



## **FOREIGN POLICY: CHARACTER OF NIGERIA'S PRESIDENT IN FOREIGN RELATIONSHIP (CASE OF DR. GOODLUCK EBELE JONATHAN)**

**Faruk Abdullahi**

Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, Federal University Wukari, Nigeria.

Email: [abdullahifaruk25@gmail.com](mailto:abdullahifaruk25@gmail.com); Tel: +2348064365477

### **Cite this article:**

Faruk Abdullahi (2023), Foreign Policy: Character of Nigeria's President in Foreign Relationship (Case of Dr. Goodluck Ebele Jonathan). African Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research 6(3), 96-111. DOI: 10.52589/AJSSHR-ZXS7DSEN

### **Manuscript History**

Received: 9 Feb 2023

Accepted: 30 March 2023

Published: 26 June 2023

### **Copyright** © 2023 The Author(s).

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits anyone to share, use, reproduce and redistribute in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

**ABSTRACT:** *This piece of write-up is aimed at examining whether or not Nigeria's foreign policy under former President Goodluck Jonathan contributed to improving the image of Nigeria globally. The study reveals that Nigeria's foreign policy over the years has been greatly sabotaged by inconsistencies and ambiguities. The study also shows that more than external challenges, it is the internal challenges that are dampening Nigeria's attainment of positive international image and national transformation. Some of those challenges include leadership crisis, corruption, insurgency and terrorism amongst others. It is therefore recommended that major reorganization of the foreign services, such that positions in the diplomatic corps and other key positions will no longer be politicized and the government should integrate professional international public relations practitioners in its interactions with the international community at large, in order to effectively boost the global image of Nigeria.*

**KEYWORDS:** Foreign Policy; Global Image; Goodluck Jonathan's Administration.



## INTRODUCTION

All nations of the world seek to attain different goals and objectives in the processes of governing their individual sovereign entities. While some of the goals can be attained by the states on their own (locally), others can only be attained with the cooperation or active support of other similar entities beyond their borders. All decisions in the form of actions or reactions, dealing with such matters requiring cooperation or active support of others across the borders of a given State for their attainment of goals, falls within the ambit of foreign policy.

Thus, foreign policy is authoritative actions taken by governments or those governments are committed to take-in orders to either maintain the desirable aspects of the international environment or to amend its undesirable aspects. Also, Hoisti in Obi defines foreign policy as the action of a state towards the external environment and the conditions usually domestic under which these actions are formulated.

This invariably means that foreign policy is the category of actions a government takes to deal with defense, security, international political relations and international economic relations. As a necessarily calculated and goal-oriented activity, foreign policy is purposive. This purpose however, is altering or creating a condition outside the sovereign boundaries to gain national advantage, usually defined in terms of national interest. National image both at home and abroad is an ethical issue. It may appear intangible but the benefits and advantages flowing from a good image are inestimably unquantifiable.

The perception of a country by members of the international community, how a country pursues its relations with others and particularly, the behavior of its citizens at home and abroad can affect a country's image thus, making it an essential feature of a nation's foreign policy. In any country, when foreign policy initiatives are well focused, it can help create and reinforce favorable images of a country to the external world. Consequently, the image a country attempts to build and project, through its foreign policy, must conform to its national interests and the expectations of other members of the international community

Hence, the Federal Ministry of Information of Nigeria stresses that a nation's attempt to have a meaningful impact and influence on the world around will be guided by her foreign policy objectives and national interests and how effectively such disposition is transmitted or communicated to the world. In other words, foreign policy objectives and national interests must be systematically packaged and projected to achieve their aims. Image building is one of the most essential responsibilities of public relations practitioners. This invariably means that a public relation is concerned with how and what others think about you either as a person or an organization. These images or views are either favorable or unfavorable.

Hence, the effort of public relations is to change negative image to positive perception. A country's standing in the international system, although dependent on some other factors, is highly dependent on the perception of her image globally. Nigeria's image has been shaped by a number of factors since her independence in 1960. These factors include Nigeria's afrocentric policy, Nigeria's big market for Euro-American finished products, Nigeria's oil boom, Nigeria's anti-apartheid policy, Nigeria's policy of technical assistance, and several other factors that evolved over the years.

It has become very obvious that crime and corruption is the bane of Nigeria's development. The current Boko Haram insurgency in the North-Eastern part of the country speaks volume.



Internationally, the pervasive corruption in Nigeria has tarnished the image of the country and has resulted in foreign nationals exercising extreme caution in entering into business transactions with Nigerians, and thereby weakening the economic sector.

President Goodluck Jonathan following his victory in the 2011 general elections, before the anxious 100 days in office, directed the presidential advisory council on international relations (PACIR) to coordinate the reforming of Nigeria's foreign policy to be investment oriented. Coupled with his interactive forum with Nigerians abroad during his foreign visits, the president asked the nation's foreign policy experts, seasoned diplomats, professionals and intelligentsia to chart a new way for the future without discarding the past. However, Nigeria's foreign policy under President Goodluck Jonathan's administration focused on the following:

1. Improved cooperation with other military forces all over the world to bring about peace globally.
2. Improved bilateral and multilateral trade relationship among nations.
3. Cooperation and assistance in curbing health challenges all over the world.
4. Promoting the welfare of Nigerians abroad to ensure they are treated with respect and dignity in all circumstances.

## **FOREIGN POLICY**

Foreign policy is a slippery and elusive concept. Despite intensifying interest in the phenomenon in the academic sphere over the years, it is still used to refer variously to a process, a strategy, or even an ideology (Heywood, 2007). It is, therefore, difficult to reduce foreign policy to a single theme or definition as there are a plethora of definitions available. For instance, Lerche and Okoro (2002) defined foreign policy of a State as the general principles by which a State governs its relations to the international environment. It is important to observe that this definition is criticized as being very narrow in scope because it refers only to the principles underlying a country's foreign policy. The definition fails to explain the actual relations or interactions that take place among the states in the international arena (Okoro, 2002). Foreign policy can also be seen as the courses of actions adopted by a state in the interest of the people's welfare. It is not in all cases that states act in the people's interest.

The debate in the United States of America (USA) in 2007 over whether to send yet more 21,000 troops to Iraq highlights the aforementioned point. The majority of the congress and the public opposed the move, but (Former President) George W. Bush, ignored the Congress and public's thoughts saying he was the "decider" (the Grand Commander of the Federal Republic) in line with Article II of the Constitution of the United States of America (USA), and increased troops levels unilaterally. Consequently, he ignored the World Powers Resolution (WPR) of 1973 (Rourke, 2009). According to Chibundu (2003), the term foreign policy can be seen as a "country's response to the world outside or beyond its own frontiers or boundaries". That response may be friendly or aggressive, casual or intense, simple or complex, but it is always there." It may be safe to state here that actions or responses or support may not be entirely active or direct.. In International Relations and most of the other fields in Political Science, it is believed that inaction is an action in itself (Dahl, 1991).



Gaubá (2007) pointed out, in politics, refusing to decide is simply deciding to allow others to decide for you. One cannot, therefore, be politically neutral. Little wonder some states have been seen to have not taken any action in response to a situation. The United States and Russia's refusal to intervene (militarily) in Syria in 2011 and Iraq in 2003 respectively are quintessential cases. Even the Chinese government, with the nation's standing in global politics and economics, is firm on its decision not to intervene in Syria.

Furthermore, Light (1999) saw foreign policy as the official relations that take place between the units of the international system. Again, foreign policy consists of those discrete official actions of the authoritative decision-makers of a nation's government or their agents which are intended by the decision-makers to influence the behavior of international actors to their own policy. Policy as used here refers, to Okolie (2009), "... not as actions based on some Grand design but as a continual process of pragmatic adjustment to the actions of others in the International environment." Light's focus on only official relations makes her definition incomplete as there are a plethora of relations between states which are unofficial or which do not follow the normal foreign policy making channels.

The activities of the Red Cross society, Islamic fundamentalists groups who are challenging the orthodox western beliefs all over the world, and the Cold War politics of sponsoring of coups d'état in the emerging nations of Africa by the American Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and the Soviet Komitet Gosundarstvennoy Bezopasnosti (KGB) (which translates in English as Soviet State Security Committee), just to mention but a few, are quintessential cases.

Rosenau, Thompson and Boyd (1976) presented a more comprehensive definition by distinguishing three views of foreign policy: as a cluster of orientation; as a set of commitments and plans of actions; and as a form of behavior (cited in Okoro, 2006). Viewed as "a cluster of orientations", foreign policy refers to the general tendencies, attitudes, Perceptions, values and principles that underlie the conduct of states in global affairs, e.g. Nigeria's non-alignment, Soviet's expansionism, America's liberal democratization. China's Sinocentrism, and so on. Viewed as a "set of commitments and plans of actions, State's foreign policy could promote or preserve situations abroad in a manner consistent with their basic orientation, e.g. the formation of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) by the capitalist bloc, the Soviet Union's WARSAW Pact, the United States Marshall Plan, and so on. Viewed as a "form of behavior", foreign pertains to the concrete Steps taken by states vis-à-vis situations abroad, e.g. Nigeria's peacekeeping missions in Liberia, her struggles against the gruesome Apartheid regime and concomitant policies in South Africa, America's war on terrorism, and so on (Okoro, 2006).

From the above definitions, three (3) components are discernible:

1. The actions of states: Foreign policy regulates the conducts, actions, agenda and objectives of states in their relations with others;
2. National or domestic interests which influence these actions: These domestic interests are myriad ranging from the citizens, diplomats, political executives, bureaucrats, interest groups, among others.
3. External environment of a state towards which these actions are oriented: This external environment comprises the plethora of actors in the international system, both states and non-state actors like MNCs, terrorist groups, international organizations, and issues towards which a state's policy action is targeted at.



## GLOBAL IMAGE

A country's standing in the international system, although dependent on some other factors, is highly dependent on her image perception being positive or negative. The perception of a country by members of the international system, how a country pursues its relations with others, and particularly, the behavior of its citizens at home and abroad combine to determine the country's image (Zimako, 2009). Thus, image making is an essential feature of a nation's foreign policy. Image can be seen as the perception of a country by other actors in the international arena (both states and non-state actors), which can be a result of objectivity or subjectivity of purpose. The global image of a country, therefore, provides a basis for self-reappraisal in the event of any bad perception (Chidozie, Ibietan & Ujara, 2014). Global image, Boma-Lysa et al. (2015) purported, relates to how a country is seen by other global actors when it pursues its relations with others and particularly, the behavior of its citizens at home and abroad.

Accordingly, a nation's dogged pursuit of image-building forms an important determinant of how well the country is doing at home and abroad and is simultaneously an essential element in the strategy for foreign policy formulation and implementation. Drawing from Chidozie et al. (2014) and Holsti (1996), it may be safe to state that just as image-making can be objective, it is also relative or subjective in that, images are either good or bad. Both good and bad perceptions have their consequences. But nations, according to their own standards or leaders' perception, perpetually endeavor to have a good image among the comity of nations. Hence, it may appear intangible but the benefits and advantages flowing from a good Image are inestimably unquantifiable. Chidozie et al. (2014:51) wrote that:

*A good image constitutes a source of goodwill and patronage for a country. Investors largely consider this factor in determining where to direct investment funds. It also explains the level of unfriendliness. It is therefore understandable why every Government seeks to promote, at all times, a better image nationally and internationally... A good image results in respect, influence and prestige. While, a bad or negative perception of a country's image implies that such a country lacks respect, Influence and prestige in the international system.*

Indeed, the image issue is a product of perception. There is yet no universally acknowledged scientific standard for perception as it is pervasively subjective. To the extent that human societies are complex, perception is a complex phenomenon (Zimako, 2009). The perception of a nation in international relations is the perception of its people, and the perception of its people is also partly a function of the political leaders' actions and character. Consequently, the image a country attempts to create and project, through its foreign policy, must conform to its citizens' perception of the country, its national interests, and the image expectations of other members of the international community.

## NATURE OF NIGERIAN FOREIGN POLICY

It may not be far from the truth to assert that the often cited belief that state's exploits and achievements in the international scene are about national interest has established the basis of interrelationship of various policies in a state. In explaining national interest, Akinboye (1998) purported that national interest serves two primary purposes as an analytical tool which serves as a conceptual guide by providing the objectives often considered by a state while weighing



an intended foreign policy option; and as an instrument of political action which serves to justify or repudiate a state's foreign policy option and action in the international system.

While expressing the universality of this common knowledge, Bukarambe (1990) substantiated that this is even more profound between the internal-external sets of policies because the two dimensions establish the complete process of a state's policies both within its sovereign self exclusively and between it and the internal environment including non-state actors. The extent of the essence of a state's policies - which are determined by a combination of national peculiarities and national perceptions are such that they are discernible not only vis-à-vis the universal dimension but also in limited settings and even within affinity groups (Bukarambe, 1990). For instance, Africa is distinct from other continents that do not possess Africa's geo-cultural resemblances; nevertheless, even the policy objectives of every African state can vary due to national distinctiveness like geography, demography, natural resources, etc., and can be permanent.

When applied to Nigeria, the foregoing establishes three interrelated perspectives. First, Nigeria also shares the universal premise of an organic link between all its national policies; the dependence and coordination of the policies during implementation; and Nigeria's peculiarities and attributes differentiates it from other (African) states (Bukarambe, 1990). This ultimately shapes the country's national disposition and self-perception and hence the objective basis and nature of its foreign policies away from the general trend.

## CONCEPT OF FOREIGN POLICY

There is no generally agreed definition of foreign policy; hence different scholars have attempted to define the concept from their own perspectives. Modelski in Obi defines foreign policy as the system of activities evolved by communities for changing the behavior of other states and for adjusting their own activities to the international environment. Similarly, Frankel in Obi defines foreign policy as consisting of decisions and actions that involve to some appreciable extent relationship between one state and another. A country's foreign policy consists of self-interest strategies chosen by the state to safeguard its national interests and to achieve its goals within the international relations milieu. It is the aggregate of a country's national interest which results from the interaction of internal and external forces as perceived by the foreign policy decision makers.

The approaches used are strategically employed to interact with other countries, for countries to relate effectively with one another, foreign policy must be well defined, well thought out, and must possess direction. Hence, Adeniran in Wogu infers that foreign policy can best be understood through an explanation of what it actually is. Foreign policy, according to him, consists of three elements. One is the overall orientation and policy intentions of a particular country toward another. The second element is the objective that a country seeks to achieve in her relations or dealings with other countries. The third element of foreign policy is the means for achieving that particular goal or objectives.

In recent times however, due to the deepening level of globalization and transnational activities, relations and interactions have been known to exist between state and non-state actors in the international political arena. These relations in their own way have influenced several foreign policies between nation states. The foreign policy of any nation is the external projection of



some of the domestic policies of that country that may have relevance in such an arena. Both domestic and foreign policies of a country are interrelated, or perhaps more accurately stated, are more inter-penetrated. It is thus appropriately defined as: A country's response to the world outside or beyond its own frontiers or boundaries. That response may be friendly or aggressive, causal or intense, simple or complex, but it is always there. It comprises many elements diplomatic, military, trade, economics, social, cultural, educational, and sporting, among others., and it varies in form and focus according to the circumstance [6]. Some countries can at different times be friends or enemies or valued allies, with a relatively long or short period of time. For example, Nigeria broke diplomatic relations with Cote d' Ivoire, Gabon, Tanzania and Zambia, during the Nigerian civil war (1967-1970), because they recognized and traded with Biafra - the Break Away Eastern Region of Nigeria; but the relationship was restored at the end of the war. Besides, the policy of non-recognition of the apartheid regime of South Africa by Nigeria changed with the installation of a black majority rule by the African National Congress (ANC) country. The point to keep in mind is that whatever forms it takes, some response to the outside world is always there.

In effect, every country must have a foreign policy in order to live and survive as an independent body in the complex, sometimes dangerous world we live in today. Essentially therefore, countries all over the world design and implement foreign policies in order to guide their external relations as well as protect, promote and defend their vital national interests. This could be in areas like defence of territorial integrity, the promotion of economic, military, strategic and diplomatic Interests and whatever a country might consider as its vital national interest. It is therefore naturally expected that Nigeria's foreign policy ought to be fundamentally guided by her national interest which should ordinarily serve to either justify or repudiate the nation's action or inaction in international relations.

According to Yaqub, it should be understood that a country's foreign policy should be dynamic enough to respond to the challenges that might be taking place in the world which are outside its territorial confines. Indeed the dictum in international relations is summed up by the saying that, "there is no permanent friend but permanent interest". Section 19 of 1979 and 1999 constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria had gone further to set the foreign policy objectives of the Nigerian state. Thus:

**The Foreign Policy Shall be:**

- Promotion and protection of national interest.
- Promotion of African integration and support of African unity.
- Promotion of international cooperation for consolidation of universal peace and mutual respect among all nations and elimination in all its manifestation.
- Respect for international law and treaty. Obligations as well as the seeking of settlement of international disputes by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration and adjudication.
- Promotion of a just world economic order.

Yusuf and Akinboye averred that protection of our national interest has remained the permanent focus of Nigeria's Foreign policy, but the strategies for such protection have varied



from one regime government to another. By this statement, he infers that various governments from independence to date have pursued the same goals and objectives of Nigeria's foreign policy but in different ways. Thus, the foreign policies under Goodluck Jonathan's administration were deduced from the above and they include:

- Improved cooperation with other military forces all over the world to bring about peace globally.
- Improved bilateral and multilateral trade agreement.
- Cooperation and assistance in curbing health challenges all over the world.
- Promoting the welfare of Nigerians abroad to ensure they are treated with respect and dignity in all circumstances.

## COMPONENTS OF FOREIGN POLICY

According to Obi, foreign policy is a product of many factors and forces. Some of these factors and forces are natural, while some are man-made. Also, while some are permanent others are temporary. It is the sum total of these that are referred to as components of foreign policy. Rodee in Obi states that in devising foreign policy, a nation must consider certain basic facts of its existence. The frame of reference includes its geographical situation, population potential, economic endowment and ideological environment.

Brecher in Obi summed the components as geography, external and global environment, personalities, economic and military position and public opinion as the major components of foreign policy. Rosenau in Obi differs a bit in his own components. He listed size, geography, economic development, culture and history, great power structure, alliances, technology, social structure, moods of opinion, political accountability, governmental structure, and situational factors (both external and internal).

**Geographical situation:** The geographical characteristics of size, topography, shape and climate are important factors. A state with a sizable territory, good climate, natural defense boundaries, arable land for food production and a shape which is compact and easier to defend is seen as possessing the necessary power potential that enables a state to prosecute independent foreign policy. Also, the geographical location of a country, to a very large extent, determines its defense policies. Countries that have aggressive and troublesome neighbors must have a policy based on how to contain them, either through arm build-up or through military alliances.

**Military power:** The military strength of a nation to a large extent influences its foreign policy. Countries that are militarily strong often adopt aggressive postures on issues they feel strongly about. This is because they back their tough stance with actions. Morgenthau in Obi states that the dynamic force which mould international relations is to be found in the states drive for power. Power is also a means for serving national interest. Nations that are militarily strong, most often believed that in international politics, might is right. All their policies are framed in such a way that when persuasion fails, power comes in handy to help them actualize their goals.

**Economic endowment factor:** In defining foreign policy, Karl Deutsch in Obi included the pursuit and protection of a country's economic interest. This goes to show the importance of





economic consideration in foreign policy. Nations need to engage in trade with other nations in order to sell what they have in abundance and buy what they need and do not have at all or sufficiently reflects their economic interest. The ability of every state to pursue its foreign policy successfully also depends on its economic position. Developed countries because of their developed economy have been able to pursue their foreign policy with much success.

**The decision making process:** Foreign policies like domestic policies are products of various processes. The elite who make these policies are human beings, who have their individual preferences, world views and emotions. The decisions which they make to a large extent reflect their personality. Frankel in Obi states that policy choices flow inexorably from the composite images of competing elites within the political system. It is therefore very difficult to divorce the personality of a leader from the policies of his government. It is therefore apt to say that the personality of leaders plays a very prominent role in determining foreign policy of their countries.

**Population:** According to Obi, though a populous nation does not automatically translate to a strong nation, population is a factor in the strength of nations. A nation's population helps in her military might because a nation with a very small population may not have enough soldiers to turn it into a strong nation. A country's population is a very important factor in its rating and status abroad. Since countries regard populous nations as a force to reckon with, due to their numerous potentials, this affects a nation's power position and her foreign policy.

**Public opinion:** Public opinion as a factor in foreign policy making is particularly important in real democratic countries where the government cannot easily go against the grain of public opinion. Therefore, foreign public opinion determines foreign policy of a country.

### **NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY UNDER PRESIDENT GOODLUCK JONATHAN ADMINISTRATION (2011-2015)**

At the time President Yar'adua came into office, it was worthy of note that his health had been severely threatened. While he was trying to manage his ill-health, Yar'adua made no provisions for the Vice President to act in his absence. Thus, the consequence was that the ship of the Nigerian state was sailing rudderless on the international waters of foreign policy. Without functional institutions and without a leader, Nigeria's foreign relations and indeed the State of Nigeria also went into a coma when Yar'adua went into a coma in a Saudi Arabian hospital. Nigeria failed to show up at important international meetings, lost many positions in multilateral associations, forsook obligations, and found herself in a situation where many of her allies started wondering what had gone wrong with Nigeria. This eventually led to the death of Yar'adua on May 5<sup>th</sup> 2010, his Vice, former President Jonathan was appointed acting president of Nigeria until the 2011 election where he won the seat of the president of Nigeria.

Upon Yar'adua's untimely death in 2010, Vice-President, Goodluck Jonathan assumed office as the President for the duration of their joint-ticket. At the expiration of the first-term, President Jonathan contested and won the Presidential election in 2011, and thus, presided over Nigeria till 2015 (Odubajo, 2017). Convinced that a lot of changes had taken place during the 50 years of existence of Nigeria's foreign policy thrust, President Jonathan ordered a review of the foreign policy document in line with his administration's domestic policy thrust popularly called the transformation agenda. The foreign policy position of the Jonathan administration



was generally perceived as a continuation of the foreign policy thrust of his predecessor. This nonetheless, specifically, the administration's foreign policy endeavors were embedded in the attainment of the administration's Transformation Agenda.

This Transformation Agenda, according to Ituma (2012), was aimed at addressing the following: macroeconomics framework and economic direction; job creation; public expenditure management; governance; justice and judicially; legislature; education; health sector; labor and productivity; power sector; information and communication technology; Niger Delta; transportation; foreign policy and economic diplomacy.

In this vein, the government reached out to the rest of the world in seeking assistance for the development of the local economy. Jonathan's attempts paid-off as the Nigerian economy raked in huge capital and foreign investments. As Ukwuije (2015:114) captured it, the administration's foreign policy led to the:

*Opening up Nigeria to the global business community and becoming Africa's number One destination of foreign investors. In the first 6 months of 2014, a total of US\$9.70 Billion or NI.51 trillion flowed into the national economy as FDI... Under Jonathan's administration, Nigeria rebased its GDP for the first time in over a decade to become the largest economy in Africa, overtaking South Africa and Egypt in the process, and that the Proceeds from Nigeria's non-oil export rose to US\$2.97billion by the end of 2013, up From USS2.3million in 2010... Under Jonathan's administration, Nigeria became the First country in West Africa to host the World Economic Forum (WEF) in 2014. It was also the most successful WEF for Africa (WEFA) in history, boasting a global reach of 2.1 billion people according to estimates.*

Also, strong positions were taken in respect of issues concerning the region and the continent as a whole. Nigeria sided with the west in respect of the political crises in Cote d'Ivoire and Libya. Boma-Lysa et al. (2015) recorded that the regime and through its leadership in ECOWAS effectively managed the ouster of Laurent Gbagbo of Côte D'Ivoire when he refused to hand over power, after the 2010 Presidential elections in that country. Again, for Bariledum et al. (2016), Nigeria's posture of peace played out strongly during the twelve months of Jonathan's administration when it threw its weight behind Libya's National Transitional Council, and championed the ECOWAS Framework Agreement on the situation in Mali.

Nigeria recorded appreciable successes as a new vista in economic and citizen diplomacy continued to open. In line with the citizen diplomacy, Nigeria and South Africa resolved their diplomatic row over the deportation of some Nigerians traveling to South Africa, reviving their bi-national commission which had been moribund (Bariledum et al., 2016). Also, the relationship between Nigeria and the US continued to improve under Jonathan. This is most exemplified in the signing of the first US-Nigeria bi-national Commission. The Commission's main focus was Nigeria's domestic priorities; key components of what Jonathan termed his transformation Agenda. On the downside though, the inability of the government to crush the Boko Haram insurgents cast a dark cloud on the Jonathan administration's domestic and foreign policy agenda, though the government worked assiduously to ensure the delisting of Nigeria from the US terror list (Odubajo, 2016).

The foreign policy position of the administration of President Goodluck Jonathan who succeeded the late Yar'adua is generally perceived as a continuation of the foreign policy thrust of his predecessor. In his capacity as the acting President, Jonathan embarked on a number of



diplomatic shuttles, as part of a deliberate attempt to reassure the world that Nigeria was well and secure despite the internal political challenges especially with the challenges of succession it was going through. Nigeria literally returned to the international arena. One of the shuttles took him to the USA where he met with his American counterpart which enabled the delisting of Nigeria from the discriminatory rule of the Department of Homeland Security on special screening of passengers on international flights to the United States that specifically targeted Nigerians (consequent upon the Christmas day attempted bombing a US airline by a Nigerian Abdul Mutallab). Also, Jonathan recalled Nigeria's ambassador to Libya in protest of a suggestion by Muammar Gaddafi that Nigeria should separate into a Muslim North State and a Christian South. The action was aimed at checkmating the excesses of the then Libyan leader and sending a strong signal that Nigeria can no longer tolerate such undue interference in the nation's internal affairs from any State.

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

In fact, he engineered a purposeful mobilization and instrumentalization of Nigerians in the diaspora for national development. Not only did the administration encourage the formation of the Nigerians in the Diaspora Organisation (NIDO) in all countries where there are Nigerians, it went further to establish a Diaspora Commission to take charge of the affairs of Nigerians in diasporas and ensure their effective instrumentalisation. His prompt response to the denigrating deportation of Nigerians by South Africa sent a very strong signal that Nigeria has come of age and that any attempt to denigrate her will have consequences. The diplomatic way President Jonathan was able to manage the said Nigeria-South Africa face-off was highly welcomed by Nigerians. He was also quick to order the evacuation of Nigerians trapped in the crisis to countries like Libya in 2011 and Egypt in January 2012. In fact, Nigeria was the first to airlift her citizens from Egypt. In January 2012, Nigeria hosted the fifth Nigeria/EU dialogue aimed at streamlining migration in a globalizing world and in the interest of all parties. This affirmative action's projected vividly the citizen centered focus of Nigeria's Foreign Policy.

The Jonathan's administration gave special attention to the improvement and strengthening of economic ties with the country's partners in the international community as a foundation for stability and growth. For the first time, there were conscious efforts by Nigeria to ensure that her sacrifices of lives and resources towards restoring peace to many countries in Africa no longer go without commensurate national benefit. It marked a paradigm shift in Nigeria's foreign policy. However, focusing on Nigeria's domestic priorities did not mean abandonment of African issues. It is on this commitment that the regime and through its leadership in ECOWAS effectively managed the ouster of Laurent Gbagbo of Cote D'Ivoire when he refused to hand over power, after the 2010 Presidential elections in that country. Similar crisis of self-perpetuation in office in Niger was also condemned by the Jonathan's Administration.



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

After President Goodluck completed the tenure of former President Umaru Musa Yar'adua, he (Jonathan) then contested and won the April 2011 presidential election with massive support and expectations among many Nigerians. The president's development emphasis was anchored on a transformation programme which according to him was to totally transform every decaying sector in Nigeria. It was also the time Nigeria was witnessing high levels of insecurity occasioned by the activities of Boko Haram in the North East, corruption and youth restiveness, among other problems. All these factors contributed negatively to the global perception of Nigeria and Nigerians. In order to address these problems, President Goodluck Jonathan's foreign policy direction focused on investment and economic co-operation within the global community.

This according to Obuoforibo was made during the May 29 inaugural and acceptance speech of the President; thus, Nigeria's new foreign policy direction is now on investment and economic co-operation which thus ties foreign policy to the country's domestic agenda, a radical departure from the old one which has Africa as the centerpiece. The new foreign policy lays more emphasis on investment rather than political drive as it is the only avenue to deliver the dividends of democracy to the electorate. The new posture of government is that while we retain the leadership role in our sub-region, and while we play our leadership role on the continent by taking the lead in all major issues on the continent, the foreign policy direction will also be used to propel the economic and industrial development of our country.

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

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

Internationally, the pervasive corruption in Nigeria has tarnished the image of the country and has resulted in foreign nationals exercising extreme caution in entering into business transactions with Nigerians, thereby weakening the economic sector. President Goodluck did not actually succeed in implementing foreign policy as evidenced from the USA government refusing to sell weapons to Nigeria, and the South Africa government also sizing Nigeria money meant to purchase weapons to fight Boko Haram, among other diplomatic skirmishes



globally. Similarly, many Nigerians were executed in countries like Indonesia, Philippines, Australia and unprovoked attacks on Nigerian nationals and massive deportation of Nigerians across the globe.

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

### **SUMMARY/CONCLUSION**

Discussion so far shows that more than external challenges, it is the internal challenges that are dampening Nigeria's attainment of positive international image and national transformation. Some of these challenges include leadership crisis, corruption, insurgency, irregular power supply, low quality/public service delivery and rating of the nation's educational institutions amongst others. Also, the study asserts that foreign policy constitutes a force for positive international image, a force for positive change, which should be maximally harnessed for national development and transformation, emphasizing that a robust foreign policy position invariably promotes international respectability among the comity of nations and positively affects a country's national transformation agenda-hence Federal Ministry of Information stresses that a nation's attempt to have a meaningful impact and influence on the world around it will be guided by her foreign policy objectives and national interests and how effectively such disposition is transmitted or communicated to the world. In other words, foreign policy objectives and national interests must be clinically packaged and projected to achieve their aims.

Nigeria's foreign policy under Goodluck Jonathan's administration has no significant role in boosting the global image of Nigeria. I also emphasize that Goodluck Jonathan's administration foreign policy plays a significant role in boosting the global image of Nigeria. Therefore, we conclude that the foreign policies established and focused on by Goodluck Jonathan's administration had a negative impact and implication on the global image of Nigeria as clearly stated. The aspect of this paper is that the image of Nigeria globally is negative and almost equally the same number think the image of Nigeria globally is good. It is therefore apt to say that since the majority of the population agree that the image of Nigeria globally is negative, public relations should be effectively integrated and should be involved in the formulation of policies as they concern the international community.



## REFERENCES

- Abdulrasheed Adamu, Muhammad bin Muda, And Mohammad Zaki bin Ahmad. Conceptualising national interest in Nigerian foreign policy: A focus on abacha regime//Journal of Education and Social Sciences. Vol. 5, issue 2, (October). ISSN 2289-1552 2016. -[http://jesoc.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/KC5\\_211.pdf](http://jesoc.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/KC5_211.pdf)
- Adejumo, A.,(2007) Re-Ojo Maduekwe's Citizenship Diplomacy. Available on INTERNET at <http://209.85.129.132/search?q=cache:R5j9cuj4sJ:www.nigeriasinamerica.com/articles/20...>
- Akinterinwa BA (2004) Concentricism in Nigeria's foreign. Vantage publishers limited, Ibadan
- Agbu, O., (2007) Nigerian Foreign Policy under President Umaru Musa Yar'adua: Challenges and Prospect. Being a Paper Presented at the One-Day Seminar on Citizen Diplomacy Organized by the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos. 29 November.
- Ajaebili C (2011) The Option of Economic Diplomacy in Nigeria's Foreign Policy. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science 1: 277-280.
- Alao A (2011) Nigeria and the global powers: Continuity and change in policy and Perceptions, South African Foreign Policy and African Drivers Programme. Occasional Paper Series (SAIIA) No 96.
- Aluko O. (1981) essays in Nigerian foreign policy. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Chibundu VN (2003) Foreign Policy with Particular Reference to Nigeria (1960- 2002). Spectrum books Ltd, Ibadan.
- Chukwuemeka E, Bartholomew U, Ugwu J (2012) Curbing Corruption in Nigeria: The Imperatives of Good Leadership. Singaporean Journal of Business Economics and Management Studies 1:61-81.
- Dudley B. (1982) an introduction to Nigerian government and politics. London: Macmillan.
- Elmer (1961) Conduct of America Diplomacy. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company Inc.
- Eze, O.C. (2007) Citizen Diplomacy, Legal Perspective, National/ International Dimension. Being A Paper Presented at the One-Day Seminar on Citizen Diplomacy. Organized by The Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos 29 November. Fawole,
- Eziolisa, Peter Okwudili. Nigeria's Foreign Policy: The Realities // Journal of Research in Arts and Social Sciences, Vol. 4 No. 1 December, 2015
- Federal Ministry of Information (2012) External publicity and Nigeria's Foreign Policy. Lagos: The Nigerian institute of International Affairs (NIIA).
- Human Rights Watch (2006), Imperatives for Immediate Change to the African Union Mission, In Sudan, Human Rights Watch Report, 18, 1.
- Evaluation of Nigeria's Foreign Policy at 53 / Research on Humanities and Social Sciences. Vol.5,No.2, 2015. [www.iiste.org](http://www.iiste.org)
- JCga, A.M (2014) "Values, Electoral Systems and the Importance of Successful Elections in Nigeria's Foreign Policy", being a lecture delivered at the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NILA), Lagos, 23 October 2014
- Jinadu, L.A. (2005) "The Philosophical Foundations and Fundamental Principles of Nigeria Foreign Policy", in U, Joy Ogwu (ed.) New Horizons for Nigeria in World Affairs. Lagos: Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, (pp. 17-28)



- Mbachu, O. (2007) Citizen Diplomacy: The Challenges For Nigerian Defense And Security in The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Being. A Paper presented at a Seminar on Citizen Diplomacy organized By the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos. November 29
- Lalude, G (2005) "Resolving the National Question", in Adeoye A. Akinsanya and John A. Ayoade (eds.) Readings in Nigerian Government and Politics. Ogun: Gratia Associates International, (pp. 501-523)
- Lipede&Adelusi, (1995) "US and the EEC's Foreign Policies Towards Nigeria: Issues of Human Rights and Democratisation, 1986-1993", FASS Seminar, NDA, Kaduna
- Magbadelo, J.O (2007) "Obasanjo Administration and the Management of Nigeria's External Debt", in Bola A. Akinterinwa (ed.) Nigeria's National Interests in a Globalising World: Further Reflections on Constructive and Beneficial Concentricism, Volume 111, Nigeria's National Interests Beyond Nigeria, Ibadan: Bolytag International Publishers, (pp. 225-252)
- Magbadelo, J.O. (2007) "The Global Agenda of the Olusegun Obasanjo Administration", in Bola A. Akinterinwa (ed.) Nigeria's National Interests in a Globalising World: Further Reflections on Constructive and Beneficial Concentricism, Volume 111, Nigeria's National Interests Beyond Nigeria, Ibadan: Bolytag International Publishers, (pp. 635-653)
- Menkene, J.K and Fonkeng, P (2010) "Cameroon-Nigerian Relations: A Model for Posterity Nigerian Journal of International Affairs (NJIA), Vol.36, No. 2, (pp. 103-128)
- Mustapha, R (2007) ""Nigeria After the April 2007 Elections: What Next? Paper presented to the Royal African Society, London, 31 May.
- Morton AK (2007) Theoretical systems and political realities: a review, System and process inn IntenationalPolitiCs. University of Chicago, USA.
- Nnadozie, U.O (2005) "National Conference, Federalism and the National Question: Federalism, Constitutionalism and Elections in Nigeria", in Warisu O. Alli (ed.) Political Reform Conference, Federalism and the National Ouestion in Nigeria, Lagos: The Nigerian Political Science Association (NPSA). (Pp. 197-213)
- Nwoke, C.N (2014) "Towards a Knowledge Economy for Genuine Transformation in Nigeia: The Crucial Role of Leadership", in Chibuzo N. Nwoke and OgabaOche (eds.) Contemporary Challenges in Nigeria, Africa and the World. Lagos: The Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA). (Pp. 51-67)
- Nwolise, O.B.C (1988) "Political Parties and the Electoral Process", in Victor Ayeni and Kayode Soremekun (eds.) Nigeria's Second Republic. Lagos: Daily Times Publications. (Pp. 35- 66)
- Nwankwo O (2013) Shifting the Paradigm in Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Goodluck Jonathan and Nigeria's vision 20:2020. Social Sciences, Science Publishing Group 2: 212-221
- Obi E (2006) Nigeria's Foreign Policy and International Relations Theories. Vector Publishers, Onitsha.
- Obiozor, G.A (2007) Nigeria and the World: Managing the Politics of Diplomatic Ambivalence Among Nations, Selected Essays and Speeches, New York: Atlantic Books
- Oche, O (2013) "Terrorism and Nigeria's Foreign Policy". Nigerian Journal of International Studies (NJIS), Vol. 38, Nos. 1&2, (pp. 282-299)
- Ogunsanwo, A (2009) "Citizen Diplomacy: Challenges for Nigeria's Foreign Policy", in Osita C. Eze (ed.) Citizen Diplomacy. Lagos: The Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA), (pp. 19-30)



- Ogunsanwo, Alaba (2007) Citizen Diplomacy: Challenges for Nigeria's Foreign Policy. A Paper Presented at the One-Day Seminar on Citizen Diplomacy organized by the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos November, 29.
- Oluyemi O, Fayomi F, Chidozie A, Ajayi A (2015) Nigeria's national image and her foreign Policy: An exploratory approach. *Open Journal of Political Science* 5: 180-196.
- Okocha, C & Nzeshi, O (2007) Nigeria to Adopt Citizenship Diplomacy. Available on internet at <http://209.85.129.132/search?q=cache:wel89qwlwuwj:nigeranbronds.blogspot.2007/o.22>
- Omotola, J.S & Saliu, H.A, (2005), Nigerian Foreign Policy Under Obasanjo in H.A Saliu (edited) Nigeria Under Democratic Rule (1999-2003) Vol 2. Ibadan, University Press. Plischke,
- Saliu, H.A. (2000) Nigeria and Peace Support Operators, trends and Policy Implication, in *International Peacekeeping Journal*, 7, 3.
- Saliu, H.A (2006a) "Contending Views on Nigerian Foreign Policy under Abacha", in Hassan Saliu (ed.) *Essays on Contemporary Nigerian Foreign Policy, Volume 1*, badan Vantage Publishers Limited, (pp. 307-329)
- Salu, H.A (2006a) "The Foreign Policy Legacies of the Babangida Regime", in Hassan A. Saliu (ed.) *Essays on Contemporary Nigerian Foreign Policy, Volume 1*, Ibadan: Vantage Publishers Limited, (pp. 296-306)
- Sampson, I.T (2014) "State Responses to Domestic Terrorism in Nigeria: The Dilemma of Efficacy", in Chibuzo N. Nwoke and OgabaOche (eds.) *Contemporary Challenges in Nigeria, Africa and the World*. Lagos: The Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA). (Pp. 23-50)
- Satow, E., (1966) *A Guide to Diplomatic Practice*. London: Longmans, Green and co. Ltd.
- Soyinka, K. (1994) "Diplomatic Baggage: MOSSAD and Nigeria: The Dikko Story", Lagos: Newswatch Books Limited
- Soremekun, K (1988) Foreign Policy", in Victor Ayeni and Kayode Soremekun (eds.) *Nigeria's Second Republic*. Lagos: Daily Times Publications. (Pp. 219-232)
- Uhomoibhi, M, (2012a) An Overview of Nigerian Foreign Relations: A Practitioner's Perspective in Anyaoku, E (edited) *Review of Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Issues and Challenges*. Lagos, NIIA, 1.
- Useni, J.T (1997), "The Abacha Mission: Pains and Gains", *ECPER Journal*, Vol. V, No. 1, (pp.6-25)
- W.A (2003) *Nigeria's External Relations and Foreign Policy under Military Rule, 1966 to 1999*. Ile – Ife: O.A.U. press.
- Weiss T.G (2003) *The illusion of UN Security Council Reform the centre for strategic and International studies and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology*.
- Wogu IAP, Sholarin MA, Chidozie FC (2013) A critical Evaluation of Nigeria's Foreign Policy At 53. *Journal of Research on Humanities and Social Sciences* 5: 137-147.
- Yaqub N (2004) *The millennium development goals and the sustainability of Nigeria's Foreign Policy in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Vintage publishers, Ibadan.
- Zedilo, E (2005) *Reforming the United Nations for Peace and Security proceeding of a workshop To Analyse the Report of the High-Level panel on Threats, Challenges and Change*. Yale Centre for the study of Globalization.
- Zimako, O.Z., (2009) *Face of a Nation: Democracy in Nigeria, Foreign Relations and National Image, Modern Approach*. Lagos: Nigeria.