

Globalization and Foreign Policy of Nigeria: Issues and Challenges in Umaru Musa Yar'Adua's Diplomacy of Consequence

Christian Chidi Okeke, *Ph.D*

Department of Political Science, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria.



Article History

Received :02/04/2022

Accepted : 05/04/2022

Published : 08/04/2022

Corresponding author:

Christian Chidi Okeke,
Ph.D

Abstract

That globalization enhances transnational interconnectedness of people within the international system has long been established. Through that process, citizens traverse national boundaries for economic, religious, social and cultural purposes. This has, however, affected the citizens in various ways and consequently influenced foreign policy of the different states at various times. This study particularly assessed how globalization influenced Nigeria's foreign policy during Musa Yar'Adua's administration. The qualitative mechanism of data collection and analysis was applied in the study. Social Constructivist Theory served as theoretical framework of analysis. The study found out that globalization accounted for the re-definition and re-focusing of Nigeria's foreign policy under Yar'Adua. It equally found out that the citizen-centric thrust of the administration's foreign policy failed to achieve its objective owing to the bottlenecks thrown-up by globalization. The study therefore recommended refocusing of foreign policy towards resolving the country's internal contradictions.

Keywords: globalization, interconnectedness, foreign policy, international system, citizen diplomacy

Funding: This study received no specific financial support.

Competing Interests: The author declared that he has no competing interests

Introduction

Globalization has, today, redefined the global system with its diverse impacts. In fact, it is the defining process of the present age (Khor, 2000). The import is that globalization has shaped numerous things, ranging from foreign policy to national policy formulation and implementation. Obviously, with globalization, the international system is witnessing what Rangarajan (2003) describes as the integration of economies and societies through the cross-country flow of information, ideas, technologies, goods, services, capital, finance, and people. From all indications, the globalization process accounts for greater integration of the world in the economic, social, cultural, and political spheres (Alli, 2006). And this becomes much more evident in all facets of human existence in contemporary societies with each passing day.

As an enabler, globalization provides the capacity for citizens of one country to cross their national boundary into other states for various reasons which include economic, political, social, and

cultural. This has even become much more entrenched within the confines of international relations as well as the global community. It is for this reason that scholars agree that the globalization process has indeed become a strong determining factor with regard to how states relate to one another. It is a departure from the pre-globalization era and even the early inception of the concept when such integration was at zero and low ebb. What this practically means is that integration has become more pronounced, visible, and impactful as globalization becomes more entrenched. Put differently, the globe has become much more compressed through the various instruments enabled by globalization.

However, the conviction is that globalization is equally a double-edged sword. In essence, it has its pros and cons and has different kinds of impacts. In certain cases, it has brought about policy changes within and outside the frontiers of sovereign states and other entities alike. Obviously, its impacts are multi-faceted. What this rightly implies is that globalization which provides the impetus for transnational cooperation has also become a reason why states

have adapted their foreign policy objectives to reflect the realities of the time. In some cases, it has weakened the capacity of most sovereign states to advance their national interest.

Contextually, this study critically examined the impacts of globalization on Nigeria's foreign policy during the Umaru Musa Yar'Adua administration. It set out to determine how globalization influenced the foreign policy of the regime. In essence, it sought to know if globalization positively impacted the foreign policy of Yar'Adua's administration or otherwise. This is with a view to offering far-reaching recommendations on how to achieve foreign policy objectives as the grip of globalization on global governance gets deeper.

Statement of the Problem

Nigeria's foreign policy has existed since 1960s after gaining her political independence from Britain. Ideally, foreign policies assist sovereign states to achieve their national interests. A foreign policy is a blueprint that contains preferences pursued by states in their external interactions or relations. It guides states as they engage in international politics, with aims that bring benefits to citizens. With independence, Nigeria made Africa the centerpiece of her foreign policy.

The reality and generally speaking, however, is that Nigeria's foreign policy since independence lacks firmness and proactive orientation. Its obvious weakness and ambiguity are so remarkable that it robs the country of the benefits of being an active member of the global system. If not for anything else, it barely offers protection to Nigerian citizens in foreign countries.

Thus, it is a general consensus that the foreign policy orientation of the Nigerian political elite is ad hoc in nature, incoherent, inconsistent and unsystematic (Omenma, 2015). And this was the case under Yar'Adua. The foreign policy of the era suffered from what has variously been described as an exhibition of the high level of political obscurantism and indolence by foreign policy elites of the country. It was also encumbered by what Okeke (2020) described as a lack of economic fiber by the Nigerian State to firmly pursue and sustain her declared foreign policy goals. In essence, the theory and practice of citizen diplomacy in Nigeria's foreign policy process as was witnessed under Yar'Adua's administration was more rhetoric than reality (Odoh and Nwogbaga, 2014).

For instance, as more Nigerians engaged in trips abroad and consequently increased interactions with citizens of other states (enabled by globalization), issues of maltreatment of Nigerians abroad equally escalated in equal proportion, particularly during the Yar'Adua administration. Thus, the period 2007 to 2010 seemed characteristic of an era when globalization heavily impacted Nigeria's foreign relations rather negatively. What appears to give credence to this is the fact that many Nigerians, in an attempt to utilize opportunities offered by globalization, became victims of the integration process.

Specifically, the maltreatment of Nigerian citizens overseas during Yar'Adua's administration was obviously unimaginable. Some scholars even argue that such maltreatments reached unacceptable

levels during Yar'Adua's era owing to reports that apart from the over 20, 000 Nigerians that were serving jail terms in prisons across Europe and Africa (1, 500 in Libya; 391 in India, 15 in Nepal; 14 in Japan, 13 in Canada, 40 in the Niger Republic, 150 in Togo, 1, 400 in Britain, etc), many others were harassed and molested on daily basis in foreign countries. Other scholars, however, argue that it was the priority accorded the principle of reciprocity as a response by the Yar'Adua's government as well as the decision by the administration to be vocal against the maltreatments that made it appear as though it was particularly outrageous at the time. It is in the light of these realities that this study set out to interrogate the impact of globalization on the diplomacy of consequence pursued by Yar'Adua's administration in Nigeria.

Objectives

The study had broad and specific objectives. The broad objective of the study was to determine the correlations between globalization and Nigeria's foreign policy under Musa Yar'Adua. The specific objectives were:

1. To examine how globalization influenced Nigeria's foreign policy under Musa Yar'Adua's administration
2. To determine the effectiveness of diplomacy of consequence as Yar'Adua's foreign policy response to the negative effects of globalization
3. To determine how Nigerian foreign policy objectives can be achieved in the face of globalization

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. How has globalization affected Nigeria's foreign policy under Musa Yar'Adua's administration?
2. In what ways has diplomacy of consequence responded to the negative effects of globalization?
3. How can Nigerian foreign policy objectives be achieved in the face of globalization?

Methodology

The qualitative mechanism of data collection and analysis was applied in this study

Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on the Social Constructivist Theory whose central thesis as noted by Weber (2005) is that what states do depend on what their identities and interests are. As Ujara and Ibieta (2014) put it, the theory is based on how actors within the international system define their national interests, threats to those interests, and their relationship with one another. By implication, those ingredients go to determine the amount of impetus put into play in order to logically drive those foreign-policy goals to the desired conclusion. That is why the theory contends that states decide on what they want and need, not only based on material needs but social interaction. In order to also sustain an elaborative discourse on the principles of the theory, Goldstein and Pevehouse (2011) posit that Constructivism recognizes that power is not absent from the international system but it focuses more on social interactions based on perception. It is in that light that they, therefore, maintain that the Constructivist theory examines how

state interests and identities are intertwined and how those identities are shaped by their interaction with other states.

Obviously, the focus of Constructivism is on human awareness or consciousness in its place in world affairs (Jackson & Sorensen, 2006). Thus, the perception of friends and enemies, in-groups and out-groups, fairness, and justice all become key determinants of a state's behaviour (Slaughter, 2011). That explains why while some Constructivists would accept that states are self-interested and rational actors, they would equally stress that varying identities and beliefs underlie the notions of rationality under which states pursue simply for survival, power, or wealth. To that extent, Wendt (cited in Weber, 2005), outlines the fundamental principles of the theory to include:

- ❖ People act toward objects, including other actors, on the basis of the meanings that the objects have for them: social knowledge
- ❖ The meanings in terms of which action is organized arise out of interaction: social practice
- ❖ Identities (and interests) are produced in and through 'situated activity': social identities and interests.

In view of the exposition, the implication of the theory for this paper which seeks to examine the correlations between globalization and Nigeria's foreign policy under Yar'Adua is therefore not far-fetched. This is more so when the central argument of the theory to the effect that when a state succeeds in constructing a perception of itself for another state, that ultimately changes the nature of relations in the global system is placed under intelligible consideration. The import, therefore, is that the ability of Nigeria to create a positive perception of itself to the rest of the state actors in the context of social relations, for instance, automatically brings about a corresponding change or adjustment in the way the rest of the other states relations with the country. However, since Nigeria relates with the rest of the world through her foreign policy, globalization comes in to determine success in terms of goals that the foreign policy sets to achieve. By implication, seeking to correct the perception and address the maltreatment of Nigerian citizens abroad was apt as the foreign policy direction of the Yar'Adua administration. But whether that goal was achieved within the context of globalization, and to what extent, was the subject matter that this paper set out to examine.

Literature Review

Perspectives on Globalization and Impacts

Globalization is both a highly contested concept and a very complex process that can be understood from different perspectives: economic, social, political, and cultural (Audu, 2010). Over time, it has acquired a plurality of definitions as scholars struggle to approach it through their different lenses. The effect of such multiple perspectives is that the term today has both controversial meaning and origin; however, scholars unanimously agree that it is a multifaceted process (Asogwa and Omemma, 2001).

To Muhammad (2013), globalization as a multidimensional concept connotes the deepening of social, economic, and cultural

interactions among countries of the world through the conquering of the barriers of time and space. It is a process promoted by the openness of most countries to international trade, international investment, and international finance (Onimode, 2000). According to Raymond and Kegley (2010), globalization is a process that predictably intensifies the integration of not just the global economy but the people through the instrumentality of technological advancement while in the same vein represents a set of processes that are widening, deepening, and accelerating the interconnectedness among societies. Essentially, the concept refers to the shrinking and dismantling of territorial boundaries and barriers to enable the easier flow of goods, peoples, information, and services across nations.

Clearly, globalization has many faces and many impacts. That is what Khor (2000) emphasized when he said that globalization is a very uneven process with unequal distribution of benefits and losses. However, to buttress his understanding of the concept, Onuoha (2008) argues that globalization is capitalism at the desperation stage. In agreement, Olisa (1999) maintains that globalization is one ongoing gigantic movement initiated and pushed forward by the developed capitalist and industrial Western nations with a view to removing or weakening territorial and jurisdictional boundaries and barriers of individual nations. The overall ambition, according to him, is to establish a world free-market economy and open political system in which all nations would participate and operate along with a set of rules and conventions.

In the further exposition, Onuoha (2008) contends that two main schools of thought which are liberal and radical schools have emerged to explain the meaning of globalization. By extension, the divergent opinions also reflect the depth of disagreement as to what constitutes the impacts of globalization. According to Onuoha (2008), the liberals see globalization as one of the best things to have happened in the millennium. To the liberals, globalization is a process of freeing economies so that trade between countries can take place more easily. Freeing up in this context, as he informs, means providing more opportunities for businesses to make a profit and reducing the state's role as a producer or deliverer of services.

Okeke (2018) in his account posits that liberals believe that globalization is a neutral and inevitable part of historical change as well as a process that will increase wealth and prosperity for all countries and people, including workers while remaining the only positive path for the world economy. This shows that globalization means to them a positive phenomenon that ensures greater movement of people, goods, technology, and idea, with the potency to accelerate sustainable development across the globe. In all, the liberals are consistent in their opinion that globalization boosts income levels and helps to raise the standard of living, particularly in developing countries. This is in addition to other gains like an achievement of economic growth, the spread of democratic values, respect for human rights, and a high density in information technology (Ezeibe, 2015). In fact, the belief of liberal scholars as far as globalization is concerned is one that portrays the concept as one of the best things to have happened in the millennium.

Conversely, radical scholars have collectively questioned the logic behind globalization and see nothing new in the globalization process (Onuoha, 2008). It is in that light that radical scholars classify globalization as a new form of imperialism. What is instructive in the perspective is the fact that radical scholars tenaciously hold the belief that globalization is increasing global poverty. Their major argument is that globalization is affecting different categories of countries differently. Definitely, this is the point that radical scholars struggle to score.

Specifically, radical scholars' view is that globalization undermines the capacity of many developing countries to grow and develop. To them, the phenomenon accounts for rising poverty, money laundering, and international terrorism. Asobie (2002) aligns with the radical view and adds a major dimension to the globalization controversy. He argues that globalization, in its current phase, is essentially the universalization of capitalism in its speculative variety. Obviously, the speculative dimension enunciated by him renders the globalization process a suspect sort. That explains why Akpuru-Aja and Emeribe (2000) agree that one result of globalization is grotesque and dangerous polarization between peoples and countries benefiting from the system and those that are merely recipients and reactionaries to the effects. Ezeibe (2015) while showing support for the position goes as far as accusing globalization of affecting developmental thinking and actions of developing polities. He insists that globalization is a form of entrapment for Africa.

Foreign Policy: Meanings and Necessity

Foreign policy evolves as a result of certain realities. In the real sense of it, states have come to identify certain interests which are paramount to them outside their borders. These interests cover a wide range of issues and include the influence they wish to wield in the system, the degree of power they desire as well as status and roles in which they aspire to define their statehood. It is these interests that compel states to evolve means of relating with other states, with the aim of achieving the generally-outlined objectives. Actually, states are not sufficiently endowed with vital resources necessary for their survival as well as the well-being of their citizens. The states, thus, use foreign policy to amass those resources that are externally located and to fulfill the aspirations of their citizens.

Be that as it may, defining foreign policy is quite problematic. There is no agreed decision on the definition of foreign policy as scholars have attempted to define the concept from their own perspectives (Obi, 2006). In other words, scholars do not have a consensus on the actual meaning of foreign policy (Omenma, 2015). This accounts for the multiplicity of definitions associated with the concept.

However, what is regarded as foreign policy is simply a set of explicit objectives of a state with regard to the world beyond its borders and a set of strategies and tactics designed to achieve those objectives. In effect, the foreign policy of a state significantly implies the harnessing of extra-territorial resources to fulfill intra-territorial aspirations (Igwe, 2007). It is a country's response to the world outside or beyond its own frontiers or boundaries which may

be friendly or aggressive, casual or intense, or even simple or complex.

Broadly speaking, foreign policy refers to the total sum of principles that determine a state's interaction in the international system, bearing in mind her goals and the means of achieving such goals (Ojukwu, 2015; Chibundu, 2003). Equally, foreign policy can be conceptualized simply as the foreign action of a state, the conscious behavior of a state towards its external environment, or a state's official attitudes towards events outside the state. It is equally right to describe it as the act of pursuing national interest by sovereign states guided by certain principles; a dynamic political course that a state follows in her relations with other states; the deliberate and conscious decisions taken by a state in coping with its external environment as well as a blueprint which a state adopts in her effort to obtain or maintain the preferred arrangement of things and people abroad (Okeke, 2018; Saliu, 2013).

Certainly, foreign policy dictates how a country will act with respect to other states and to a somewhat lesser extent how it behaves towards non-state actors. Indeed, it is the rational pursuit of a set of national objectives in external environments by a state. Simply put, it is the external behavior of a state whose ultimate goal is to maximize greater advantage for the country. In essence, a state can be said to be pursuing foreign policy when it has taken some steps or actions to deal with some problems outside its borders. It is also foreign policy when a state decides to keep quiet and refuses to take any action.

From all indications, the question of whether a country will have a policy towards others is a highly compelling and inevitable situation. Every country must have a foreign policy in order to live and survive as an independent state. That implies that foreign policy is inevitable, paramount and an integral essence of statehood.

Nature of Nigeria's Foreign Policy before Yar'Adua's Administration

Historically speaking, Nigeria's foreign policy officially commenced on October 1, 1960, following her political independence from Britain. At independence, the country outlined its own foreign policy goals different from the foreign policy of Britain. Specifically, in his ministerial statement in the House of Representatives on the conduct of foreign affairs, Sir Alhaji Tafawa Balewa declared that in formulating its policy for the conduct of foreign affairs, the Federal Government recognized that its primary duty is to safeguard and promote the interest of the Federation and its citizens, and outlined the fundamental thrust or principles of Nigeria's foreign policy as follows:

- i. The sovereign equality of all African states
- ii. The respect for independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of all African states
- iii. Non-interference in internal affairs of other African states
- iv. Commitment to functional cooperation as a means of promoting African unity
- v. Total eradication of racism and colonialism from Africa
- vi. Non-alignment, and

- vii. Peaceful settlement of disputes by negotiation, conciliation, and arbitration (Okeke, 2018; Okolie, 2015; Yakubu, 2011, Omenma, 2015).

Instructively, Nigeria as a sovereign state within the international system crafted for herself foreign policy objectives that could enable her to actualize the country's national interest. There is, however, the problem inherent in defining what actually constitutes Nigeria's national interest. This is a major challenge since national interest is a key concept in foreign policy and the foundation of any state's foreign policy. National interest is the main reason or justification for foreign policy (Yakubu, 2011). Yet it is difficult to define the national interest of Nigeria (Nwanolue, 2015). According to him, some foreign policy expectorates believe that Nigeria has no clear-cut political ideology and national interest.

Nevertheless, Africa was made the centerpiece of Nigeria's foreign policy. This means that Nigeria has come to realize that her parochial interests in relating with the outside world are better achieved within a larger Africa. By implication, Nigeria considers Africa as the main theatre for the realization of her foreign policy goals. It is in that light that the country, since her independence, has shown and demonstrated genuine concern about the plight of Africa and this explains why the country was instrumental in the decolonization of some African states. She also was a major factor at the end of the apartheid regime in South Africa.

Since the regime of Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, this focus on improving the lots of Africa has remained undistracted even though there have been debates as regards Nigeria's capacity to function as "Saviour of Africa" with her internal challenges and backwardness. Be that as it may, certain reasons account for the adoption of Africa as the centerpiece of Nigeria's foreign policy. These include the realization by Nigeria that her independence would be worthless if other countries of Africa were still colonized. Besides, she hopes to mobilize other African countries to solve continental challenges from within rather than outside as well as to speak with one voice on matters of international concern. Instructively, Nigeria regards herself as the giant of Africa. It is this estimation that made Nigeria consider Africa a priority in her foreign policy drive. Close to this is the belief that Nigeria had the ambition to emerge as a power in Africa and from there push through as a power to reckon with internationally. Thus, Nigeria wished to contribute toward building political and economic conditions that will assist in the defense of independence and territorial integrity of all African states.

Nigeria's Foreign Policy under Yar'Adua

Nigeria's foreign policy under Umaru Musa Yar'Adua's administration lasted from May 29, 2007, to May 5, 2010. During the administration, incidences against Nigerians in the course of the country's foreign relations with other states were at a high level. It was the same across Africa, into Europe, and Asia. For instance, in May 2008, South Africans unleashed xenophobic attacks on immigrants and many Nigerians suffered grievous loss and distress in the process. As Omenma (2015) puts it, prior to the xenophobic attack, there were a series of systematic and hostile campaigns of calumny against Nigeria and Nigerians including the burgling of the Nigerian embassy in that country. The height of the attack by South Africa, he observes, was the movie captioned

District 9 which was deliberately packaged to rubbish the image of Nigeria and her citizens. In fact, the movie depicted Nigerians in South Africa as criminals and prostitutes.

Be that as it may, other incidences of grave implications to both Nigeria and Nigerians abound during Yar'Adua's presidency. For instance, despite public outcry, the country failed to stop the execution of Samuel Iwuchukwu Okoye and Hansey Anthony Nwaolisa by the Indonesian government in June 2008. Those were, nonetheless, a part of several Nigerians on death row across the globe. For instance, in Libya, it took the timely intervention of the African Union to stop the country from executing several Nigerians lined up for the guillotine (African Express, cited in Okeke, 2020b). Even at that, the Union could still not deter Libyans from arbitrarily deporting Nigerians. The incidents consequently gave room to a refocusing of Nigeria's foreign policy during Yar'Adua's administration.

The situation involving Nigerians abroad within the presidency of Yar'Adua required a prompt and extraordinary response. It was, indeed, an unusual time in the annals of Nigeria's foreign policy. The pressure on the government for swift intervention was much, even though it was evident that so little success was in sight. Nevertheless, an intervention was needed. This is why Yakubu (2011) maintains that the administration of Yar'Adua needed a refocused foreign policy establishment capable of linking and mainstreaming the administration's domestic agenda with Nigeria's international interests in a way and manner that would ensure that the country took its rightful and respectful place and position in the era of globalization.

Thus, the administration of Yar'Adua adopted what Omenma (2015) describes as the opposite of the country's traditional approach to foreign relations in which the interest and welfare of all the Nigerian citizens both at home and in the diaspora were sacrificed on the altar of continental leadership and prodigality. It was a foreign policy where Nigeria played big brother to outsiders whereas her citizens were dying without help. The country vaingloriously prided itself as the giant of Africa and gave aid without asking for anything in return. In contrast, Omenma (2015) quoted the Foreign Affairs Minister in Yar'Adua's administration, Chief Ojo Maduekwe as having declared that the new framework in Nigeria's foreign policy was Citizen Diplomacy described as diplomacy of consequence such that "if you are nice to us, we will be nice to you; if you are hostile to us, we will be hostile to you".

As Omenma (2015) puts it, the new approach was a clear departure from the traditional vainglorious active pan-African leadership role that rather than yielding something in return to the country had ironically resulted in mockery and incessant attack on Nigeria and her citizens. Before then, the country's foreign policy thrust was bogus and ambiguous. It was weak and wobbled. Hence, Nigerian citizens and their property were in constant threat abroad without any strong and commensurate intervention.

However, Maduekwe (2008) hinted during the period that Nigeria's foreign policy would be more citizen-centered than ever before. By implication, Nigeria's citizens would be the subject and object of Nigerian foreign policy. Thus, Nigeria and Nigerians

would be at the core of the country's foreign policy exertions (Yakubu, 2011). But, as Yakubu (2011) puts it, what the then Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ojo Maduekwe said was the need for the diplomacy of consequence which in ordinary diplomatic parlance was called reciprocity. The minister said citizen diplomacy during the era required Nigerians to seek to do or say what will best serve and advance the interests of Nigerians at any place and at any time. Thus, he maintained that citizen diplomacy focused on maximizing the economic, political, and social welfare of the citizen through astute diplomacy. It was concerned with how to enhance the image and self-worth of the Nigerian people and how citizen diplomacy proceeded from the basic assumption that the foreign policy must be the external projection of the government's efforts at promoting the welfare of the citizen. It was, thus, an extension of traditional diplomacy in seeking to advance and protect the national interests of the Nigerian people.

Diplomacy of Consequence: A Child of Circumstance or Conscientious Policy?

In his reaction to the diplomacy of consequence or citizen diplomacy popularized during the administration of President Yar'Adua, Yakubu (2011) argues that Maduekwe (2008) was aware that it was not a new foreign policy but the same foreign policy repackaged to meet the challenges of domestic policy and the rapidly changing world order. To him, it was a rebranding of Nigeria's traditional foreign policy with a sharper focus on Nigerian citizens since the basic needs of the citizens would henceforth be the rationale and justification for every foreign policy decision. What that means is that a traditional policy was given impetus by that regime and nothing more. In essence, Yar'Adua's administration did not introduce something new by way of citizen diplomacy. The policy has always been there. The only difference is that the regime used the diplomacy of consequence to maximize its interest with regard to its dealings with the outside and in particular with the responsibility of protecting of the citizens.

Nonetheless, the basic tenets or elements of citizen diplomacy were:

1. Nigeria and Nigerians to be at the center of the nation's foreign policy
2. Nigeria's foreign policy must meet its development aspirations and objectives in a manner that impacts more directly on the lives of the citizenry. Indeed, Nigeria's foreign policy must reinforce and contribute significantly to the realization of the Seven-Point Agenda of the present administration
3. Nigeria's foreign policy must seek synergy with domestic policy to ensure that the former benefits ordinary Nigerians. Indeed, the boundary between domestic policy and foreign policy has collapsed into national security for the collective well-being of Nigerians
4. In line with the servant-leadership of Mr. President, Nigerian Missions abroad must actively engage the Nigerian community and the Nigerian diaspora and render quality consular and other services as a matter of right, duties, and obligations

5. Foreign policymaking and implementation must be democratized to involve Nigerians from all walks of life and not left for a small cycle of experts and practitioners alone
6. Every foreign policy endeavor must meet the litmus test of determining the extent to which it protects and advances what will best benefit the Nigerian people
7. Nigeria to be guided by the principle of reciprocity in pursuit of diplomacy of consequence in all interactions with the rest of the world
8. Nigeria and Nigerians will not accept being criminalized by the international community simply on the basis of the despicable conduct of a few of their nationals. Due recognition must be given to the remarkable feats and tremendous contributions of Nigeria and Nigerians to world civilization, socio-economic and scientific development as well as international peace and security (Yakubu, 2011: 233-234).

In spite of the lofty tenets of the foreign policy direction of the time, the critical question was, how did globalization affect the realization of the policy objectives?

Globalization and Yar'Adua's Foreign Policy: Struggle for Dominance

A critical concern is whether the foreign policy of Nigeria under Yar'Adua succeeded under the preponderance of challenges posed by globalization in the course of pursuit of the country's foreign relations. In other words, of what essence were the foreign policy objectives pushed forward during Yar'Adua's administration, in particular the diplomacy of consequence? Basically, Alalade (2009) hinted that the concept of citizen diplomacy as was championed by Yar'Adua's administration lacked operational modalities. Obviously, there was no systematic framework or modality on how to carry through with the policy. To say the least, the operational modalities of the foreign policy of the period were not fully and clearly articulated till the death of the policy in May 2010. This, therefore, resulted in an implementation challenge for the much-publicized diplomacy of consequence.

Obviously, the inherent challenge with the foreign policy of Yar'Adua's administration is summed up in what Omenma (2015) talks about to the effect that the foreign policy orientation of the Nigerian political elite is generally ad hoc in nature, incoherent, inconsistent, and unsystematic. That means that the same challenges that had befallen previous policy efforts in the country adversely limited the success of the foreign policy of Yar'Adua's era, to start with. It was as though the problem is insurmountable. Such characteristic feature of Nigerian foreign policy has an antecedent and has continued to be the bane of successive foreign policy formulation and implementation in the country. This is undoubtedly what led Newswatch (cited in Okeke, 2020b) to the conclusion that successive Nigerian foreign policy elite has either exhibited a high level of political obscurantism and indolence or has chosen the style of indiscretion and area boy diplomacy.

Generally speaking and as Odoh and Nwogbaga (2014) rightly put it, the theory and practice of citizen diplomacy in Nigeria's foreign

policy process seem to have been more of rhetoric than reality. This, according to them, is because the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of the country's foreign policy were at the instance of elites and largely at the expense of the ordinary Nigerians. By implication, those at the helm of political leadership determine the foreign policy direction of the country. In most cases, their persuasions and choices are extricated and dislocated from the convictions, aspirations, and benefits of the people who such policies should ordinarily serve. They rather serve their interest and not the common good.

That is the primary reason why the people to whom ultimate power in any democracy belongs become major victims of irrational foreign policy orientation that the elites and the expert's craft for the country. This situation, of course, led Omenma (2015) to warn that even with a buoyant and strong economic base, Nigeria may still not exert any global influence or earn respect from other countries if her foreign policy ship continues to be steered by people that are bereft of diplomatic sagacity and perspicacity of mind.

Obviously, it beats the imagination as per how realizing the policy objectives could be possible in the face of the identified quagmire. Certainly, there is no such antecedent elsewhere and Nigeria cannot be an exception. That consequently accounts for the intervention made by Kukah (2009) who held that enhancing Nigeria's prestige and respect abroad can only be feasible if the foreign policy arena of Nigeria was expunged of the present elite that makes a haphazard and sporadic set of policies that are enmeshed in confusion and endless experimentation. However, the concern has often been whether the Nigerian political system was ever ready to allow for a reform that could ensure that the right people and approach find their way into the mainstream of Nigeria's foreign relations.

Yar'Adua's Foreign Policy vs Globalization: The Implication

It is important to ask some basic questions regarding Nigeria's foreign policy under Yar'Adua. Most importantly, it is expedient to discover if the policy itself has some weak points or otherwise to sprout success. In other words, does it have enough fiber to withstand centripetal forces pushed out by globalization, for an instance?

Critically, Omenma (2015) argues, as answers to the posers, that even though the citizen diplomacy as adopted by the administration of Yar'Adua focused attention on the Nigerian citizens at home and in the diaspora, yet it qualified for mere policy simulation. In fact, it is his contention that the citizen diplomacy of the period adopted a cosmetic approach and was a mere policy deception and nothing more. Otherwise, to what extent did it achieve its set goals?

Without mincing words, therefore, it is in order to argue that the citizen diplomacy of Yar'Adua's administration failed woefully to protect Nigerians from the vagaries of globalization as Nigeria engaged in foreign relations. It regrettably had nothing tangible to justify the enormous fanfare conspicuously exhibited during its

public presentation in terms of deliverables. The implication, therefore, is that allowing the local conditions in Nigeria to remain at unpropitious levels will continue to bring the weight of globalization and its processes to bear and heavily too on Nigeria's foreign relations. It also means that Nigeria and Nigerians will continue to stay underneath the globalization process, and not on top of it. This, in turn, will keep on having damaging implications for the country's foreign relations.

Conclusion

Generally speaking, globalization enhances the transnational interconnectedness of people within the international system. The globalization process intensifies integration and brings people as well as goods and services together through the dismantling of territorial barriers. However, globalization brought about calumny and degradation of Nigeria and her people during Musa Yar'Adua's administration. Maltreatment of Nigerians abroad became a teething problem during the period, just as citizens of the country living abroad were arrested at will, repatriated, jailed, or placed on death row.

As a response, the administration redirected the country's foreign policy from its traditional outlook into citizen diplomacy. The major component of the new focus was the principle of reciprocity or what was referred to as diplomacy of consequence. The concept was directed toward retaliating unfavorable treatment of Nigerians abroad. Essentially, it was based on the protection of the citizens, as the country carried through with its foreign relations. However, the operational modalities of the policy were not fully articulated before the sudden death of Yar'Adua on May 5, 2010. Citizen diplomacy was thus touted as mere policy deception and simulation, ad hoc and unsystematic. In fact, the administration was accused of having adopted a cosmetic approach to its adopted citizen diplomacy. In essence, the foreign policy of Nigeria under Yar'Adua crumbled under the adverse impact of globalization.

Way Forward

With the circumstances that accounted for the failure of Nigeria's foreign policy under Musa Yar'Adua's administration, the study made the following recommendations:

1. The need for the country to reappraise its foreign policy in such a manner will provide an answer to the challenges posed by globalization. This is premised on the fact that globalization has come to redefine how countries pursue their national interests through foreign policy. Certainly, globalization throws some challenges on the way to realizing these foreign policy goals.
2. Diplomacy of consequence or citizen diplomacy is central in the pursuit of Nigeria's national interest. The administration of Yar'Adua took a bold step to have prioritized and given it new impetus. Such priority aligns with the major tenet of democracy which is all about the people. There is a need therefore to strengthen it and give it all the enabling support to succeed. It needs to bark and bite. It should not just do the former and leave out the latter. This is necessary regardless of the fact that the policy did not achieve much before its demise.

3. Nigeria's political class needs to embrace a new orientation toward nation-building. They need to show more patriotism and enthusiasm towards making the country and her foreign policy successes. To achieve this, they need to place national interest far above parochial and pecuniary, self-serving interests while crafting policies that would direct their country's external behaviour.
4. Leadership is required to address the internal contradictions that work against Nigeria's foreign policy. Since the national policy is yoked together with foreign policy, addressing these internal challenges is key. For instance, such intervention will minimize the high migration level involving many Nigerians. It will reduce or even out-rightly eliminate demographic pressure and the challenge of internal displacements. This will in turn trim down the number of Nigerians facing maltreatment abroad.

References

1. Akpuru-Aja, A. & Emeribe, A. (eds) (2000). *Policy and contending issues in Nigeria's national development strategy*. Enugu: John Jacobs Classic Publishers.
2. Alalade, O. (2009). *How serious is Nigeria about its foreign and security policy?* Retrieved on January 2, 2022, from <http://thenewsng.com/opinion/how-serious-is-nigeria-about-its-foreign-and-security-policy%E2%80%944osulale-alalade/2009/05>
3. Alli, W. (2006). The impact of globalization on conflicts in Africa. In S. Best. *Introduction to peace and conflict studies in West Africa: A Reader*. Ibadan: Spectrum.
4. Asobie, A. (2002) *International relations, foreign policy and the prospects and problems of globalization*. Paper presented at the ASUU National Conference held in Abuja. on October 14-17.
5. Asogwa, F. & Omenma, D. (2001). *Modern dictionary of political science*. Enugu: Onix Publishers Nigeria.
6. Audu, J. (2010). The interface among globalization, democracy, governance and leadership in Africa: The Nigerian experience under President Olusegun Obasanjo (1999-2007). *Nigerian Journal of Political Science*, 14(1 & 2), 86-96.
7. Chibundu, U. (2003). *Foreign policy: With particular reference to Nigeria 1961-2008*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
8. Ezeibe, C. (2015). *Abc of political economy: A beginner's guide to understanding the state and economy*. Nsukka: UNN Press Limited.
9. Goldstein, J. & Pevehouse, J. (2011). *International relations*. United States: Pearson International Edition.
10. Jackson, R. & Sorensen, G. (2006). *Introduction to international relations: Theories and approaches (3rd edition)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
11. Khor, M. (2000). *Globalization and the south: Some critical issues*. Penang: Third World Network.
12. Kukah, M. (2009, October 1). Preparing for Nigeria's coming power elite. *The Guardian*.
13. Maduekwe, O. (2008). *Citizen diplomacy and Nigeria's national interest*. A speech delivered at the eleventh orientation course for volunteers of the technical aid program for 2006-2010, May 19-June 1.
14. Mbah, C. (2012) *African Politics: An introduction*. Nimo: Rex Charles and Patrick Limited.
15. Muhammad, A. (2013). Globalization. In A. Hassan, & A. Fatai, (eds). *Introduction to international relations*. Ibadan: College Press and Publishers Limited.
16. Nwanolue, B. (2015). State and national interest: the Nigerian question. In A. Okorie (ed) *Contemporary readings on Nigeria's external relations: Issues, perspectives, and challenges*. Abakaliki: WillyRose and Applesseed Publishing Company.
17. Obi, E. (2006). *Fundamentals of Nigerian foreign policy: A study on the role of national interest in foreign policymaking*. Onitsha: Bookpoint Limited.
18. Odoh, S. & Nwogbaga, D. (2014) Reflections on the theory and practice of citizen diplomacy in the conduct of Nigeria's foreign policy. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 19(10), 9-14.
19. Ojukwu, C. (2015). Terrorism, foreign policy, and human rights concerns in Nigeria. In A. Okorie (ed) *Contemporary readings on Nigeria's external relations: Issues, perspectives, and challenges*. Abakaliki: WillyRose and Applesseed Publishing Company.
20. Okeke, C. (2018). International relations. In M. Oddih, et al.(ed) *Fundamentals of African government and politics: Perspectives, issues, and challenges*. Awka: Centre-point Publishers.
21. Okeke, C. (2020). Foreign policy and domestic politics of Nigeria: A contemporary discourse. *International Journal of Politics and Good Governance*, 11(11.2), 1-20.
22. Okeke, C. (2020b). Citizen diplomacy and human capital development in Nigeria: A contemporary discourse. *International Journal of New Economics and Social Sciences*, 1(11), 297-314.
23. Okolie, A. (2015). Fundamental issues in foreign policymaking and implementation in Nigeria. In A. Okorie (ed) *Contemporary readings on Nigeria's external relations: Issues, perspectives, and challenges*. Abakaliki: WillyRose and Applesseed Publishing Company.
24. Olisa, M. (1999). *Nigeria and globalization: Lessons from the United States*. Paper presented at a public lecture organized by the Centre for American Studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
25. Omenma, D. (2015). Nigerian foreign policy: Trends and transformations. In A. Okorie, (ed) *Contemporary readings on Nigeria's external relations: Issues, perspectives, and challenges*. Abakaliki: WillyRose and Applesseed Publishing Company.
26. Onimode, B. (2000). *Africa in the world of the 21st century*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
27. Onuoha, J. (2008). *Beyond diplomacy: Contemporary issues in international relations*. Enugu: Great AP Express Publishers Ltd.
28. Rangarajan, C. (2003). *Globalization: Concept and concerns*. Retrieved on January 4, 2022, from <https://mea.gov.in/articles-in-indian-media.htm?dtl/15252/Globalisation+concept++concerns++1>
29. Raymond, G. & Kegley, C. (2010). *The global future: A brief introduction to world politics*. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

30. Saliu, H. (2013). Foreign policy. In H. Saliu, H. and F. Aremu (eds) *Introduction to international relations*. Ibadan: College Press and Publishers Limited.
31. Slaughter, A. (2011). *International relations, principal theories*. Retrieved on January 4, 2022, from <http://opil.ouplaw.com/view/10.1093>
32. Ujara, E. & Ibietan, J. (2014). Citizen diplomacy and Nigeria's international image: The social constructivist explanation. *Covenant Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 6(2), 14-30.
33. Weber, C. (2005). *International relations theory: A critical introduction*. New York: Routledge.
34. Yakubu, Y. (2011). *Nigeria's foreign policy: A basic text*. Zaria: Ahmadu Bello University Press Limited.