domestic events". International Peace Academy (2003) observes that Nigeria's foreign policy is best explained within the sphere of a "Concentric Circles" of domestic, regional and external influences. At the domestic level we have the elites driving the foreign policy as they deem it fit.

The tool is a functional analytical framework for packaging responses to the challenges posed by the emergence of knotty issues in international arena as well as the asymmetrical relationship among states, which is a fall out of defect of globalization. Such a tool would enable foreign policy analysts, foreign policy makers and experts in international relations deduce facts from unsubstantiated crop of issues before them. An expert in foreign policy/international relations/international politics should not allow his perception of his environment to deceive him. Rather, the reality of the environment should be his guiding framework and how to make good decision out of the environment should be his focus. Therefore, we should talk about Nigeria's foreign policy in a realistic way with a view to making distinct the operational aspect of the decision making as the real unit of analysis as different from the psychological in which the decision maker acts on the situation the way he perceives it. Such entanglement woven around international politics does not allow the foreign policy analyst identifying the substantial actions from the attitudes of expediency in international politics.

4.3 Attitudes of Expediency in Nigeria's foreign policy

The attitudes of expediency in international politics preclude the international relations/foreign policy experts from systematically analyzing issues in foreign policy. The attitudes of expediency in international relations are not a response to hard facts, or to any permanent features of international life. It is an action based on the psychosomatic mood of a state at a particular moment in its relations with the external actors and/or with regard to the happenings in the international arena. A state may be at liberty to jettison the facts on certain issues and goes ahead to act according to the circumstances of the situation. This affirms the principle of determinism in political science that for every effect there is a cause, although this is often manipulated to the benefit of the gladiators especially in international politics. This is so when a good reason is substituted for the real reason. In other words, the real reason is politically jettisoned for the good reason. The United States tolerated the former Pakistani military Head of state, General Musharraf (Rtd) before he became the civilian president of Pakistan. The dictatorial Pakistani leader was tolerated at the expense of the global condemnation for military regime more so with Musharraf tampering with the constitutional provisions of Pakistan, which created opportunity for him to transform himself into the civilian president of that country.

The United States supported this undemocratic action of the Pakistani leader at the expense of the much cherished ideology of its liberal democracy. This is done with a view to seeking the support of the dictator in fighting the most source of international threat – terrorism. It is a temporary attitude of the United States in fighting terrorism and not a permanent feature of American foreign policy, one of which is centered on spreading its universally accepted ideology – democracy. It is for the same reason that United States supported the dictatorial African leaders in the past. Evidence has shown that the end of Cold War has meant the demise of

many African despots. Mobutu Sesesekou was a typical example of the United States' attitude of expediency in fighting the spread of communism in Africa.

Another archetypal example of the attitude of expediency with regard to the Nigerian experience is the British Government handling of the former governor of Bayelsa state Chief Deprieye Alamesigha's loathsome escape from British police custody. The attitude of expediency in international politics can be described as the protection of national interest. The attitude of expediency in foreign policy also explains the disposition of Nigeria's foreign policy towards the Charles Taylor's saga. The role Nigeria played before Charles Taylor 'step aside', his asylum in Nigeria, his purported escape and, very finally, his capture at the Nigerian border are all an attitude of expediency at play. This means that the dictates of the time determines the conduct of foreign policy of any state/actor. It is in recognizing this fact that Nigeria should look inwardly for its foreign policy instead of relying on and putting Africa as its centre of its foreign policy. Nigeria should approach its foreign policy beyond putting Africa as its centerpiece, sensing the fact that globalization has redirected, re-controlled and redefined the contour of relations among states of the world. So, considering this monumental change in the affairs of the state, it is apparent that Nigeria's focus on foreign policy should also go along the transformational path of globalization. This is because of the fact that globalization has come to re-emphasize the intricacy of international politics - the protection of self interest of states.

In fact, the anarchic nature of international politics, that is, lack of government to oversee its administration, has meant that states have to seek for protection by themselves. Reuben Abati¹ concurs with the necessity for Nigeria's foreign policy to reflect the global dynamism as exhibited by globalization. He puts it markedly that "we must abandon this tunnel vision about Africa being Nigeria's main concern, and define relations in terms of gains and interests. We must seek a connection between domestic policy and foreign policy". This becomes imperative as the states in an era of globalization have to come to term with the reality that the national interest of the countries within the present context of globalization should be determined by the domestic problems of the individual countries, but in relation to the happenings in the international arena. Again, the importance of foreign policy of any state is anchored on its national interest; this means that the citizens should benefit from the foreign policy formulation. It is on this premise that Nigeria should approach its relations with others – national actors, trans-national actors, international organizations etc. Consequently, Nigeria should begin to approach its foreign policy with the dictates of globalization, in a globalized world, *denationalization* has taken over nationalization. This means that power hitherto held by states has been transferred to supra-national bodies/international organization. Jessop (2003) talks about the spectacular change in the power of the state at the national scale as brought about by the impact of globalization. So, individual states have to fend for themselves. Jessop talks about *denationalization* of statehood thus:

...this involves the transfer of power previously located at the national territorial level upwards to supra-regional or international bodies, down-wards to regional or local states, or outwards to relatively autonomous cross-national alliances among local, metropolitan or regional states with potentially complementary interests. In addition, new state powers have been allocated to scales other than the national. This re-allocation of specific state powers weakens national states qua mutually exclusive, formally sovereign, spatially segmented instantiations of the modern inter-state system (Jessop, 2003:36).

5. International Arena and its Configuration

Nigeria should recognize the external milieu of international politics, that is, the political configuration of international system. The *uni-polarity* of the international system in favor of the hegemonic power of the United States has made the domination of the system by the United States very possible by the aid of globalization, as already discussed in the earlier sections of the paper. Within this context, countries have to recognize the fact that the United States has become the basic reference or source of international actions. The dwindling nature of the regional organizations, international organizations and supra-national organizations in military, economic and political roles has assisted the hegemonic ascendancy of the United States. For example, the dwindling nature of the United Nations has strengthened the *uni-polarity* of the international system in favor of the United States even though such *uni-polarity* has not translated into securing the international order.

The present configuration of the international arena has been a tailback to Nigeria in getting assistance. For example, when composition of the international system was bi-polar, sources of assistance were many with each source trying to make essence of its aid and ironically controlling the minds and resources of the recipients, since politics, according to Nwolise (1999) seeks to control the minds and resources of men and nations. The then two major blocs of the defunct Soviet Union and the United States freely opened pockets of their politically loaded assistance to Africa, Nigeria included. It is in recognizing the importance of the configuration of the

¹ For further reading, see Reuben Abati's piece on Nigeria's foreign policy, The Guardian, August 29, 1999, p.10, www.nguardiannews.com

global system that the external relations of Nigeria have to be constructed. This is the reality globalization has ironically brought to us. The foreign policy of any country in an era of globalization should be the one that sees globalization as an indispensable determining variable in its formulation. It is the prism in which the framework of any relation with any actor should be built, be it with state actors, international organization, supranational organization or civil society. Why is this so? In the international arena, globalization has reconfigured the relations of states – political, social, economic, cultural and environmental. Globalization has ravaged developing countries and made them subservient to its dictates.

Again, the intrinsic value of globalization such as the attribute of supra-nationalization of statehood has meant that states should put globalization as a deciding factor in formulating its foreign policy. This is because states have to relate with one another not only on things that connect them, but also on things that divide them. This is imperative more so that globalization spreads inequalities and creates unequal relationships. Thus, it is necessary for states to relate within the encyclopedic context of globalization when formulating policy that has wider implications for the country such as the United States African Command.

6. Conclusion

The main thrust of this paper is that there should be total reorientation of Nigeria's foreign policy formulation with a view to keeping pace with globalization. Nigeria should recognize the supra-nationalization of globalization, which has downplayed the importance of regional groupings. So, such not-so-good objective of the Nigeria's foreign policy of having Africa as centerpiece of its foreign policy should give way to accommodating happenings in the international arena. Developing country such as Nigeria should develop its own foreign policy, which can meet the challenges of globalization more so that globalization has become imperative. Nigeria should learn to leave with this reality. Nigeria can formulate a good, comprehensive foreign policy by factoring in domestic challenges that can bring development. This is because globalization drives development. Sources of domestic problems such as insecurity, political crises, and economic upheaval should, as matter of urgency, be identified and solutions adequately provided. It is this that can guarantee the propensity of Nigeria to herald in a new foreign policy that can meet the challenges of globalization.

References

- Adedeji, A (2002) *From the Lagos Plan of Action to the New Partnership for African Development and from the Final Act of Lagos to the Constitutive Act: Wither Africa*, Keynote address prepared for presentation at the African forum for Envisioning Africa held in Nairobi, Kenya, 26-29 April
- Aluko, S. (2000) *The Economic and Political Failure of Globalization in Africa*, www.aboutsudan.com/conferences/khatoun/aluko.htm
- Brian, W. (1997) "Diplomacy" in Baylis, J. and S. Smith, (eds). *The Globalisation of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Brown, L.R. and H. Kane (1995) *Full House: Reassessing the Earth's Population Carrying Capacity*, (London: Earthscan).
- Forest, T. (1997) "Notes on the Political Economy of State Intervention", *IDS Bulletin*, 9, 1.
- Heinrich Boll Foundation (2004) *The National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS)*, www.boellnigeria.org
- Haass, R. (2002) "Defining U.S. Foreign Policy in a Post-Post-Cold War World" *Foreign Policy Association*, FPA Arthur Ross Lecture, April, 22 retrieved from www.fpa.org on July 8, 2009.
- GIndependence Policy Group (2005) *United Nations Reform and Nigeria's Bid for a Permanent Seat on the Security Council* (Abuja: IPG Centre).
- Jessop, B. (2003) "The Future of the State in an Era of Globalization", in *International Politics and Society* (New Jersey: The State university of New Jersey), 3/2003.
- Kofi, T. and A. Desta, (2002) *Africa's Development Challenges in the Millennium*, paper presented at Third World Network (TWN) Africa and the Council for the Development of Social Research in Africa (CODESRIA), Accra, Ghana, April 23-26.
- Nwolise, O.B.C. (2001) *War Making, Peace Making and Conflict Resolution in Africa*, Paper Presented for 5 Day Peace-Mediation Essential Skills Training Programme, AREF Headquarters, Lagos, March 19-23.
- Okoosi, A.T. (1997) *Global Versus Regional Peace-Keeping: A Survey of Nigeria's Involvement in the ECOWAS ECOMOG Operation in Liberia*, NISER Monograph Series, No 7, 1997
- Olanipekun, W. 2008. How to fix Nigeria: the Judiciary. *Newswatch Magazine*. Oct. 4
- Olukoshi, A.O. (2002) "Governing the African Development Process: The Challenge of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)", Occasional Paper, *Centre of African Studies*, University of Copenhagen, September.
- Scholte, J. (1997) "The Globalisation of World Politics" in Baylis, J. and Smith, S. (eds). *The Globalisation of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

- Sprout, H and Sprout, M. (1967) "Geography and International Politics in an Era of Revolutionary Change" in Peter Toma and Andrew Gyorgy (eds.) *Basis Issues in International Relations*, (Boston: Allyn & Bacon) p.140-160.
- The Guardian, CROSSROADS by Reuben Abati: What is Obasanjo's Foreign Policy? August 29, 1999, P10.
- Tandon, Y. (2002) *NEPAD and FDI: Symmetries and Contradictions*, Presentation at the African forum for *Envisioning Africa* held in Nairobi, Kenya, 26-29 April
- Tooze, R. (1997) "International Political Economy in an Age of Globalization" in Baylis, J. and Smith, S. (eds) *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, (New York: Oxford University Press)
- Thomas, C. (1997) "Poverty, Development, and Hunger" in Baylis, J. and Smith, S. (eds) *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, (New York: Oxford University Press)
- Taylor, I. (2004) *Why NEPAD and African Politics Don't Mix*, (Silver City, NM & Washington, DC: Foreign Policy In Focus), February 16.
- The Guardian, *Globalization and its impact on Niger Delta region*, Thursday, May 1, 2008, P54. www.ngrguardiannews.com
- The Guardian, *World Report: Bush defends Iraq war decision despite report*, Friday, October 8, 2004, p 9. www.ngrguardiannews.com
- The Guardian, *General dawns Iraq 'Nightmare'*, Sunday, October 14, 2007, P8. www.ngrguardiannews.com
- The Guardian, *What is Obasanjo's Foreign Policy?* August 29, 1999, P.10, retrieved from www.ngrguardiannews.com on August 30 2000.
- United States Department of State. 2013. 2012 human rights reports: Nigeria. *Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor*. April, 19. Retrieved April 24, 2013, from www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/hrrpt/2012/af/204153.htm#.
- World Bank Group (2009), *Country Brief: Nigeria*, retrieved from www.worldbank.org on July 10, 2009.