

# THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

## Nigeria's Foreign Policy, 2007-2017: Political Leadership and the Outcomes of Foreign Policy Transactions

**Augustar Dienegha Aprioku**

Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Political Science and Administrative Studies,  
University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria

**Dr. Okechukwu S. Amadi**

Senior Lecturer, Department of Political Science and Administrative Studies,  
University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria

**Dr. Henry E. Alapiki**

Professor, Department of Political Science and Administrative Studies,  
University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria

### **Abstract:**

2007 to 2017 marked ten years of successful transition to democratic governance in Nigeria, which had been ruled by the military for more than 16 years at a stretch after it took over power in 1983. The military administration had plunged the country into poverty, dilapidated and inadequate infrastructures, low economic performance, battered international image and total loss of international friendship with her former allies. Nigeria was returned to democracy in 1999, with the first civilian administration successfully handing over power to another civilian government in 2007. From 2007 to 2017, Nigeria had witnessed the administration of three presidents in Nigeria. These presidents had formulated different foreign policy thrusts to address the issues facing the country; however, the challenges of poverty and insecurity were still staring straight at Nigerians in their faces. Meanwhile, the literature was replete with the assumption that Nigeria's foreign policy from 2007 to 2017 did not performed well. The study adopted poor leadership as an independent variable to investigate the non performance of Nigeria's foreign policy from 2007 to 2017, which is the dependent variable. Using the two-level game theory and linkage theory as theoretical framework, the study found that corruption, poor handling of civil dissatisfaction/agitations and insecurity portrayed leadership failure on the parts of these leaders; which by extension forestalled a couple of important bilateral agreements in favour of the Nigerian government.

**Keywords:** Foreign policy, domestic constraints, political leadership

### **1. Introduction**

Foreign policy is a very vital instrument for the survival of a state in this current era of globalization and interdependence of states in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. This assumption is even more cogent for developing countries like Nigeria that rely on more advanced states for most of their basic needs. More so, Nigeria as the giant of the African continent needs a foreign policy that will continue to make her enjoy cooperation from all the other states in the continent in particular. All countries in the world today are engaged in foreign policy formulation and articulation, therefore having a vibrant foreign policy that is well articulated by an intelligent and well-meaning political leadership is the hallmark for a sustainable foreign policy outcome for the development of the country (Palmer & Perkin, 2007; Spiegel, Matthews, Taw & Williams, 2012). Nigeria as a sovereign state has been conducting foreign policy since 1960 when she gained independence from her colonial master Britain, however; the literature is replete with scholarly articles on the poor performance of Nigerian foreign policy since its inception more than 57 years ago. This they blamed on poor leadership and military intervention in the politics of Nigeria. Besides, Nigerian foreign policy had undergone different changes and nomenclatures through these years, but the ordinary Nigerian at home and in the Diasporas are yet to derive reasonable benefit as a result of these foreign policy thrusts of these administrations of the country (Okeke & Aniche, 2014; Obi, 2015; Saliu, 2016).

The political leadership of a country is considered as the direct route for the conduct of foreign policy at both bilateral and multilateral levels for the benefit of the citizens (Palmer & Perkin, 2007; Spiegel, Matthews, Taw & Williams, 2012). The leadership of a country is classified as one of the factors of domestic constraints in the conduct of foreign policy in International Relations Theory (Palmer & Perkin, 2007; Adnan, 2014; Folarin' 2015). Domestic constraints are those factors in the internal political environment of a given nation that impede its effective negotiations of bilateral and multilateral economic and political transactions. At such levels of negotiations, a country with a poor performing leadership may not be a powerful voice in the comity of nations and at the negotiation table (Fafora, 2011). The essence of this study is to review the performance of the last three administrations in the conduct of Nigeria's foreign policy from 2007 to 2017. This study applied a triangulation of the linkage political theory and Putnam's Two- Level Theory of

Negotiation to analyse the influence of political leadership in the outcome of the conduct of Nigeria's foreign policy from 2007 to 2017.

### *1.1. Statement of the Problem*

Nigeria returned to democratic governance since the successful democratic transition of power in 1999. From 1999 to 2007, the country enjoyed a smooth democratic governance and economic diplomacy which culminated in a peaceful transition of power in 2007. From 2007 to 2017, the country has been administered by three democratically elected governments; however, these administrations have been assumed to have recorded low performance in foreign policy transactions as a result of very frequent incidences of high profile political corruptions, internal conflicts arising from ethnic and religious pluralism, agitations for resource control in the Niger Delta, agitation self determination (the Biafra secessionist movement), high level poverty, rise in the rate of unemployment, escalating incidence of crimes, unprecedented youth migration etc.

These issues at the domestic level of the country have created a negative image of the country since 2007 to 2017, however, scholars and analyst of Nigerian foreign policy have not viewed these issues on their own as having the capacity of affecting the performance of Nigeria's foreign policy, but have blamed poor leadership as a factor that is solely responsible for the poor performance of Nigerian foreign policy within the period under study. Their argument is that, a country's advantage in foreign policy transaction is to a large extent dependent on the quality of leadership at the helms of affairs of the country with capacity to manipulate situations at the domestic level whether favourable or not to the advantage of their state (Adnan, 2014).

In the case Nigeria from 2007 to 2017, the leadership has not been able to manage other domestic constraints prevalent in the country to the advantage of the country's foreign policy transactions. Foreign investment in the country was very low, compared to other countries that had been able to attract foreign investments as a result of the leadership's ability to create the right environments that lured foreign investors. Advanced nations such as the United States of America, Germany, the United Kingdom etc could not trust the Nigerian leadership with sensitive issues such as the supply of arms which the country lacked the capacity of producing, even though she was in dire need of supplies to address the issue insurgency that threatened her integrity as a state.

## **2. Theoretical Framework**

For the purpose of this study, we shall employ a triangulation of the Two Level Negotiation Theory of Robert Putnam and the Linkage politics approach in International Relations theories. The hybridization of these analytical models would enable the researchers to analyse the win-set margins (gains) that were open to the Nigerian foreign policy outcomes, using leadership as the independent variable that influenced the performance of Nigeria's foreign which is the dependent variable.

## **3. Theoretical Review**

### *3.1. The Two Level Game Theory of Negotiation*

According to Putnam (1991), the distinction between the domestic and the external environment was difficult to demarcate, and economic and other vital inter-governmental transactions often gets into the domestic decision-making process. Putnam posits that the Two-Level Game Theory of Negotiation captures very well the manner in which international negotiations operating at Level 1 involve a parallel domestic negotiation process involving the home principals operating at Level 2. The theory emphasizes how the domestic environment operating as the level 2 could influence the outcomes of negotiations at the international level, which is operating as the level 1. The level 2 comprises the leadership of a country, which include the parliament, in the case of Nigeria, the Parliament is made up of the Senate and the House of Representatives, all located at Abuja, the Federal Capital Territory; the political parties and interest groups, the president and all stakeholders in at the domestic level 2. If this leadership is weak by any ramification, this could influence the win-set of the country involved. The "win-set" here refers to the benefits \gains that a country which is involved in a transactional negotiation achieves in the course of a negotiation. Negotiations in this sense involve bilateral agreement on trade and investments or other treaties that may be of mutual benefit to the parties involved and multilateral agreement on issues concerning several nations at the regional, sub-regional or the global platform such as the United Nations (UN), European Union (EU), World Trade Organization (WTO), Economic Communities of West African States (ECOWAS), African Union (AU) etc.

#### 3.1.1. Linkage Approach

Linkage politics approach posits that domestic constraints and foreign policy are organically interconnected and that the totality of the domestic structure determines or conditions the character of foreign policy. In other words, the internal political environment shapes the outcomes of a country's foreign policy formulation and implementation.

According to Frankel (1972), Linkage Approach has its starting point from the systems analysis and it denotes any recurrent sequence of behaviour that originates in one system and is reacted to in another (Rosenau 1969:5). The moral and social conduct of the elites in a country stimulates the manner in which actors at the international level will react to them. When a country's leadership is morally and socially corrupt at the domestic level, because of the linkage thesis, such country will have a reciprocal reaction from the external environment (Spiegel, Matthews, Taw & Williams, 2012). A case in point is Nigeria during the military dictatorship of General Sani Abacha, the internal issues of human rights abuses were

reacted to by the International Community and sanctions were laid against the country that made Nigeria a pariah state (Folarin, 2018; Obi, 2015, Saliu, 2016).

#### 4. Conceptual Clarification

For the purpose of this section, we shall give a brief conceptual clarification (contextual meaning) of the following terms as would be used in this study in order to eliminate as much as possible any tinge of ambiguity. They include the following: foreign policy, domestic constraints, leadership role and the significance of the period under study-2007-2017.

##### 4.1. Foreign Policy

According to Frankel, Foreign Policy can be viewed as consisting of decisions and actions, which involves to some appreciable extent relations between one state and others at the international level (Frankel, 1963:1). This means that foreign policy can only take place at the international level and it must involve nations or sovereign states and their actions towards other state.

For Roscoe Pound cited in (Northedge, 1974), foreign policy involves the use of political influence in order to induce other states to exercise their law-making power in a manner desired by the state concerned. This definition of foreign policy gives the idea that states are all powerful to influence the law making power of other states at all times, but in reality, that is hardly the case as most states will only bow to only much more powerful states than themselves.

Holsti (1983) presented foreign policy as "actions of a state towards the external environment and the conditions under which their actions are formulated.

Modelski (1987), foreign policy is a "system of activities evolved by states communities for changing the behaviours of other states communities and for adjusting their own activities to fit into the international environment. For him "communities" here refers to sovereign states, international organizations like the United Nations (UN), the European union (EU), the African Union (AU) etc. and Multinational corporations represented by their states because only sovereign states can formulate and implement foreign policies. He further stressed that foreign policy is systematic and deliberately selected national interest.

Osuntokun (2001:122-233) on the other hand viewed foreign policy as inevitably linked to the domestic policy of a nation. According to him it is almost impossible to separate domestic policy from foreign policy as the two are intricately related, as a nation's foreign policy is the political instrument or technical framework upon which it pursues its domestic interest. He further stated that a country's national power has a direct relevance with its foreign policy. And leadership is one of the elements of national powers of a country, therefore, if a country is deficient of good leadership that will affect its domestic policy, which in turn would affect its foreign policy (Osuntokun, 2001).

##### 4.2. Domestic Constraints

Domestic constraints are the socio-economic and political conditions under which the foreign policy decision makers work and the effects of those working conditions on the outcomes of foreign policy transactions as they vary from state to state (Osuntokun, 2001; Palmer & Perkin, 2007; Adnan, 2014). Every country has its constraints but the task lies with decision-makers to make the best of their constraints to the advantage of their states or they may be at the losing end. Below are some examples of some domestic factors that may act as constraints in the course of states' interactions and foreign policy formulation, implementation and outcomes.

##### 4.3. The Location and Size of a State

The location and the size of state can be of advantage or disadvantage to the state. Location of a state may concern issues like access to some strategic sea routes for trade and the presence or absence of natural barriers such mountains, rivers etc. however, with advancement in technology, location of a state is longer of big advantage or disadvantage to states. The size of a state can also pose a challenge when it comes to the management and adequate governance. It is a common assumption that smaller nations are easier to govern than bigger nations (Palmer & Perkin, 2007).

##### 4.4. Human and Natural Resources

A large illiterate population is a liability to a nation and a constraint but a well educated population is always an asset to a nation. If the population is productive and innovative, the country can become a force and its foreign policy would be commanding in the international arena. Natural resources such as crude oil, precious stone and strategic minerals could also strengthen the foreign policy of a nation.

- The media: media reportage has a strong influence on the foreign policy of a state. Nations gain insight into other nations by the kind reportage they receive from the media and that might a positive or negative perception.
- Interest group: this comprise of all the different human associations that support or attack the government for different reasons. If these groups are many in support of the government, the foreign policy of the state would definitely be vibrant.
- Social system: the social system of a state as to how the citizens perceive the government and also how the presence of the government is felt by the people is considered a domestic constraint. If a government provides social amenities for its citizens and the feel integrated, this adds power to the state and gives it a voice in the international community.
- Political Parties: the activities of political parties in a state have the capacity of strengthening or destabilizing a government and it foreign policy before the international arena. When party activities have the potential of

toppling a sitting government, then the foreign policy of that government may not have the weight that it is suppose to have.

#### 4.5. Political Leadership

The term leadership has been defined by many scholars in different fields of human endeavors as being very vital for the development of the socio-economic and political conditions of man in every society no matter the rate of its advancement in human history. But for the purpose of this work, we shall be defining the term from the political perspective.

John Gardener views political leadership as the process of persuasion or example by which an individual induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers (*Weekly Trust*, 2004: 11, cited by Ogbeidi, 2012). Further, he defines leadership as a body of people who lead and direct the activities of a group towards a shared goal. It also denotes the ability to lead, direct and organize a group.

In line with this understanding, Norma Schwarzkopf (2015) describes leadership as a potent combination of strategy and character and strongly emphasized that, of the two elements, character is the most preferred for leadership. Consequently, leadership is a process of social influence by which a person influences others to accomplish an objective and directs the organization/ society in a way that makes it more cohesive and coherent (Chemers, 2002). A leader therefore is expected to demonstrate qualities, which embrace but not limited to good character, vision, tact, prudence, and ability to lead by example. A rational leader engages in cost-benefit analysis of maximizing gains and minimizing losses in international politics (Oppermann, 2013). Every leader that interacts at the international level does so with the aim of deriving maximum benefit to its home country, while trying as much as possible to minimize losses. This attribute of leadership buttresses the theory of two-level negotiation which this study will employ in analyzing the political leadership of Nigeria in the scope of this study.

Therefore, Political leadership prefers to the ruling class that bears the responsibility of managing the affairs and resources of a political entity by setting and influencing policy priorities affecting the territory through different decision-making structures and institutions created for the orderly development of the territory. It could also be described as the human element that operates the machineries of government on behalf of an organized territory. This includes people who hold decision making positions in government, and people who seek those positions, whether by means of election, coup d'état, appointment, electoral fraud, conquest, right of inheritance or other mean. Broadly defined, however, political leadership goes beyond the ruling elites that directly manage the affairs of a territory; it embraces the totality of the political class that has the capacity to manipulate the machineries of government even from behind the scene. However, in the case of Nigerian leaders, the foreign policy has not benefited the citizens as it ought to since she gained independence since 1960. Nigeria's Afrocentric policy has been a policy that makes the country to expend so much resource in solving the problems of other countries in Africa without accruing the much sort after benefit to the country.

### 5. An Over View of Nigeria's Foreign Policy from 2007-2017

Nigeria gained independence in October 1<sup>st</sup> 1960, and has since then been engaged in both bilateral and multilateral treaties with nations of the world and international organizations such as the UN, AU, Commonwealth etc.; but for the purpose of the work, we shall carryout a brief overview of Nigeria's foreign policy from 2007-2017.

From 2007 -2017, Nigeria has had three democratically elected government. In 2007, the Obasanjo's administration which had been in power since 1999, when the military administration of General Abdulsalami Abubakar transited power to his administration, handed power to late president Umaru Musa Yar'Adua after a highly disputed elections. Yar'Adua upon assuming power in 2007 came up with a new set of domestic policy known as the Seven Point Agenda (SPA) and a new foreign policy thrust known as Citizen Diplomacy. The president like his predecessor former President Olusegun Obasanjo planned on focusing on the citizens of Nigeria and the domestic economy, while making Nigeria's foreign policy to concentrate more on her citizens than on the whole of Africa, as had been the thrust of Nigeria's Afrocentric foreign policy for the past four decades. According to Ojo Maduekwe, the then Minister of Foreign Affairs, who unveiled the new foreign policy thrust on behalf of President Yar'Adua, Citizen Diplomacy was a departure from the type foreign policy that Nigeria had been engaged in the past. He described the policy thus:

If you are hostile to Nigeria, Nigeria would be damn hostile to you. In essence, the era of flamboyant magnanimity and reckless foreign spending had gone. The times of banking on intangible "gain" or "self deception" or of playing the "big brother" role in Africa was ruefully and painfully seen as wasted years. Citizenship Diplomacy therefore meant - expect Nigeria to pay you back in your own coin. It is a sort of tit-for-tat or counter-strike diplomacy; meaning that, Nigeria must take a serious corresponding action, or its pound of flesh, should any country violate the human dignity of her citizens residing in its land. Here, as in physics, actions and reactions must be equal and opposite, and directly proportional and equilateral (Nwanolue; Osegbue & Iwuoha, 2010 :53; Obi, 2015; Saliu, 2016).

This foreign policy was formulated at a time in the history of the country, when most of her youths, especially those without skills due to the poorly planned educationally system that produced half-baked students at the secondary school level and the cumbersome method of securing tertiary education, which would eventually produce "jobseekers" instead of "job creators" who upon graduation were forced to seek economic asylum in foreign lands such the United States of America and countries in South America, countries in Europe, countries in North Africa such as Libya, Algeria etc

and sub-Saharan African countries such as Gabon, Angola, South Africa etc. Unfortunately, these Nigerians were poorly treated in these foreign lands where they had gone to seek for employment. The Nigerian government at a time was unable to create employment for young school leavers and the private sector could not support the government because of lack of infrastructure which discourages private sector investment in the economy. So most Nigerians were accused of drug-trafficking, prostitution and other nefarious vices that earned them jail terms with tortures or they were shamefully deported back to Nigeria stigmatized with international media coverage.

The Yar'Adua's foreign policy thrust was the first time in the history of the country, when a policy was singularly formulated with the aim of benefiting the Nigerian citizen directly. Unfortunately, the policy suffered a lot of set back as the leadership under President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua was weak due to some domestic constraints with regards to his failing health and the structure of his government. The president Yar'Adua himself came into power under some contentions with regards to the fairness of his victory in the 2007 presidential election. The opposition parties accused the former president, Olusegun Obasanjo of just imposing Yar'Adua as his stooge. Reports had it that Yar'Adua had an undisclosed terminal illness that made it almost impossible for him to actively go out on the campaign trail to garner voters to vote for him during the elections, instead it was Obasanjo himself who had to go out and campaign for Yar'Adua in most occasions. To prove the claims of the rumors making the rounds then, a few months after assuming office as the president of Nigeria in November 2007, barely six months after his assumption to office, Yar'Adua was flown to Saudi Arabia reportedly to perform lesser Hajj, from where he later had cause to visit to the King Faisal Specialist Hospital, Jeddah in Saudi Arabia for urgent medical attention. He later returned back to Nigeria after three months had been mid-2008, Yar'Adua embarked on medical trip to Saudi Arabia for a comprehensive medical attention, which took him about three and half months to be out of the country again less than six months after his return from his previous trip. Meanwhile, as Yar'Adua was battling with his health in Saudi Arabia that same 2008, Nigerian residents in South Africa were suffering fatal mayhem as a result of the xenophobic attacks in that country. However, Mr. President was never on ground to follow foreign policy issues squarely and diplomatically. On the alternative, every other person that may have been appointed to deputize him in issues of foreign relations, be him the Vice President or the Foreign Affairs Minister, neither had full discretionary powers nor authoritative legitimacy of action. Moreover, many of those that were strongly for Yar'Adua in the cabinet never allowed for the democratization of the decision making powers both at the instances of national and foreign matters. Unfortunately, this trend continued to be the case in the Yar'Adua's administration in spite of the urgency and strategic value of issues at stake notwithstanding.

S/N	Names of Countries with Nigerian Prisoners	Number of Prisoners
1	Libya	1,500
2	India	391
3	Britain	1400
4	Nepal	15
5	Japan	14
6	Canada	13
7	Niger Republic	40
8	Togo	150
9	Equatorial Guinea	128

*Table1: Nigerians in Foreign Prisons during Yar'Adua's Administration*

*Source: Nwanolue, B.O.G; Osegbue, C. & Iwuoha, V.C. (2010)*

From Table1 above, one can see the number of Nigerians that were outside the shores of Nigeria in foreign prison was very large as at 2007 when Nigeria put forward citizen diplomacy as her foreign policy thrust. When Nigeria tried to negotiate the release of these prisoners, they got a negative response as a result of the poor image of the country which had been further battered by the increase rate of migration of the youths of the country in search of livelihood.

In considering the linkage politics theory, a nation's domestic environment could have a reflective reaction on its foreign policy implementation and outcome. This is because foreign policy is the continuation of domestic policy at the global or international level. Hence, a weak or poorly structured political administrative arm of a nation will negatively impact on the foreign policy of that nation. Nigeria like the United States of America has a written constitution that has been in force since 1960, and has been reviewed and amended only three times since independence in 1960 when the country starting operating its affairs based on the provisions of the 1960 constitution.

The 1999 federal constitution of Nigeria is well framed to avoid vacuum in any office within the public sector of the country, especially that of senior public servants in the federal ministerial offices. In chapter five and Section 145 of the constitution the federation, it clearly states the delegation of duty between the president and his vice in order to avoid a vacuum in such vital offices. The section is as follows:

Whenever the President of Nigeria transmits to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a written declaration that he is proceeding on vacation or that he is otherwise unable to discharge the functions of his office, until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary such functions shall be discharged by the Vice-President as Acting President (1999 federal constitution of Nigeria, section 145).

This section of the constitution was not never applied in most of the time that Yar'Adua was absent in office as the president of Nigeria. This made it impossible for his vice president Goodluck Ebele Jonathan to act in the capacity of Acting President in the months when the president battled with poor health. Yar'Adua could not attend the 2008 and 2009 United Nations General Assembly (UNGA), so could not his vice as he was not delegated to act in that capacity, so, Nigeria missed out on such strategic function of Heads of states and government. Off course, there was a genuine reason for that, the president's illness was allowed to affect governance in its totality, thereby portraying Nigeria as a country that had not institutionalize its public sector. And so, Nigeria lost her voice as a serious nation before other well-meaning nations. This also affected her negotiation for the release of her citizens in other foreign lands languishing in prisons.

The leadership in Yar'Adua's administration was also accused of high rate of theft and misappropriation of public funds such as the case of Patricia Etteh who was then the Speaker of the National House Assembly (Senate). The poor leadership of the Yar'Adua's administration was blamed on his deteriorating health which eventually caused his death in May 2010.

In the history of the presidents of Nigeria, Goodluck Jonathan is said to be the first president with the highest qualification being a Ph. D degree holder from Zoology from the University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria. More so, he had been the Deputy Governor, Acting Governor and Governor of Bayelsa state. So as President of Nigeria, expectations were high that his leadership would be better than what was obtainable in the previous administrations. President Jonathan came up with his Transformation Agenda for the domestic policy and a new foreign policy thrust that is inclined towards attracting Foreign Direct Investments (FDIs) in Nigeria known as Economic Diplomacy; this was because the economy of Nigeria was really in a bad shape following the global economic melt down and the mismanagement of the country's funds by public office holders. President Jonathan Economic foreign policy was aimed at attracting foreign investors to the country in order to set up their business in the country so that there would be job creation and empowerment of the teeming unemployed youths.

Under the Jonathan's administration, Nigeria's foreign policy was able to attract Direct Foreign Investment (FDI) worth \$8 Billion in the year 2012. China was one of the countries that invested in the non-oil sector of the economy within the lifespan of this administration. However, the political leadership, was often accused of corruption and in-house fighting. It was in this administration that the then Central Bank Governor (CBN), Lamido Sanusi Lamido, made a media out cry of the mismanagement of the foreign reserve of the country to the tune of \$20billion. The leadership was the very one looting the country's treasury that was entrusted in its care. It was in this administration, which most Nigerian elites like never before had to send their children and wards overseas to Europe, the Americas, Asia and other African countries like Ghana etc. to school, while the country's tertiary institutions were shut down by striking lecturers of the Academic Staff Union of University (ASUU) (Nwankwo, 2013). The educational system of the country was abandoned and relegated to the barest minimum, while teachers were paid stipends that were not regular and all government institutions were being run without any form of teaching and learning aids.

Cost of living and transportation was very high as there were no improvements in the agricultural and non-oil sectors of the economy. Construction of roads and other means of transportation were abandoned and the masses were faced with hardship emanating from unemployment.

Worst still, the political leadership could not stem the internal unrest of the Boko Haram that held the North-Eastern part of the country in bondage for a long time. The unpopularity of the political leadership of the Goodluck Jonathan's administration made the PDP, which was the ruling party to lose the 2015 general elections massively. With these domestic issues on ground and the international media on the one hand to disseminate local issues on global scale, Nigeria's negotiation with the United States for weapons deal to curb the insurgency menace of the Boko Haram was stalled and worst still she could not be considered for a permanent seat at the United Nations Security Council. Using the theory of Two-Level Negotiation, Nigeria's win-set in the Nigerian-US arms negotiation was very narrow such that Nigeria could not secure the deal and eventually resorted to the illegal arms with a South African firm which resulted in the scam that led to the loss of some huge amount of money.

The Jonathan's administration was succeeded by the President Buhari's administration whose foreign policy thrust is yet to be determined. In Buhari's past administration as a military Head of State of Nigeria from 1983 -1985, he was poorly reputed for foreign policy that saw to the expulsion of non-Nigerians who were mostly from neighbouring countries to the disregard of the Good Neighbourliness foreign policy principle of Nigeria. within the first six months of his administration, most foreign investment in the country were forced to shut down as a result of his anti-corruption fight that saw the capital flight of foreign currencies such as the Dollar and the Pound which had more value than the Naira. While Buhari may claim to fight against corruption in order to cleanse the leadership of corruption, his first budget to the national assembly was said to be missing, while the second one was said to be padded and inflated by unidentified persons in the National Assembly. With these domestic constraint of poor leadership, Buhari's negotiation for the repatriation of looted funds stacked in foreign bank accounts have not been successful especially with Swiss bank where over \$1billion Abacha looted fund is pending repatriation to Nigeria. The Swiss banks in charge of the looted money were disproportionately bold to give Nigeria some preconditions that must be observed before the money would be returned to the country. The conditions included the reassurance to the Swiss Banks that money would be expended on the very poor in the country.

In 2017 under the watch of President Buhari, Nigeria while still struggling to totally defeat Boko Haram was confronted by the herdmen/farmer bloodbath that has left so many Nigerians living in the rural areas of the North-Central geopolitical zones homeless and number of them dead as a result of the clashes that is brought about by declining natural resources in the Northern parts of the country thereby engendering resource based conflicts. The government could not take a strong decision on the issue of ranching as a means of phasing off the age-long nomadic lifestyle of the

cattle rearers who would invade the Farms of the local farmers and destroy their crops thereby causing conflicts. This latest issue has once again put Nigeria on the spotlight as a critic country.

The Buhari's administration tried to enter a deal on currency swap with the Chinese government in 2016, that deal is not yet realized as there are fears on the part of the Chinese government about the political environment of Nigeria.

## 6. Discussion

Using the triangulation of the linkage politic theory and the two-level negotiation theory, it can be deduced that the poor political leadership of Nigeria from 2007-2017 has not brought much gain in foreign policy transaction that involves political leaders. The domestic constraints playing out at the internal environment of Nigeria has rubbed off negatively on the image of the country. The leadership of the Nigerian government has been involved in so much corruption at the local level, so that they are disregarded at the international arena. This has affected Nigeria's win-set in negotiations in the Bilateral agreement to repatriate prisoners from some countries like Indonesia and Libya where they were alleged to be in possession of some contraband items during the Yar'Adua's. Also in the Yar'Adua's administration; the president himself who was the chief diplomat during the negotiation for the Africa Command that the United states hoped to station in Africa in order to protect her interest in African, this multilateral agreement was not reached as African negotiators headed by late president Yar'Adua had no foresight that in the near future Nigeria would need the assistance of the United States in her fight against Boko Haram that was brooding in the silhouette of poverty and deprivation in the North-Eastern part of Nigeria. It was a fact that leaders of the African continent had their doubts about the sincerity of the Bush administration to the peace and security of the African continent, however, the Yar'Adua's administration as the Head of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and a major stakeholder in the African Union (AU) could have persuaded the other states of the continent to buy into the offer to gain military skills in arms production which the continent had dare need of. This incidence was an obvious instance of deficiency in negotiation on the part of the President to promote his ideas on three fronts and emerge winning in the game, but the president rather withdrew from the agreement with the United States, thereby bowing to the pressure from the other African states (Pambazuka, 2007.)

Poor leadership in the form of corruption forestalled Nigeria's arms deals with the United states thereby making Nigeria unable to curb the Boko Haram terrorism in the Jonathan's administration. Foreign policy as a platform for interaction among states at both the bilateral and multilateral levels has not been utilized by Nigerian leaders to engender the much expected gains from 2007-2017, even though these administration all existed on the foundation of democracy.

## 7. Conclusion

Foreign policy is a platform for the interactions of states for mutual benefits. However, most states' success in foreign policy has a direct bearing on the domestic environment that may act as constraints in the course of negotiation. Nigerian leaders are yet to take into cognizance that the fact that what happens within the borders of the country will positively or negative affect their negotiation win-set in foreign policy transaction. Nigeria has not experienced the much expected development as a result of poor leadership that not been able to manage her domestic challenges to her advantage.

## 8. Recommendation

- Nigerian should be more involved in the foreign policy formulation and implementation of the country as outcomes of foreign policy transactions could have so much effect on them as citizens. As in the case of Nigeria's inability to get military assistance from the United States after the Africommand.
- Nigeria should be engaged in more collaboration with the more developed countries as this would foster technological advancement for her.

## 9. References

- i. Adnan, M. (2014). Foreign Policy and Domestic Constraints: A Conceptual Account. *South Asian Studies A Research Journal of South Asian Studies*. 29:2, P.657-675
- ii. Chemers, M. M. (2002). Cognitive, Social, and Emotional Intelligence of Transformational
- iii. Leadership: Efficacy and Effectiveness. In R. E. Riggio, S. E. Murphy, F. J. Pirozzolo (eds.),
- iv. *Multiple Intelligences and Leadership*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- v. Fafora, D. (2011). Nigeria's foreign policy: Gains and loses. *The Nation*, P.64. Nigerian Institute of International Affairs – Press Library clippings
- vi. Okeke, V.O.S & Aniche, E.T. (2014) Internal Political Environment of Nigerian Foreign Policy and Implementation of Citizen Diplomacy Under Yar'Adua/Jonathan Administration (2007-2011): A Linkage Political Approach. *American Journal of Social Issues and Humanities*. Vol.4(1).
- vii. Eneh, O.C. (2011). Failed Development Vision, Political Leadership and Nigeria's Underdevelopment: A Critique. *Asian Journal of Rural Development*, 1: 63-69.
- viii. Nwankwo, O.B.C. (2013). Shifting the Paradigm in Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Goodluck Jonathan and Nigeria's Vision 20:2020. *Social Sciences*, 2, 6: 212-221.
- ix. Nwanolue, B.O.G; Osegbue, C.& Iwuoha, V.C. (2010) A Postmortem Analysis of Nigeria's Foreign Policy Under Yar'adua's Administration. *Bassey Andah Journal*. Vol.3. 48-78
- x. Ogbeidi, M. M. (2012) Political Leadership and Corruption in Nigeria Since 1960: A Socio-economic Analysis. *Journal of Nigeria Studies*. Vol.1. 2e 1

- xi. Omotola J.S. (2011). A Cabalised Regime: Neopatrimonialism, President Yar'adua's Health Crisis and Nigeria's Democracy. CEU Political Science Journal. Vol. 6, No. 2
- xii. Oppermann, K & Spencer, A. (2013). Thinking Alike? Saliency and Metaphor Analysis as Cognitive Approaches to Foreign Policy Analysis, *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 9(1):39-56
- xiii. Osuntokun, J.(2001). Historical Background Survey of Nigeria's Foreign Policy. Conference paper presented at the international conference on nigeria and the world after forty years: policy perspective for the new century. December, 5-6.
- xiv. Palmer, N.D. & Perkins H.C. (2007). *International Relations*.(3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Delhi: Sandeep Press.
- xv. Weekly Trust. (2004, September 16).
- xvi. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/8664150.stm>
- xvii. <http://www.pambazuka.org/images/articles/363/47047africom.jpg>This
- xviii. <https://www.marxist.com/yaraduas-seven-point-agenda-nigeria.htm>
- xix. <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2017/07/living-two-presidents/>
- xx. <http://www.eyeway.ng/2015/01/09/another-child-of-necessity-is-born/>