Globalization and Nigeria's Foreign Policy

Emmanuel O. Oforle* and Vincent Chuks Maduekwe

Department of Political Science, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University Igbariam Campus.
*Corresponding Author E-mail: emmadapper@yahoo.com; vincentmcphd2013@yahoo.com

The "foreign" in foreign policies are being killed by globalization by blurring the line between domestic and international policies and making the traditional notion of "us" and "them" obsolete. This study investigates the impacts of globalization on Nigeria's foreign. It traces the background of Nigeria's foreign policy in a resolute bid to understanding the present and highlighting the differences especially, those necessitated by globalization. Qualitative method of data collection and analysis of data generated from secondary sources were employed in the study which concluded that globalization brought new actors, engendered a shift from the Afrocentric past and opened a floodgate of new and thorny issues such as transnational terrorism, climate change, human rights and the proliferation of small arms and light weapons; in the milieu of Nigerian foreign policy.

Keywords: Globalization, Foreign Policy, International Organizations, Denationalization

INTRODUCTION

The liberalization of trade, finance and investment; and the increased global interconnectivity due to technological advancements have changed the game and tempo of foreign policies of countries of the world by hitting and torpedoing national sovereignties and territorial integrities. "This integration that has been intensified by the unprecedented advancements in information and communications technology has prompted the description of the world as a 'global village'….," (Lawal and Daiyabu, 2015). The realities of globalization began to manifest in Nigeria since late 1980's. However, its roots lay in the structuring of the country's political economy along the liberal capitalist line by the nation's erstwhile colonial master, Britain (Lawal and Daiyabu. 2015). The realities of this ever-widening wave of globalization across nations today is not only manifesting on the economic design of the country alone wherein it rooted but in all the national concerns including the Nigeria's "range of actions, as well as a set of principles influencing these actions, taken with reference to external situations and factors" (Frankel, 1978:26-27); i.e, also on Nigeria's foreign policy. This study therefore seeks to investigate the impacts of globalization on Nigeria's foreign. It traces the background of Nigeria's foreign policy in a resolute bid to understanding the present and highlighting the differences especially, those necessitated by globalization. Qualitative method of data collection and analysis of data generated from secondary sources were employed in the study.

CONCEPTUAL DISCUSSIONS

Globalization

The concept of globalization is devoid of a generally accepted definition and as such, there exist numerous definitions of globalization which were more or less the number of authors on the subject. Among the definitions is that of Fawole, (2003:26) which takes globalization to mean the process of change towards greater international economic integration through trade, financial flows, exchange of technology, information and movement of people. This definition captured the central nature of globalization which is its dynamism. Globalization is a non-static phenomenon. It is an ever-widening wave of inter-connection. As globalization widens, the world shrinks. According to Sosa (n.d.),

Whether one regards it as an illusion or not, our modern world seems to be shrinking. It is amazing how the dimensions of our planet are being reduced by the rapid diffusion of information and cultural merging. News and reports of the most shocking incidents go around the globe

in a matter of minutes. Traveling from one point of the earth to the most exotic resort is possible in just a few hours. Nowadays you can find yourself at a traditionally Chinese area eating McDonald's or visiting the most famous European sites while you listen to Latin-American music everywhere. You can be in Kazakhstan watching MTV programs or in El Salvador eating Burger King's hamburgers. People in Africa and Asia crave at the most, a "Western" way of living; communistic nations follow the economic features of democratic states. The examples are endless but they all are a result of the most influential and striking 20th century phenomenon known as globalization.

Globalization is also the increasing flow of goods, services, capital, technology, information, ideas and labour at the global level driven by universal policies and technological changes (Ayuba and Okafor, 2014). This definition is consistent with the examples of the manifestations of globalization in Sosa (n.d.) where McDonald's could be found in China (flow of goods and services);and news and reports of shocking incidents reaches even the remotest part of the globe in a matter of minutes (flow of information), etc.

The confusion and controversy beclouding the true meaning of globalization might have informed James Rosenau's decision that it is safer to say what globalization is not than what it is.

Globalization is not the same as globalism, which points to aspirations for an end state of affairs wherein values are shared by or pertinent to all the world's five billion people, their environment, their roles as citizens, consumers or producers with an interest in collective action designed to solve common problems. Nor is it universalism—values which embrace all humanity, hypothetically or actually (Rosenau 1996).

Oman, (1996, p. 5) in Beerkens, (2006) evaded definition and took to description:

''Globalization is the growth, or more precisely the accelerated growth, of economic activity across national and regional political boundaries. It finds expression in the increased movement of tangible and intangible goods and services, including ownership rights, via trade and investment, and often people, via migration. It can and often is facilitated by a lowering of government impediments to that movement, and/or by technological progress, notably in transportation and communications. The action of individual economic actors, firms, banks, people, drive it, usually in the pursuit of profit, often spurred by the pressures of competition. Globalization is thus a centrifugal process, a process of economic outreach, and a microeconomic phenomenon."

We take globalization in this study to mean the widening of the interconnections of the socio-cultural, economic and political sectors of the countries of the world due to the liberalization of trade, finance and investment and technological advancements.

Foreign policy

Just like globalization above as well as most of the concepts in the Social Sciences, the concept of foreign policy has been viewed from variegated perspectives and lacked a generally accepted definition. Rosenau, (1974) for example conceives of foreign policy as authoritative actions taken by governments or are committed to take in order either to maintain the desirable aspects of the international environment or to amend its undesirable aspects. This definition brings to the fore the very essence of foreign policies by countries of the world which is hinged on two pillars: maintenance and change. Countries favoured by the status quo struggle to have the condition maintained while the disfavoured countries pursue policies for change. Foreign policy spells out the objectives that state leaders have decided to pursue in a given relationship or situation, as well as the general means they intend to pursue those objectives (Goldstein, 2003). The means referred to above are otherwise known as tools including:

Tools of intelligence and information

(a) Information and intelligence gathering
(b) Dissemination of information, analysis, and ideas
(c) Dissemination of propaganda and misinformation

Tools of diplomacy

(a) Cultural and scientific exchanges
(b) Offering diplomatic recognition; expelling/recalling diplomats; holding or withdrawing from diplomatic exchanges and discussions
(c) Joining or withdrawing from negotiations, treaties, summit meetings
(d) Offering or joining alliances, membership in international and regional organizations
(e) Suspending or withdrawing from alliances, membership in international and regional organizations

Tools of aid, economic development, and trade

(a) Provision or withholding of humanitarian aid, technical/engineering/scientific/professional assistance
(b) Economic and trade relations inducements, development aid, trade treaties, creation of trade zones, help in attracting investments
(c) Economic and trade sanctions, tariffs, quotas, restrictions on investment, trade restrictions, bans on

specific imports, general import bans, seizure of bank accounts and financial assets.

Tools of military influence, power, or force

(a) Joining or offering military alliances or security pacts, provision of military foreign aid or military technical assistance and training. Withdrawing from military alliances or security pacts, suspending or ending military foreign aid, or military technical assistance and training.
(b) Secret paramilitary operations, assassinations (e.g. Navy Seals, drone strikes, etc.).
(c) Military buildups, mobilizations, troop movements, test weapons firings, shows of strength.
(d) Blockades, armed intervention, (Close up Foundation 2013).

Foreign policy therefore is not only a set of explicit objectives with regard to the world beyond the borders of a given socio-political unit, but also encapsulates sets of strategies and tactics designed to achieve those objectives (Legg and Morrison, 1971) with such instruments/tools as above seeking maintenance or change in the international arena.

Background of Nigerian foreign policy

The formation and execution of Nigeria's foreign policy from independence has been engineered by no fewer than fourteen different administrations through the external affairs ministry; from Tafawa Balewa's administration in 1960 to President Obasanjo's administration in 2003; from the administration of President Musa Yar'Adua to the immediate past administration of President Goodluck Jonathan. These various administrations - including the different military regimes which took over administrative power in Nigeria for over a cumulative period of 35 years, of the entire over 50 years of the existence of Nigeria's foreign policy- claimed to pursue the same national interest with regards to the nation's foreign policy. They pursued the countries interests under the foreign policy themes such as: Dynamic foreign policy, Africa as the centre piece of Nigeria's foreign policy, concentric circles, concert of medium powers, economic diplomacy, and citizen diplomacy among many others. However, since independence, Nigeria's foreign policy has been guided by certain objective and principles namely:

(i) The protection of the sovereign and territorial integrity of the Nigerian State.
(ii) The promotion of the economic and social well-being of Nigeria.
(iii) The enhancement of Nigeria's image and status in the world at large.

(iv) The promotion of unity as well as the total political, economic, social and cultural liberation of   Nigeria and Africa.
(v) The promotion of the rights of black people and others under colonial rule.
(vi) The promotion of international cooperation conducive to the consolidation of world peace and security, mutual respect and friendship among all people sand states.
(vii) Redressing the imbalance in the international power structures which has tended to frustrate the legitimate aspirations of developing countries.
(viii) Respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of all nations.
(ix) The promotion of world peace based on the principles of freedom, mutual respect and equality of the world (Akindele and Ate, 2000: xiv in Ezirim, n.d.).

Dynamic foreign policy

What brought this concept of dynamic foreign policy into the lexicon of Nigeria's foreign policy analysis was quite accidental. It was what emerged when Anthony Enahoro accused the federal government's foreign policy initiatives of lacking dynamism. In retort, the Foreign Affairs Minister, Hon. Jaja Nwachukwu, went on to reel out the foreign policy engagements of Nigeria and how these engagements were dynamic and that if these measures were not dynamic, then he doesn't know what else the word dynamic constitutes. By putting the concept of dynamism at the center of this discourse, particularly making it appear as a core requirement of any foreign policy endeavour, the streak of dynamism gained currency as a fundamental basis of foreign policy making and evaluation in Nigeria (Wogu et al., 2015).There was no express delimitation of the concept of dynamism of Nigerian foreign policy in the occasion save for the closest by Enahoro that *subaltern groups represent the true voice and true temper of the people of the country' and that as such any foreign policy measure outside of their sympathies is 'lacking in inspiration, it is not dynamic* (Enahoro in Pine, 2011).

Based on this Enahoro's position, foreign policies of different administrations have been classified as either conservative or dynamic. Attah Pine cited above wrote that while the Balewa, Gowon and Shagari administrations were deemed conservative, that of Murtala/Obasanjo, Obasanjo/Yaradua are deemed dynamic.

Africa as the centre piece of Nigeria's foreign policy

The origin of the concept is traceable to the Prime Minister of Nigeria, 1960-1966, Alhaji Tafawa Balewa. Military rules between 1966 and 1979 that followed the 1966 coup adhered to the afro-centric foreign policy drive

religiously. There were notable positions in favour of afro-centric foreign policies from 1960-1979. First was that of the Hon. Prime Minister, Alhaji Tafawa Balewa. According to him, we belong to Africa and as such Nigeria would pursue realistic African policies. Africa should be given a pride of place in Nigeria's foreign policy formulation. This Balewa's position signaled the era of Big Brother Role performed by Nigeria which regrettably is yet to be appreciated by African countries. Pine, (2011) discussed it thus:

What major economic niche has Nigeria carved for herself in these post-conflicts countries? There is hardly anything one can point finger towards. Yet, the Africa-centeredness framework has continued to maintain a stronghold on foreign policy thinking in Nigeria. The theories of concentric cycles and concert of medium powers all take their bearing from this perspective.

Second, was the dare-devil statement by the military head of state, Murtala Mohammed in his address to the OAU in Addis Ababa, he gave notice of the direction that Africa was going to take, in the new era, and with Nigeria's leadership. Part of his speech as in Ezirim (n.d) read thus:

Africa has come of age, it is no longer in the orbit of any continental power. It should no longer take orders from any country however powerful. The fortunes of Africa are in our hands to make or mar.

This bold speech was backed up with actions as seen especially in the defiance with which Nigeria recognized the MPLA as against the US-backed UNITA in Angola and emerged victorious.

The concentric circles

Literally, this means an ordered set of different sizes of circles with a centre. While maintaining the age-long afrocentric foreign policy thrust of Nigeria, the concentric circle foreign policy drive by Muhammadu Buhari administration between 1983-85 re-arranged the country's interests in order of importance in which the domestic interests occupied the epicenter. Gambari (1989:3) in Ezirim (n.d) captured it thus:

The pattern of concentric circle may be discernible in our attitude and response to foreign policy issues within the African continent and in the world at large. At the epicenter of these circles are the national economic and security interests of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, which are inextricably tied up with the security, stability and the economic and social well-being of our immediate neighbours. One of our principal priorities is to put on a more constructive footing relation with our neighbours

with whom we share identical goals of regional stability and peace.

The prioritization of Nigeria's domestic interest could be seen in the foreign policy actions of the regime such as when borders were closed indefinitely against neighbouring countries at the face of the Quadripartite Agreement entered by Nigeria with Benin, Ghana and Togo; as a measure against smuggling and money laundering in Buhari's much-vaunted fight against corruption; and such as the bungled Umaru Dikko kidnap at the face of father-child relationship between Britain and Nigeria.

Economic diplomacy

The concept of economic diplomacy as a foreign policy plank was introduced in Nigeria foreign policy during the Ibrahim Babangida administration. The government conceptualized economic diplomacy policy as, *the promotion of export trade, investment and increased financial assistance from friendly countries* (Pine, 2011). General Ibrahim Babangida saw foreign policy as an "issue-based pursuit reflecting a package of objectives and goals tied to the nation's security and the well-being of Nigerians generally". According to Arhewe, (2013), the then Foreign Affairs Minister, Ike Nwachukwu in June 1988 pointed out that "it is the responsibility of our foreign policy apparatus to advance the course of our national economic recovery." The imperative of an economic diplomacy foreign policy framework was inspired by the economic pressures that were exerted on the Nigerian economy as a result of the introduction of the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP). The focus was on export promotion, encouragement of direct foreign investment, debt rescheduling, embracing of neo-liberal economic measures and deep involvement in the interplay of the capitalist international political economy. The political wing of economic diplomacy agenda was that Nigeria will ingratiate itself and cultivate the goodwill and friendship of the leading countries of Europe, North America and Japan (Pine, 2011).

Thus, in all, Babangida's regime was credited with some achievements such as:

(a) The revival of Nigeria's active commitment to ECOWAS by lifting boundary closures and restoring free movement within ECOWAS countries.
(b) Nigeria's active intervention in inter-African affairs and conflicts, especially in West Africa, in the border wars between Mali and Burkina Faso and in the strained relations between Sierra Leone and Liberia.
(c) The establishment and funding of Nigeria's Technical Aids Corps (TAC) which provides highly trained Nigerian personnel at little or no costs to needy African states.

(d) The formation of the Lagos Forum of Medium Powers.
(e) The use of Nigeria's foreign policy to support and promote Nigeria's domestic economic policy (Ofoegbu, 1990:213 in Ezirim n.d.).

Citizen's diplomacy

This constituted a shift in the foreign policy thrust of Nigeria which was largely, afrocentric. Olusegun Obasanjo upon the return of civilian rule in 1999 initiated this foreign policy thrust complemented by what foreign policy analyst referred to as *Shuttle Diplomacy*; which involved extensive diplomatic travelling in a desperate bid to sell Nigerian plights to the advanced world and meeting with Nigerian citizens in diaspora. Ogunsanwo, (2007) argues that citizens diplomacy could mean that from now on the Nigerian citizen abroad is the centre of Nigeria's national interest and therefore the country's entire diplomatic machinery should be geared towards protecting his/her interests such as economic welfare, etc. any diplomacy that does not take this into consideration will not be appropriate for our diplomatic missions abroad. Pine, (2011) was consistent with Ogunsanwo, (2007) when he wrote thus:

Citizen diplomacy is the foreign policy thrust that has been embarked upon since the advent of democratic governance in 1999. It was spearheaded by the Olusegun Obasanjo and has been in place since then through the administrations of Musa Yar'Adua and Jonathan Goodluck. Basically, citizen diplomacy contends that the citizens, that is, Nigerians are the centre piece of Nigeria's foreign policy.

This foreign policy thrust has not only strived to protecting Nigerians abroad from discrimination by foreign governments, it has also allowed Nigeria to tap into the huge benefits of her citizens abroad.
Games, (2013) told of Nigeria's response to the wanton deportation of Nigerians by South Africa in 2012 which was consisted with her citizens' diplomacy foreign policy thrust:

These came to a head in 2012 with the deportation from Johannesburg of 125 Nigerian travelers in one day, allegedly for yellow fever certificate infractions. Nigeria's retaliation was swift. It, too, began deporting travelers and threatened to take action against South African companies in Nigeria, striking at a group that comprises the main interface between the countries in Nigeria itself. South Africa's apology for the handling of the deportations by airport officials defused the situation and created space for frank political engagement on the issues.

Furthermore, through the instrumentality of the citizen

diplomacy, it is envisaged that Nigeria will harness the resources and potentials of her diaspora, mainstream the doctrine of reciprocity, and create an enabling environment for her citizens to prosper and engage in broad issues of human importance at both the national and international levels. In the event too, it will enhance Nigeria's export portfolio and attract foreign direct investments (Wogu et al., 2015).

Nigeria's foreign policy in the era of globalization

Over the past two decades, the capacity of each State to act alone towards others in the best way it perceives which is at the foundation of the traditional concept (of foreign policy), has continued to decline just as the State-centric view of international system and its territorial organization of politics is being questioned. The new word is globalization (Nwankwo, 2013).In an increasingly globalized world; the classic images of foreign policy as a political practice conducted by sovereign states have become increasingly inadequate (Jørgensen and Hellmann, 2015). The "foreign" in foreign policies is being killed by globalization by blurring the line between domestic and international policies and making the traditional notion of "us" and "them" obsolete.
Mark Leonard, Director, Foreign Policy Centre in the United States quoted in Nwankwo (2013) painted the picture of the realities of globalization on foreign policy today thus:

*Foreign Policy used to be about what went on abroad: diplomatic handshakes in the distant capitals, nation speaking solely unto nation, far removed from ordinary life. No longer! Today, events in far flung places have a direct impact on our lives. We find ourselves in the midst of a vast network of relationships and interest that disregard national divisions.*What then are the impacts of this trend on the Nigeria's foreign policy?

Emergence of new actors and new issues

In Nigeria's foreign policy, globalization has introduced new and very powerful actors; and also new issues.

Globalization has not only brought in new actors it has also introduced new issues in interstate relations…. The impact of globalization has also greatly enhanced the cross border relevance of many issue areas in international politics. Chief among these is climate change. It has also heightened the relevance of issue linkages. Climate Change politics therefore has Human rights implications, regional security policy has implications for democracy, good governance has implications for peace and stability (Iwilade, 2010).

Foreign policy in Nigeria that used to be state-centric has shifted to international governmental and nongovernmental

organizations as well as to the private individuals. Amnesty International has turned a watchdog against human rights violations not only in Nigeria but the world at large. Nigeria's fight against Boko Haram insurgency has been kept at bay by the prying eyes of the organization which has even at that, severally accused the Nigerian military of human rights violations in their fight against the insurgents. Transparency International in their niche has turned a yardstick for measuring how corrupt a country is. Nigerian governments have had no problem in publishing their performance on the list of the organization often in a futile attempt to disprove allegations of corruption during their regime.WTO bestrides trade; while UNO, EU, AU, ECOWAS and the likes have assumed or on the road to assuming the status of supranational organizations. Free movement policy of ECOWAS within member states for instance could justifiably be blamed for the introduction of the Ebola virus in Nigeria which claimed many lives including that of the Lagos-based medical doctor, Ameyo Adadevoh; before it was put under control. According to Ayobola (2012), the President, (Obasanjo) during his extensive foreign trips, (in his administration) addressed (some of the actors including) the UN, ECOWAS, the Group of 8 (G-8), Group 77 (G-77), the Commonwealth, African Union (AU) and European Union (EU).

New economic powerful countries that emerged after the cold war constituted new actors too in Nigeria's foreign policy. These new powers have great economic influence in the country in such a magnitude that there were already a number of moves at entering into agreements with them.

The rise of new economic powers outside the traditional economic centres of Euro-America has altered the landscape of international political economy and economic partnership arrangements, as we see happening in the ongoing dialogue between Africa and China, on one hand, and with India, on the other (Jonathan 2011).

New Issues such as transnational terrorism, good governance, climate change and human rights have also emerged from the ever-expanding waves of globalization. Terrorism has ceased to be an internal trouble of a state such that *terrorism anywhere is terrorism everywhere.* Boko Haram, though based in Nigeria, tormented the neighbouring Cameroun, Chad and Niger Republic. Efforts at "degrading" the terrorist band were bootless until the formation of Joint Multi-National Task Force (JMNTF) involving Nigeria, Cameroun, Benin, Niger and Chad.

Change in Nigerian foreign policy objectives

Globalization necessitated a change in the foreign policy

thrust of Nigeria. What used to be afrocentric shifted to a medley of economic and citizen's diplomacy. Jonathan, (2011) captured the inevitability of the change in order to grapple with the trends of globalization thus:

In the era of globalization; …we have no choice but to adjust and adapt the way we conduct foreign policy. As we respond to the forces of globalization, perhaps more than ever before, our diplomacy must be put at the service of our domestic priorities.

The mixing of the two foreign policy thrusts was designed with globalization in mind and it was informed with the belief that economic diplomacy is compatible with the promotion of democracy while citizen's diplomacy is entirely compatible with defending human dignity both at home and abroad.

The implementation of the globalization-induced foreign policy objectives picked momentum with daring condemnation of the coup d'état in Mali; and the prompt response to the denigrating deportation of Nigerians by South Africa *quid pro quo* sending a very strong signal that Nigeria "has come of age" and that any attempt to denigrate her citizenry will have consequences. Nigeria also even in the midst of prophecy of doom about her 2015 general election was able to wade through the trying times stronger and better in democracy as an assurance that democracy which she exports elsewhere is really present in her house. Ashiru, (2013) wrote about Nigeria's position during the post election crisis in Cote d'Ivoire:

It was Nigeria's strong voice to uphold democracy and support the winner of the presidential election, Mr. Alassane Ouattara, that prevented a bloodbath in Cote d'Ivoire. It was our strong and unwavering support for democracy that made the EU, UN and the US to follow Nigeria's lead, while the AU had no choice but to come on board and support Nigeria's position for the winner of the elections.

Denationalization brought about by globalization according to Genschel and Zangl (2009), featured internationalization, privatization and transnationalization. Internationalization refers to the transfer of authority to international actors, understood as international or supranational institutions under public law like the United Nations or the European Union. Nigeria's foreign policy in the era of globalization favoured greater membership in universal international organizations such as United Nations Organization; regional international organizations such as African Union and the sub-regional international organizations such as the Economic Community of West African States.

As a responsible member of the international community, Nigeria must remain committed to the principles and

purposes of the UN. It is in Nigeria's interest to continue to share our peace-keeping experiences with regional and sub-regional organizations in Africa, including ECOWAS. In other words, our commitment to regional and international peace and security must remain as strong as ever Jonathan (2011).

Privatization as the second type of denationalization refers to a transfer of authority to private actors, that is, non-state entities with a private legal form whose authority is limited to the territory of a single nation-state. Privatization trends have swept through numerous public corporations in Nigeria including NITEL, NEPA and NNPC; while numerous others are in the process of privatization or commercialization. Transnationalization, finally, refers to a transfer of authority to transnational actors – private entities like associations, unions and business firms that exert authority across borders. This category thus encompasses both NGOs and MNEs. Just as discussed above, the impacts of Amnesty International, Transparency International and the likes of Nigeria's foreign policies have been outstanding. The creation of EFCC for instance which was mandated to fight corruption in Nigeria was geared at achieving a better Nigeria's performance on the list of the Transparency International in pursuit of a brighter international image. Ashiru, (2013) summarized the new foreign policy objectives of Nigeria thus:

In planning for continued effective implementation of Nigeria foreign policy, we have identified the following themes and challenges that will continue to face our foreign policy in the immediate and long term. These include the need to sustaining the unity, territorial integrity, peace and stability of Nigeria; engaging international partners and friends to tackling the menace of security and other domestic challenges, including transnational crimes and proliferation of small arms and light weapons; terrorism and piracy, the preservation of Nigeria's leadership role and visibility in Africa; promoting regional peace and security, including the consolidation of democracy and good governance in Africa; maintaining a positive image of Nigeria abroad; the challenge of funding; and ensuring constructive engagements with major actors in the international scene such as the EU, the G8, WTO, World Bank/IMF, the UN and its specialized agencies. Other challenges include the promotion of South-South Cooperation with emphasis on financing for development and technology, including enhanced relations with China, India, Brazil, especially the African-South American Cooperative Forum (ASACOF) etc; climate change and energy security.

Conclusion

Globalization has brought profound changes in the foreign policy of Nigeria. It brought new actors,

engendered a shift from the afrocentric past and opened a floodgate of new and thorny issues such as transnational terrorism, climate change, human rights and the proliferation of small arms and light weapons; in the milieu of Nigerian foreign policy. It killed the "foreign" in foreign policy with its whirling denationalization wave to such an extent that it is quite difficult if not impossible to distinguish between domestic and external issues.

REFERENCES

Arhewe P (2013). Foreign policy: From Afrocentric to Economic Diplomacy. Retrieved from http://nationalmirroronline.net/new/foreign-policy-from-afrocentric-to-economic-diplomacy/

Ashiru O (2013). "Nigeria"s Foreign Policy", THISDAY LIVE, April 16th. Data accessed on 7 May, 2015. Retrieved from: http://www.thisdaylive.com/articles/nigeria-s-foreign-policy-newrealities-in-a-changing-world/144998/

Ayobola (2012). Globalization and Nigeria's Foreign Policy: A Study of President Obasanjo's Regime (1999-2007). *A project submitted to the Department of Political Science and International Relations College of Business and Social Sciences Covenant University Ota;* in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of Master (M.Sc.) in International Relations.

Ayuba C, Okafor G (2014). Globalization And Global Terrorism: An Analysis. Available at SSRN. Retrieved from http://ssrn.com/abstract=2517419.

Beerkens E (2006). "Globalisation: Definitions and Perspectives." Retrieved from http://www.beerkens.info/files/globalisation.pdf.

Close Up Foundation (2013).National Interest and The Tools of Foreign Policy *A Lesson Plan for Teachers.* WWW.CLOSEUP.ORG

Ezirim G (n.d). Fifty Years of Nigeria's Foreign Policy: A Critical Review accessed from http://www.academia.edu/345652/Fifty_Years_of_Nigeria_'s_Foreign _Policy_A_Critical_Review

Fawole WA (2003). Nigeria's External Relations And Foreign Policy Under Military Rule, 1966 – 1999. Ile-Ife: OAU Press.

Frankel J (1978). *International Relations.* (2nd Ed.) London: Oxford University Press.

Games D (2013). Nigeria-South Africa baseline study. *SAFPI Policy Brief No 44 September 2013.*

Genschel P, Zangl B (2009). "Metamorphosen des Staates — vomHerrschaftsmonopolisten
zum Herrs chafts manager in: Leviathan, 36 (3):430-454.

Goldstein JS (2003). *International Relations. 5th ed. Singapore: Pearson.*

Iwilade A (2010).The Impact of Globalization on Diplomacy. Retrieved from https://akiniwilade.wordpress.com/2010/01/21/the-impact-of-globalization-on-diplomacy/.

Jonathan GE (2011), Address by His Excellency, Goodluck Ebele Jonathan at President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria at the Retreat on the Review of Nigeria's Foreign. Monday, 1st August. Retrieved 01/06/2015 from http://www.nigeriavillagesquare.com/forum/mainsquare/64643-president-jonathan-review-nigerias-foreignpolicy.html.

Jørgensen KE, Hellmann G (2015). Theorizing Foreign Policy in a Globalized World. Retrieved from http://www.palgrave.com/page/detail/theorizing-foreign-policy-in-a-globalized-world-gunther-hellmann/?isb=9781137431905.

Lawal and Daiyabu (2015). "Developmental Diplomacy in a Globalised World: The Imperatives of Soft Power in Nigeria's External Relations under the Transformation Agenda of President Goodluck Jonathan." *International Affairs and Global, Vol. 28,* 2015. Retrieved from http://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/IAGS/article/download/19225/19397.

Legg KR, Morrison J (1971), Politics and the International System. New York: Harper and Row.

Nwankwo OBC (2013). *Engaging a Changing World: Continuity and Change in Nigeria's Foreign Policy.*London: Veritas Lumen Publishers.

Ogunsanwo A (2007). "Citizens Diplomacy: Challenges for Nigeria's Foreign policy". *A Paper Presented at the One Day Seminar on Citizens Diplomacy Organized by the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA)*, Lagos on November 29.

Pine A (2011). Nigeria Foreign Policy, 1960-2011. Modern Ghana News, an Internet Publication. http//www.modern Ghana.com/news/354233/1/.

Rosenau J (1974). Comparing Foreign Policies: Why, What, How, in James N. Rosenau (ed.), *Comparing Foreign Policies, Theories, Findings and Methods.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Rosenau J (1996). "The Dynamics of Globalisation: Towards an Operational Formulation,"San Diego, *Paper presented at the International Studies Association Convention*, San Diego, 18 April 1996, 3-4.

Sosa K (n.d.). "Globalization and Economic Development in the Third World: Hazard or Enhancement?" Retrieved from http://www.ia-forum.org/Files/JIXWRE.pdf

Wogu IA, Sholarin MA, Chidozie CF (2015). A Critical Evaluation of Nigeria's Foreign Policy at 53. Research on Humanities and Social Sciences; Vol.5, No.2, 2015. http://www.iiste.org.