ISSN 2705-2559
E-ISSN 2705-2567

LEADERSHIP AND DECISION MAKING IN FOREIGN POLICY: A COMPARISON OF TWO REGIMES IN NIGERIA

BY

Araba, Akeem Ayanda: Department of Arts and Social Science Education, Al-Hikmah University Ilorin, Nigeria; E-mail Address: arabaakeem@gmail.com/ +2348 58381111

&

Edokpa Fadal Mary: Department of Political Science, Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma, Edo State, Nigeria; E-mail Address: marydokpa@gmail.com/ +2348067601360

Abstract

Leadership has been considered a critical factor in military successes since records have been kept; that is, better led forces repeatedly have been victorious over poorly led forces. As a nation develops, it needs a centralized locus for its operation which can only be achieved by a single leader. All important decisions and their implementation center on the cult of the leader even when as in military or parliamentary democracies, actual decision making is diffuse. The leader embodies the collective will. This single leaders sort out the essential problems, offers possible solutions, establishes priorities, and launches developmental operations. The paper seeks to investigate the role of Leadership in Foreign Policy decision making in Nigeria, A Comparing the military regimes Generals Buhari and Babangida. The paper analyzes Buhari foreign policy and also discusses an in-depth of Babangida foreign policy in Nigeria. The nexus juxtapose the impact of Buhari and Babangida foreign policy. The leadership theoretical perspective is adopted for the study in order to determine the problem. Nigeria's foreign policy from 1960 till date had witnessed a beehive of activities. The period witnessed both success and failure and these two regime tackled and varieties of problems that arose in its relationship with other member of the international community. There is a need to re-define the Nigeria foreign policy. The country needs to concentrate more on improving the well being of her citizens, both at home and Diaspora, and ensure that they are treated fairly and justly wherever they may choose to reside.

Keywords: Leadership, Foreign Policy, Military Regime, Nigeria and Africa

Introduction

What constitutes the foreign policy of any country represents the beliefs, feeling, sentiments and more importantly, the perception of leaders who have the ultimate responsibility for policy-making. In this case, the perceptions of the head of a government regarding his country's position, national interest, capability and role will affect the country's actions and relations with other significant actors in the international system (Fawole,1999). Nigeria is a country which is located in West Africa with over 170 Million populations. Nigeria is a multi-national or multi ethnic country. She was colonized by British and gained her independence on 1st of October, 1960. She shares her boundaries with Niger, Chad, Benin Republic and Cameroon. Subsequently entered the comity of nations upon her admission into the United Nations on October 7, 1960, to pursue, assert and strive to actualize her values and interest in the global arena. Like any other country's foreign policy. Nigeria foreign policy is to a very large extent a product of many domestic and external factors and forces. These factors and forces taken together not only place certain limits upon the actions and choices of the individual makers of Nigerian foreign policy

ISSN 2705-2559
E-ISSN 2705-2567

but also set the framework within which the domestic political contest over foreign policy issues must be fought and won.

Nigeria is one of the most visible states in international community. The term "giant of Africa" is often used to describe the country because of the apparent "big brother" role she is playing, especially in ensuring the well being of her immediate neighbors and by extension to Africa as a whole. The Various regime changes the country has had, since independence coupled with changes in the personnel at the helms of affairs has had lasting effects on the country's foreign policy to the extent that her national interest is shaped to reflect the interest of each over successive government at any particular point in time.

Military regimes often present a different environmental context for foreign policy process and conduct in the sense on certain foreign policy issues which characterized democratic political culture are alien to military regime. In the course of carrying out this research the following objectives were set: to examine the Buhari regime foreign policy, to assess Babangida regime foreign policy in Nigeria, and to cross-examine the implications of Buhari and Babangida regime foreign policies on Nigeria development.

This work is divided into seven sections. The first section is set to give an introduction to what we intend to do. The second section explains the conceptual clarifications while the next section explore theoretical framework. The fourth section examines the analysis of Buhari Foreign Policy in Nigeria. The fifth section discusses the In-depth of Babangida Foreign Policy in Nigeria. The sixth section Juxtapose the impact of Buhari and Babangida foreign policy and, the seventh section contain conclusion and recommendations

Conceptual Clarifications

Foreign Policy

Foreign policy relates to the interest that a state intends to realize at the international level. It is country's goal values being sought in the world stage, and it further connotes the nation's general behaviour towards other state and non-state actors. Specially, Reynolds conceives foreign policy as the range of actions of government of a state in its relation with other bodies similarly acting on the international stage supposedly in order to advance the nation's interest (Kolawole, 2001). Kolawole (2001) amplifies this interpretation by submitting that foreign policy "aims at influencing the international system towards the attainment of what it perceives as ideal in consonance with its national interest. Frankel (1975) sees foreign policy as "consisting of decisions and actions which involve to some appreciable extent relations between one state and another (Frankel, 1975). In earlier work, Frankel (1963) defines foreign policy as a dynamic process of interaction between the changing domestic demands and support and the changing external circumstances. Lerche and Said (1979) maintain that the foreign policy of a state usually refers to the general principles by which a state governs its reaction to the international environment. Foreign policy connotes an action taken by any countries or international organizations with a view to realizing and protecting her national interest. To this extent, the issue of national interest is paramount in foreign policy calculations.

ISSN 2705-2559
E-ISSN 2705-2567

From these perceptions, it is easily derived that the external environment is very important to the achievement of foreign policy ideals. It can therefore be rightly said that without the internal landscape, there will be no foreign policy. Another germane observation is the close linkage between the domestic and the external environment, in terms of forces influencing the extents to which a state can maneuver to attain its interest. The interdependence of the two environments has informed Northedge's problematization of foreign policy as "interplay between the outside and inside (Northedge, 1968).The close ties between national and international affairs has given birth to the new concept of "intermestic" to symbolize the merger of international and domestic concern (Rourke, 1995)

Leadership

The concept of leadership has been defined in so many perspectives that it is hard to come up with a single working definition. However, Ogbeidi, (2012) defines leadership "as a body of people who lead and direct the activities of a group towards a shared goal". This implies the ability to lead, direct and organize a group towards achieving a mutually shared goal. Ubegbe (1999) defines "leadership as the process of creating the subordinates' identification with the group's mission and creating their desires to achieve the group's goal". In the light of this understanding (Ogbeidi, 2012) defines leadership as a potent combination of strategy and character and strongly stresses that, of the two elements, character is the most preferred for leadership. Leadership is a social influence process in which the leader seeks the voluntary participation of subordinates in an effort to achieve organizational goals (Graig, 2005). Similarly, John Gardener describes leadership as the process of persuasion or example by which an individual induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers (Weekly Trust, 2004). Accordingly, leadership is a process of social influence by which a superior influences subordinates to accomplish an objective and directs the organization in a way that makes it more cohesive and coherent (Ogbeidi, 2012). A leader therefore is expected to be visionary, selfless, tact, prudent, level-headed with good character, and must have ability to lead by example. True leaders in any nation are the key to a new world. It is practically impossible for any nation to improve, change, and develop without true leadership. True leaders are selfless, they think more of the next generation.

Leadership is not a right of the leader but a privilege given by the followers and the leader must respect the followers. Leadership success is measured by the success of his/her successor. No matter how great a leader may have been if he could not produce a successor, he is a failure. True leaders do not have seat-tight syndrome. However, leadership crisis manifests in any nation when the leaders are characterless, clueless, self-seeking, greedy, parochial, visionless, mission-less, uninspiring, attitudinal debauchery, unwilling to relinquish power, thoughtless, unfair, high-handed etc

Theoretical Framework

A number of theoretical explanations for the occurrence of leadership style have been provided by scholars on literature that is associated with leadership. Leadership is a process by which a person influences others to accomplish an objective and directs the state or organization in a way that makes it more cohesive and coherent. This definition is similar to Northouse's (2007) definition of Leadership, which is seen as a process whereby an individual influences a group of

ISSN 2705-2559
E-ISSN 2705-2567

individuals to achieve a common goal. The leadership theory will be group into three. The leaderships are mutually complementary models, Leadership trait, the behavioural and the situational theory will be use to analyze this research work

Leadership Traits; The historical evolution of the study of leaders and leadership derives from Galton's Great Man theory (Clark & Clark, 1989). Royalty, battlefield heroes, and other wealthy and successful individuals were thought to possess inherent talents and abilities that set them apart from the population which enabled them to achieve great success. Great Man theory subsequently gave rise to trait theory in the 1920s and 1930s, which generally unsuccessfully attempted to identify traits that made leaders different from other individuals. The underlying assumption of the theory was that leaders surely had to possess some universal characteristics that made them leaders. For the most part, traits were viewed as "givens" something that was there at birth inborn, fixed, and applicable to, and in, any circumstance.

Leadership Behaviours; The behavioural approach makes an effort to identify exactly what good leaders do on the job and then draws correlations between those specific behaviours and their leadership effectiveness (Yukl, 2002). There are two different dimensions of leadership behaviour, one focused on the task and the other on the people or interpersonal dimensions (Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, 2002; Yukl & Van Fleet, 1982). At large task aspect of the leader's behaviour focuses on job accomplishment or goal achievement. Leader behaviours here would demonstrate concerns regarding production, the exercise of directive leadership, efforts to initiate structure and supervision or oversight. The people focus or relationship behaviour would be demonstrated by concern for people, offering supportive leadership, focusing on the feelings of individuals, their comfort, showing appropriate appreciation and making efforts to reduce stress. Leaders demonstrate these behaviours in an effort to promote satisfaction among group members, facilitate the development and maintenance of harmonious relations in the work place, and retain the social stability of the group.

Situational Leadership; as investigation into leadership behaviours evolved, it became clear that the situation or context within which leadership is exercised is important as well (Stogdill, 1948; Mann, 1959). However, both did identify some specific personal characteristics that were associated with leadership in the studies they examined extroversion, dominance, etc. As a result of their work, they determined that diverse situations could place decidedly different burdens on leaders. Thus, leader traits, for example, were relevant only to the degree that they pertained to the task under consideration. Consequently, they concluded that there were no specific set of characteristics that could distinguish leaders from followers, nor were there characteristics that could predict leader success. Yukl (2002) noted that the effectiveness of a leader's behaviour could be dependent on a number of situational factors the extent of the leader's authority and discretion, the nature of the work performed by the organization, the attributes of the subordinates, and the nature of the external environment. This view was consistent with what Westburg (1931) had found–that a leader's success was tied to his ability to understand both his followers as well as the environment, and then respond to both as required by changing circumstances.

ISSN 2705-2559
E-ISSN 2705-2567

Analysis of Buhari Foreign Policy in Nigeria

The Buhari regime came into being on 31st December, 1983.The regime faced staggering task on taking over power because of corruption, decay and ineptness that characterized the Shagari administration. The regime had inherited a load of external loans, and was also faced with the daunting task of redeeming Nigeria image in the international community. In his inaugural speech to the nation on 31 December, 1983, Buhari accused the Shagari administration of making the nation "an object of ridicule because of its incoherence and lack of direction". The regime, therefore, opted "to use foreign policy as an effective instrument for rebuilding the shattered economy and internal security". It thus committed itself to reversing the decay and despair of the domestic, economic and social order (Akinyemi et al 1989:7).As a result of the rigid hierarchy and commandist structure, strong willed and self-opinionated rules like General Muritala Muhammed, Olusegun Obasanjo and Muhammed Buhari were able to stamp their own imprints on Nigeria's foreign policy (Fawole,1999).

On taking over power, General Buhari's regime promised to pursue a "dynamic but realistic" foreign policy objective, characterizing his regime as an "offshoot of the Murtala/Obasanjo regime. General Buhari further explained that his regime would pursue the dynamic policies of their predecessors but would be mindful of the country's declining resources and would thus pursue foreign policy with realism (Buhari, 1984). The regime came up with the concept of 'Concentric Circle' as a priority of Nigeria foreign policy. As Buhari puts it; the pattern of concentric circle may be discernable 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 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 neighbor. He continues by saying that one of our principal priorities is to put on a more constructive footing relation with our neighbor with whom we share identical goals of regional stability and peace.

The regime was characterized by a messianic attempt to restore to Nigeria foreign policy, purposefulness, activism and credibility by appointing a foreign policy expert, Dr. Ibrahim Gambari, as the minister for External Affairs, the extension of the purge of the civil services to the foreign policy bureaucracy and the unlimited authority given to the new minister to rationalize and structure the external affairs Ministry to make it a cost-effective and efficient instrument for promoting Nigeria interest and aspirations(Ibid).The regime was committed to the sustenance and flourishing of the economic community of West Africa State (ECOWAS) by paying promptly her budgetary and other assessed contribution and through the instrumentality of ECOWAS, her relations with neighboring countries were further cemented under the regime (Gambari, 1989).

It revamps the country's economy without compromising her integrity. The regime began loan negotiation with International Monetary Fund (IMF) but the negotiation stalled because the regime was not prepared to accept the conditionality's attached to the deal. The government did not want to devaluate the naira, nor was it ready to remove subsidy on petroleum products, and to relax export controls because such measures would be detrimental to the already ailing economy. The regime introduced foreign exchange control regulations, and other measures

ISSN 2705-2559
E-ISSN 2705-2567

aimed at reducing inflation, increased oil production levels by exceeding its OPEC production quota, thereby improving external balance of payments, and reducing the accumulation of the nation's debt. It also recognized the POLISARO government of the Saharawi Arab Democratic Republic (SADR) and aided her admission to the OAU despite opposition from some other Africa development (Ibid; 278-279).The Buhari regime was also committed to the total liberation of Southern Africa, and afford unwavering support to the liberation movements in the sub-region. The regime paid the arrears of the country's contribution to the Organization of Africa Unity (OAU) liberation fund, which the Shagari administration failed to pay.

The regime also deals with Alhaji Umaru Dikko (a senior cabinet member under Shagari) saga and the subsequent effect on Nigeria-British relations. Declared wanted over the wanton squandering and mismanagement of public funds by the Buhari government, attempt to kidnap Dikko in London by the government agents-Israel citizens and a Nigerian military officer was foiled by British security agents. The ensued crisis was such that led to frenzied relations between the two countries, due to the Airways indebtedness, the Buhari regime ensured that a British aircraft was not released until the Nigeria plane returned to Lagos. This "tit-for-tat approach" was applauded by Nigerians at home and abroad. The Dikko affairs has however, been described as "a red herring which did not stop Britain and Nigeria from announcing the 'unofficial' visit of the British Foreign Secretary to Nigeria a few weeks to the toppling of the Buhari regime" (Oyebode, 2003).

The regime re-launched Nigeria's deep commitment to the cause of freedom and liberation struggle particularly in South Africa. He signed a Quadripartite Agreement with Nigeria's neighbors to the West on 10, December 1984, to promote mutual assistance and cooperation in trade, immigration, policy and security. He also used the ECOWAS framework to resolve bilateral problems with the Togo and Ghana, as well as Nigeria's boarder problems with the Republic of Benin. It dealt decisively with the threats from Chad and Cameroon by stationing military contingents along the borders with those countries.

An In-depth of Babangida Foreign Policy in Nigeria

On August 27, 1985, Major General Ibrahim Babangida led a palace coup that overthrow Buhari as head of state. Babangida who gave himself the title of "President", adopted an outward-looking foreign policy posture. There were no challenges before Ibrahim Babangida regime. He 'inherited' a foreign policy which had been rescued from the clutches of indecision and incompetence and was on its way to full rehabilitation. Babangida's regime normalized relations with the nation's neighbor which had become strained because of the issues of illegal aliens which had made Buhari regime, to shut all Nigeria borders indefinitely. The borders which were closed in April 1984 became opened by Babangida on February, 28 1986, after 23 months (Africa Today, 1991) so as to diffuse tension within the sub-region. Because the continue closure of the border would have contradicted the spirit and ideals of ECOWAS which had been founded on the need for free movement of persons and goods within the sub-region in order to promote sub-regional economic development (ECOWAS Treaty, Article 2)

The regime initiated or piloted a military intervention by proposing it at the 13th ECOWAS summit of 28-30 May, 1990 in Banjul Gambia. The proposal was endorsed by the summit. The

ISSN 2705-2559
E-ISSN 2705-2567

committee decided on a military action, and subsequently, the ECOWAS Peace Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) was instituted to trouble-shoot and keep the peace in Liberia and Nigeria was a major financier of the institutions. Adisa (1992) describes the towering role of Nigeria in the interventionist diplomacy in Liberia as the "burden of community spirit" and further sees it as a radical departure from the country's traditional defence posture. Babangida implemented a programme of economic diplomacy. The over-riding purpose of the programme was to ameliorate the international economic climate to Nigeria's favour (Adeniji, 2000). In achieving this, the regime as a way of stimulating foreign investment, especially from Europe and the United States, established an incentive policy. The incentives include; Tax-free dividends up to seven years, Capital allowance, reduced company income tax, Allowance for research and development, import drawback scheme, A range of export incentive and liberalized scheme for reparation of earned capital arising from foreign capital participation (Babangida, 1990).

The regime continued to play significant roles in the broader Africa issues. He made a case for debt forgiveness for the continent by the Western financial institutions. Babangida canvassed that the political struggle has largely been fought and won, and what Africa needs now is economic freedom through debt forgiving and total debt write-off (Olagunju and Oyovbaire, 2013). He demanded for reparations for Africa from Europe. The reparations accounted for the forceful capture and transportation of about 10-30 million young and virile Africans to Europe, a development which retarded the African march towards development, progress and advancement in science and technology (ibid, 245). Babangida argued that slave trade brought retrogression to the continent as Africa and Europe were almost at par in terms of development up to the 15th century, prior to the slave trade (ibid).He finally submitted that European slave trade destroyed African achievement and civilization attained before the slave trade era.

In 1986, Nigeria led thirty-two other countries in boycotting the Commonwealth games in Edinburgh, Scotland, in protest at Britain's reluctance to apply comprehensive sanctions against the apartheid regime, and continued to function as an honorary frontline state; and its financial contributions to liberation movements were maintained from both private and official donations to the South Africa Relief Fund and Namibia Solidarity Fund. The regime also continued with the nation's anti-apartheid and anti-colonial policies towards Southern Africa. In 1989,for example, the regime set up a #100 million fund equivalent to US$1.5 million for the South West people's organization (SWAPO) to fight for the independent elections in Rhodesia (now Namibia).He also gave ANC US$1million,and PAC US$600,000.

Babangida regime also instituted the Technical Aid Corps Scheme (TAC) in 1987.The scheme entails sending Nigeria's trained professionals and skilled manpower, particularly in the medical, nursing, scientific, engineering teaching fields to less endowed African and Caribbean countries to work. Nigeria accounts for the full remuneration of the corps, the benefitting host countries only provide accommodation for the corps that was referred to as "ambassadors of peace" (ibid). The Babangida's International Economic relations policy which had most far-reaching implications was the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) with which the regime intended to transform the economy. The SAP which was inaugurated in 1986 was a Brettonwoods system's agenda which contained a wide range of economic reforms including privatization of public enterprises, devaluation of the naira and deregulation of the oil sector.

ISSN 2705-2559
E-ISSN 2705-2567

In 1991, he also played very crucial roles in the formation and signing of the Treaty for African Economic Community, as well as the establishment of a Department for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution. The regime mediates in several internal disputes for example Uganda and Angola. Inter-African affairs conflict especially in the West African, the borders Wars between Mali and Burkina Faso and in the strained relation between Sierra Leone and Liberia. Babangida restored normal relations with Britain, strengthened existing relations with Germany and France, and established diplomatic links with Israel. Nigeria also remained committed to the United Nation, the Commonwealth and the Non-Aligned movement through which positions on major global issues were articulated. It became a full member of the Organization of Islamic Countries (OIC).Under Babangida regime Nigeria chair the United Committee on apartheid, and Obasanjo's appointment to the Commonwealth's Eminent Persons Group was recognition of its role in the liberation struggle. The released of the Nelson Mandela from jail after twenty-seven years and the subsequent negotiations to end apartheid were celebrated in Nigeria as a major victory. In 1990, Nigeria enjoyed some good moments; General Joseph Garba became president of the 44th session of the United Nation (UN) General Assembly, while Emeka Anyaoku emerged as Secretary General of the Commonwealth.

Juxtapose the Impact of Buhari and Babangida Foreign Policy

The Buhari regime contributed to Nigeria foreign policy. The regime represents a formidable attempt at repositioning and better asserting the country in the comity of nations. It strives to define and defend the nation's national interest in relation to Africa's goal and objective and the pursuits of world peace and security for the period of about 20 months for which the regime lasted, Though economically conditioned to pursue an "African centered "foreign policy, the Buhari regime was firm and courageous in its foreign policy options. This was reflected in the way General Buhari closed the country's borders to what he tagged "illegal aliens" in 1985 despite all entreaties from within and outside the country. His strong will and personnel conviction as well as the hierarchical and commandist structure of the military paid off in this regard.

The regime had no respect for the civilian class. He jailed many and ruled by terror and forced obedience rather than by respect and reverence. The regime unpopular with the vast majority of the people, even though some of its policies were well received at home, it could not match the wide acclaim that had added to the vibrancy of foreign policy in the previous administration. Support for its policies was muted. The criticism alleged against the regime was that the high handedness of the regime, especially with the War Against Indiscipline (WAI) programmed and the death penalty prescribed for drug pushers brought about the downfall of the regime. The Prolonged closure of Nigeria's land boarders and the sporadic expulsion of aliens (mostly Ghanaians) were against the spirit of ECOWAS and generated uproar within and outside the community.

The Buhari regime pursued both domestic and foreign policies with great commitment and vigor, and as Buhari himself said, "No country in the world can command the respect and administration of the international community without a dedicated and purposeful leadership, and indeed, no country can conduct a successful foreign policy without first putting its house in

ISSN 2705-2559
E-ISSN 2705-2567

order". Following from the above, it's obvious that Buhari regime maintained a vibrant foreign policy with Africa as its principal focus. Nigeria was already a failed state economically when he seized government from Shagari. We had staggering foreign debt load of US$18 billion, so Buhari stopped all further borrowing, and in defiance of the IMF and World Bank, provided a homegrown alternative to the IMF's SAP and pegged the exchange rate of the naira at one to the US$1.50.He stopped all further borrowing from abroad; instituted counter trade for essential or desperately needed exchanging earnings to be used in serving foreign debts, after sorting out and rejecting all the dubious and unverified foreign debts in our portfolio, he paid off nearly 50% of the genuine debts by the end of his regime in 1985.

Adamolekun (1985) argues that the regime failed to embark on're-orientation' of the nation's economy, and that its policies achieved no 'real improvement'. The regime also had problems over its image as a cabal of conservative Northern interest. There was a preponderance of Northerners in the Supreme Military Council, and as beneficiaries of appointments to top positions and distribution of other forms of patronage, and Northern politician were given preferential treatment in the trials and punishments of officials of Second Republic. The pattern of retrenchments in the top echelons of the public service also seemed to suggest a deliberate attempt to replace Southerners by Northerners. This resurrected the confederation debate which began in the Second Republic in response to what was perceived to be 'unstoppable' Northern domination by some Southern politicians. The Agitations became even more pronounced under Buhari, and it was significant that retired military officers from the South-West notably Brigadier Benjamin Adekunle, the legendary 'Black Scorpion' of the civil war, and Lt-General Alani Akinrinade, joined the ranks of the confederalist (Osaghe,1990b).The most serious indictment of the regime along this line was that of General Obasanjo, former head of state, who not only criticized the regime's Northernisation policy but denied its legitimization instrument of being an offshoot of his (Mohammed/Obasanjo) regime (Obasanjo,1985) (Ibid).The regime was sufficiently alarmed by this agitation to ban all forms of political debate in the country. According to Othman (1989), 'in themselves, all these divisive issues undermined the credibility and stability of the regime. More fatally, they intensified the strains within the ruling junta.' These strains and the division which they produced between the Buhari-Idiagbon and Babangida factions underlay the overthrow of the regime by the Babangida faction.

At the Africa continental level, the OAU remained the major channel of the 'traditional' commitments to eradication of apartheid in South Africa, liberation of the entire continent from colonial rule, and advancement of unity. Ibrahim Babangida became the Organization of Africa Unity chairman in 1991, when Nigeria hosted the organization's summit; the extravagance of the hosting was condemned critically by the press. Joining the African Petroleum Producers Association (APPA) never became any serious strategic benefit to Nigeria, since member states found it difficult to reconcile their divergent interests. The Babangida regime committed the nation to the most expensive foreign policy in the history of her foreign relations. Nigeria leading roles in ECOMOG operations in Liberia and Technical Aids Corps Scheme have placed avoidable financial burden on the country, particularly when it's continued declining economy is taken into consideration.

ISSN 2705-2559
E-ISSN 2705-2567

The external economic policies of the regime have significant implication for Nigerians and the Nigeria state. The adoption of Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) since 1986 has had negative effect on people's welfare and conditions of living. The devaluation of the currency, privatization of public enterprises and withdrawal of oil subsidies triggered inflationary trend in the economy and worsened the conditions of living of an average Nigerian and this negating the nation's foreign policy goal-value of promoting the social and economic well-being of Nigerians.

The regime was too pro-western; it consistently made frantic efforts to consolidate the integration of Nigeria's economy to the core Western capitalist centers. The regime strongly identified with the western financial institutions including the IMF, Paris Club and London Club. It was criticized from the point of the public opinion and influence of pressure groups had little or no effect on the regime as the case of the nation's participation in ECOMOG and adoption of SAP showed, the regime implemented the two policies despite rejection by the Nigeria Public. Most of the objectives of the regimes are exogenous and outward looking than inward in term of beneficiaries. For instance, beside the objectives bordering on the defiance of the sovereign independence and territorial integrity of the nation, and the promotion of the economic well-being of Nigerians, all others are meant to promote non-Nigerian interests. It failed to appreciate that the primacy of any foreign policy in terms of utilization of dividends should be primarily Nigerian. Any foreign policy that therefore fails to put its citizens into maximum consideration as beneficiaries is inherently flawed.

The regime's programme such as the issues of Organization of Islamic Council (OIC) membership further articulated and undermined the fragile unity and the domestic peace security and stability of the nation. The controversies generated by the decision and the attendant religious riots still constitute a sore point in the relations of the Southern Nigeria dominated by Christian and the North dominated by Muslims' the two divide remain polarized based on religious reason. The intension of becoming a full-fledged member of the (IOC); and Religious has always been a sensitive issues in Nigeria. The step sharply divided Nigeria into two religious camps, Christian versus Muslim. The Christian argued that Nigeria's membership undermined the security provided for in the 1979 constitution, and that the OIC was established to promote Islamic interests.

Conclusion

Nigeria's foreign policy from 1960 till date, had witnessed a beehive of activities. The period witnessed both success and failure and these two regime tackled and varieties of problems that arose in its relationship with other member of the international community. There is a need to re-define the Nigeria foreign policy. The country needs to concentrate more on improving the well being of her citizens, both at home and Diaspora, and ensure that they are treated fairly and justly wherever they may choose to reside. A stable political environment is imperative in the pursuit of an available foreign policy. Thus, there is a need for the present administration to address, the various pocket of crisis arising in various part of the country, especially in Niger Delta region regarding the avengers and the problems of kidnapping which is very rampant in the country, the problem of insurgency the Boko Haram should be vigorously addressed for the safety of life's and properties. The issue of corruption, which is the bane of lack of development in Nigeria, should also be tackled by the present administration. This should include the economic

challenges facing the country. Tackling these issues will further improve the country's image in the international arena, and also help in the continual projection of the Nigeria as the "giant of Africa".

Finally, a buoyant economy and military might are very critical in the pursuit of a progressive foreign policy and the preservation of any nations' vital interest. The Nigeria government should therefore strive in the years ahead to diversify her economy and also build her military power. This is more so now that the country is facing a series of challenges.

References

Adamolekun, L. R. (1985). *Nigeria Public Administration 1960-1980: Perspectives and Prospects.* Heinemann Educational Book, Ibadan.

Adeniji,O. (2000). *Essays on Nigerian Foreign Policy Governance and International Security*, Ibadan. Dokun Publishing House,

Adisa, J. (1993). "*Nigeria in ECOMOG: The Burden of Community Spirit*" in J. Owoeye (ed) Nigeria in International Institutions, Ibadan, College Press

Ajayi, K. (2004). *Domestic Unpredictability and Foreign Policy Stability: Nigeria under Babangida*. In Dipo Kolawole, Nigeria's Foreign Policy since Independence: Trends, Phases and Changes. Julius and Julius Publisher.

Babangida, I. B. (1990b). *Text of Address to the Paris Chamber of Commerce*, France, 28 February, 2001.

Charles, O.L., and Abdul, A. S. (1979). *Concepts of International Politics in Global Perspective.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall

Clark, K.E., and Clark, M. B. (1989). *Measure of leadership.* Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Osaghae, E. E. (2002). *Crippled Giant: Nigeria since Independence.* John Archer's publisher's Limited Dugbe Ibadan

Fawole, W. A. (1999). *Paranoia Hostility and Defiance; General Sani Abacha and the 'New Nigeria Foreign Policy*. Ile-Ife: Obafemi Awolowo University Press Limited.

Frankel, J. (1975). *British Foreign Policy*. London: Oxford University press

Frankel, J. (1963). *The Making of Foreign Policy*. London: Oxford University Press.

Gambari, I.A. (1989). "*Nigeria's Foreign Policy at the Crossroads*" in Akinyemi et al (eds.) Nigeria since Independence.The First twenty-five years volume x International Relations. Ibadan Heinemann Educational Books (Nigeria) Limited.

Graig, E.J. (2005). *Meeting the Ethical Challenges of Leadership*, New Delhi: Sage Publications Ibid

Ijewereme, O. B and Dunmade, E.O. (2014). Leadership Crisis and Corruption In Nigerian Public Sector: Implications For Socio-Economic Development Of Nigeria. *International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research (IJPAMR), Vol. 2, No 3, 46-56*

Kolawole, D. (2001). *Military Rule and Nigeria's Foreign Policy 1966-1979*, Ibadan, Rulad Publishers.

Lerche, C. and Said, A. A (1975). *Concepts International Politics in Global Perspective*. Publish Englewood Cliff, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Mann, R.D. (1959*). A review of the relationship between personality and performance in small group*. Psychological Bulletin, 56, 241-270

Northedge, F.S. (1968). *The Foreign Policies of the Powers*, London Faber and Faber

Northouse, G. (2007). *Leadership theory and practice*. (3rd ed.) Thousand Oak, London, New Delhe, Sage Publications, Inc.

Ogbeidi, M. M (2012). *Political Leadership and Corruption in Nigeria Since 1960*: A Socio Economic Analysis Journal of Nigeria Studies 1, 1-25

Oke, L. (2004). *Domestic Authoritarianism and Foreign Policy Pursuit*: The Buhari Years. In Dipo Kolawole, Nigeria's Foreign Policy since Independence: Trends, Phases and Changes. Julius and Julius Publisher, 121-130

Osahon, N. (2003). *All Nigerian Coup Generals were rogues and general Muhammad Buhari was no exception*. http/thewillnigeria.com/opinion/4382

Otubanjo, F. O. (1989). "*Phases and Changes in Nigeria's Foreign Policy*" in Akinyemi et al (eds.) Nigeria Since Independence. The first-five years volume x International Relations. Ibadan Heinemann Educational Books (Nigeria) Limited.

Oyebode, A. (2003). *International Law and Politics*, An African Perspective. Lagos. Bolabay Publication.

Rourke, J. T. (1995). *International Politics on the World State*, Guilford, Connecticut, Dushkin Publishing Group.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personality factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Personality, 25, 35–71.*

Udegbe, I. B. (1999). *Leadership: Nature and Pathways to Effectiveness Psychology: Perspective in Human Behaviour*. I. B Udegbe, S.K Balogun, H. Osinowo, and A.M Sunmola Ibadan: University of Ibadan.

Westburgh, E. M. (1931). A point of view: Studies in Leadership. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 25, 418-423*

Yulk, G.A., and Van Fleet, D. D. (1982). Cross-situational, multi-method research on military leader effectiveness. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance, 30, 87-108*

Yukl, G. A., Gordon, A., and Taber, T. (2002). A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behaviour: integrating a half century of behaviour research. *Journal of Leadership and Organization Studies, 9 (1), 15-32*