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Abstract
Illegal and uncontrollable cross border migration, the circulation of terrorist mercenaries, proliferation of small and light weapons and other security equipment in the possession of unauthorized persons have contributed to increasing incidents of terrorism, banditry, inter-ethnic conflicts, xenophobic attacks, killings, destruction of means of livelihood and sack of communities across Africa. For over the past fifty years, successive regimes in Nigeria have committed and executed the policy that Africa is the centerpiece of Nigeria’s foreign policy. The outcome was fruitful because many African countries were liberated from the stranglehold of racist colonialism and apartheid because Nigeria committed enormous resources to the continental development. Current situation of insecurity in Nigeria questions the rationality of focusing on continental issues, considering the enormity of internal security challenges that Nigeria faces. The paper adopted the realist theory of international relations as a framework to explore the nexuses between foreign policy and national or homeland security. The study will adopt historical and descriptive analysis and shall rely on secondary data. This study interrogates the rationality of continuing with this policy on the backdrop of the exigency of National security. The paper argues that time and situations that warranted and justified that policy are no longer tenable with contemporary reality, hence we recommend a foreign policy agenda that makes national security the centerpiece of Nigeria’s foreign policy.
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INTRODUCTION:
The African continent for several decades was the center piece of Nigeria's foreign policy, hence Nigeria spent a sizable chunk of her natural resource earnings to play the 'big brother' role, not only in supporting decolonized African countries in their development aspirations, but supported the anti -apartheid liberation movements of Southern Africa in their quest for freedom as well as invested huge material resources in the peace keeping
missions in Africa and in the political stability of the Africa region as could be seen in the programmes of ECOMOG, etc. These investments were made to the neglect of the socio-economic wellbeing of her citizens who mainly had to bear the brunt of these investments amidst living under the huge burden of authoritarian regimes, bad governance and systemic corruption. 

Going further, an analysis of Nigeria's foreign policy thrust shows a pursuit towards 'manifest destiny', exemplified by the use of her resources to expand its spheres of influence. The various peace keeping missions beginning with the Republic of Congo in 1950s to the era of funding and leading the global anti-apartheid campaigns to that of playing a leadership role in ECOMOG as well as Technical Aid Corp among others are calculated at achieving the goal of expanding its sphere of influence.

Ekpebu (1998:128-129) succinctly stated the obvious that Giving its full backing to the frontline states was Africa's giant nation against apartheid, the Federal Republic of Nigeria. Her credentials were impressive. Nigeria followed up with moral and substantial material support to busy the victorious Mugabe government and people of Zimbabwe to their feet. Nigeria’s moral and material support for the role of the frontline states, in the liberation struggle for Namibia and South Africa was matched by her diplomatic role at the united Nation where Nigeria continued to hold the crucial position of Chairman of the World body’s powerful Anti-apartheid Committee, during the crucial years of the liberation struggle in South Africa, leading in effect, the international efforts at exposing the theoretical as well as the practical machinations of the apartheid system, mobilizing the world body to impose sanctions and promoting as well as coordinating the various measures through which the international community helped to remove mineral rich Namibia out of South Africa.

The above scenario led to some social pressures that led to serious vices, including crimes such as armed robbery, abduction, kidnapping, rape and violations of the dignity of the human person, ethnic militias, trans-border crimes such as banditry, trafficking in persons, rape and other forms of violence extremism among the people and consequently insecurity in the geo-polity. There is therefore an urgent need to reappraise the thrust of the nation's foreign policy and align it to suit the national interest, such that the strategic interest of the nation and its peoples are given priority. This paper therefore, suggest that for Nigeria to be given its pride of place in the comity of nations, it should embrace ‘The Realist Theory of International Relations’ or ‘Realism’ as her foreign policy thrust.

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF KEY WORDS.
The key words in this paper are foreign policy, African continent and National security. We shall proceed to conceptualize them.

Foreign Policy: This concept has been defined in various ways by scholars, policy makers and diplomats. Indeed, there is no definite definition of the phenomenon called Foreign policy. This is so because of the numerous definitions giving to it by many international relations Scholars. Foreign policy, also called foreign relations or foreign affairs policy are self-interest strategies chosen by the state to safeguard its national interests and to achieve goals within its international milieu (Wikipedia). Looking at it from a purpose perspective, Alli (2014:26) defines it as policy designed to project a nation's vital interests including the preservation of its sovereignty and security, and the promotion of its economic and other interest. It is thus a country's response to the world outside and beyond its frontier or boundaries, responses which are products of environmental factors - internal and external. To Akinboye (1999 in Ajaye, et al,2015), foreign policy is seen as a dynamic process leveraging on the mutual relationship between the domestic and external environments. Morgenthau (1989) sees a nation’s foreign policy as a total sum of her national interest which is used as a guide for the formulation of her foreign policy. For Goldstein (1999: 147, in Daniel,2015), foreign policies are strategies used by governments to guide their actions in the international arena. Ota and Ecoma (2015: 57) opine that foreign policy is a coordinated and articulated strategy with which institutionally-designated decision makers seek to
manipulate the international environment in order to achieve a set of national objectives. For Anyaele (2003:204, in Daniel,2015), foreign policy simply is the promotion of a nation’s interests at international levels. Clearly put, Ojo and Ezirim encapsulated what foreign policy of any nation should be. They opined that:

Foreign policy is a combination of aims and interests pursued and defended by the giving state and its ruling class in its relations with other states, and the methods and means used by it for the achievement and defense of these purposes and interests. Foreign policy is the category of actions a government takes which deals with defense, security, international political and economic relations. It is the activity whereby a state deal other states, non-governmental organizations, international organizations and certain individuals (Ojo,1990 :44, Ezirim, 2011 in Daniel, 2015).

From the above definition foreign policy is usually guided by and tailored to serve specific objectives of a country. These objectives are in furtherance of the ‘national interest’, a nebulous concept with hardly a clear meaning. For example, Nigeria's foreign policy objectives are clearly defined in Section 19 of the Constitution as follows:

a) Promotion and protection of the national interest;
b) Promotion of African integration and support for African unity.
(c) Promotion of international cooperation for the consolidation of universal peace and mutual respect among all nations and elimination of discrimination in all its manifestation;
(d) Respect for international law and treaty as well as the seeking of settlement of international disputes by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration and adjudication.

As a matter of fact, Nigeria foreign policy thrust has been Afrocentrism; which means primarily focused on Africa as her centre-piece. As a regional power, its main thrust has been to harness Africa’s unity and independence, enthrone hegemonic regime in the region and ensure peaceful resolution of regional conflicts. This it has done via the philosophy of non-alignment and non-international interference in the internal affairs of other nations; and regional economic cooperation and development. The above factors led her serious involvement and participation in Africa Union, ECOWAS, Non-Alignment movement, Common Wealth of Nations and United Nations. Basically, Nigeria Foreign Policy are subsumed two dimensions namely: National integration and Economic development.

National Interest: The foreign policy of any nation as enunciated is the functionalization of her national interest. National Interest accordingly refers to those values and ideals which a nation holds very highly and could go to war if they are compromised (Daniel, 2015: 57). However, on the issue of what constitutes vital components of Nigeria’s national interest, Aluko (1981), stated three vital ingredients. These are self- preservation of the country, defense and maintenance of the country’s independence and the economic and social well-being of the citizenry. He further argued that certain assumed national interests are core or vital. These are namely, “defense, preservation and promotion of way of life of Nigerian’s especially its values of democracy, the development of the country’s stance in the comity of nations, particularly in Africa and promoting world peace”. On the contrary, Olusanya and Akindele (1986, in Osaherumwen and Motunrayo, 2017), stated that Nigeria’s national interest are as follows: “the defense of the country’s sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, restoring the human dignity of black men and women all over the world, with the promotion and improvement of economic well-being of Nigerian citizens and which includes the promotion of world peace and justice”.

To be sure, “foreign policy and national interest of any nation are inseparable concepts in international relations. The foundation of a state’s foreign policy is her national interest which in turn directs the course of the foreign policy. Thus national interest refers to the totality or aggregate of interests of individuals and groups within a given nation-state. Nigeria’s foreign policy is the explicit objectives which Nigeria pursues and achieves its
external relations. It is the instrumentality by which Nigeria influences the global environment and through which she realizes objectives that are in consonance with her perceived national interest” (Daniel, 2015).

**National Security**: National Security has been defined inter-alia as "a state or condition where cherished values and beliefs such as justice, equity, freedom of speech, movement and worship as well as our nation's overall well-being are permanently protected from harm. In sum, security simply means safety; a state of safety of persons, property and stability in society. A state of safety of equilibrium and tranquility within the Nation state" (Committee on National Security, National Conference Report, 2014:11).

Indeed, to the ordinary man or woman on the street, security means safety or protection from harm and danger. In defining security, Okonkwo (2018) agrees with McNamara (1968) and Seers 1977 who see security as development and hold the view that without development, there can be no security. It is their view that any country that seeks to achieve adequate military security against the background of acute food shortages, population explosion, and low level of productivity, fragile infrastructural base for technological development, inadequate and efficient public utilities and chronic problem of unemployment has a false sense of security. Thus a successful security policy must take into account a humanistic people centered development programme aimed at eradicating poverty, unemployment and inequality. Indeed, as Jega observed:

- there is, however, now a growing tendency to define national security to include not just military defense of territory but also internal stability and socioeconomic development. Of course, national security has both internal and external dimensions. (Jega,2007:193).

Jega’s observations above was further corroborated by Ate and Akinteriwa (1992:256) and Luckham (1983, in Jega, 2007: 256) when they opined that national security is “the defense and protection of the sovereignty of the country and its territorial and political jurisdictions against external and indeed internal threats”. And that “it is not just the physical survival of (the people and their state) which is at the issue, but also the satisfaction of their needs for food, health, clothing, education and shelter”.

The above conceptualization of national security differ from the understanding of colonial and post-colonial policy thrust that often view security from a militaristic approach whereof emphasis was laid on the acquisition of arms and ammunition at the expense of human development, a trend that was attributable to the unstable nature of such newly independent states and at other times their desire to hold on to the levers of power.

Thus Okonkwo (2018) states that to redefine national security in the 21st Century, Nigeria must operate a buoyant, diversified and indigenous economic infrastructure which will serve as the base for sustaining education, research and development, science and technology, as these are paramount for a highly vibrant and industrialized economy which in turn, would not only increase military power and capability alone, but other vital areas of national development such as agriculture and socio economic empowerment in all. Insecurity connotes the absence of security.

It is in the purview of this conceptualization and holistic assumption, that Nigeria’s national security agenda and objectives can be seen as “the protection and defense of the country’s territorial integrity, promotion of peaceful coexistence in the polity, containing/eliminating threats to internal security, ensuring systemic stability and bringing about sustainable and equitable socioeconomic development” (Jega,2007:194). Consequently, it is in line with this view that the framers of the Draft National Defense Policy defined national security as:

- An all-encompassing condition in which citizens can live in freedom, peace and safety;
- Participate fully in the process of governance, enjoy the protection of fundamental rights;
have access to resources and necessities of life; and inhabit an environment which is conducive to their health and well-being. Although total security is rarely possible, even for the most powerful nations, Nigerians deserve a strong nation with her fundamental values intact and her institutions and people secure (RDNDP: 1-2, in Jega, 2007: 194).

**Concept of Insecurity:** The basic underpinning that belies insecurity is that it is a multi-dimensional issue at the front burner of many scholarly debates. This has been variously viewed by researchers at different sides of the prism on its sociology in the polity. The United Nation Development Programme Report for 1994 sees human insecurity to mean acute threats to hunger, diseases and repression, fear lack of protection or inadequate freedom from danger. For Achumba et al (2013, in Obi, 2015:12), insecurity is simply a state of being cocooned in danger, exposed to risk or anxiety. When someone or group of persons are literally exposed to any form of danger or risk occasioned by physical, moral, emotional, accident and environmental aggressions, this could a state of morbid insecurity.

However, Achumba et al (2013) clearly mentioned two broad planks of insecurity. These are namely remote factors and immediate proximate factors. The remote factors are “lack of institutional capacity resulting to government failure, pervasive material inequalities and unfairness, ethno-religious conflicts, conflicts of perceptions between the public and government, weak security system, loss of socio-cultural and communal value system”. Significantly, the proximate factors are “porous borders, rural/urban drift, unemployment, poverty and terrorism”.

Going from above, national insecurity connotes a state of anomie, where there is a disintegration or disappearance of the norms and values that were previously common to the society. It signposts an era of total breakdown of law and order which affects the social, economic and political structures of the society. To be sure, as Obi rightly stated:

> In recent times, Nigeria has witnessed an unprecedented level of insecurity and Terrorism since the advent of the democratic dispensation. The pattern of insecurity has been regionalized: militia groups in the south, insurgency in the north, kidnapping in the south and east, ritual killings in the west and east, political and non-political calculated assassinations across the nation. The regional pattern of insecurity has given rise to regional security formations in the country in a bid to curtail the alarming rate of insecurity (Obi, 2015:13).

The above observation by Obi, clearly summarizes the spate of insecurity in Nigeria as a result of an inchoate foreign policy.

**Africa Continent:** This is the second largest of the continents; bound by the Mediterranean in the north, the Atlantic in the west, and the Red Sea, Gulf of Aden, and Indian Ocean in the east. The Sahara Desert divides the continent unequally into North Africa (an early centre of civilization, in close contact with Europe and West Asia, now inhabited chiefly by Arabs) and Africa south of the Sahara (relatively isolated from the rest of the world until the 19th century and inhabited chiefly by Negroid peoples). It was colonized mainly in the 18th and 19th centuries by Europeans and now comprises independent nations. The largest lake is Lake Victoria and the chief rivers are the Nile, Niger, Congo, and Zambezi. Pop: 1 100 000 000 (2013 est). Area: about 30 300 000 sq km (11 700 000 sq miles)

**OBJECTIVE:**
This paper seeks to adopt the 'reality theory' in the examination of Nigeria's foreign policy thrust and to critically appraise the efficacy of the realism approach in contending with national and regional insecurity.
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: The Reality Theory.
The question that we need to address is, does Nigeria's foreign policy thrust align with the reality theory? Is this theory serving the nation's foreign policy interest and if not what alternative approaches would serve the nation's best interest in the enhancement of national and regional security? To begin with, we must answer the question, what are the fundamentals of the reality theory in international relations?
First, realism shares some semblance with the Hobbesian’s as it views the human nature as selfish, conflictual, and competitive in nature. It recognizes States as the only actors at the international level and holds the view that states are rational actors that are inherently aggressive and obsessed with security. It therefore holds the view that the international system is anarchic in nature and going further that states should have armaments, that is arms and ammunitions to project their national interest. Exponents of realism such as Hans Margenthau and Kenneth Waltz are quite conservative to change, and would rather see international relations from a static point of view. For these exponents might is right.

Realist theory of international relations or ‘Realism’ as used ex-changeably, unravels the relationship between the State and its hold on security. Realism in essence makes several assumptions. It holds that nations “states are unitary, geographically- based actors in an anarchic international system with no authority above, capable of regulating interactions between states as no true authoritative world government exists (Teryyima 2014:6). The main thrusts of Realist theory are Statism, Survival and Self- help. The underlining factor of Statism is that, the nation states are the main actors in international politics, thus it is a state centric theory of international relations. It is the contention of the Realist theory that international system is an embodiment of anarchy which denotes that, international politics or relationship, is the struggle for power and survival of the fittest between self-interest states. To the Realist, security is the onus of the state arising from the postulation of Thomas Hobbs (1651) in The Leviathan. In this book, Hobbs stated that the state of nature is commonly referred to as the law of jungle where anarchy, chaos, strife, men fighting each other, nations at war with each other, state of perpetual fear and danger of death and men, in the state of nature are selfish, making life poor, nasty brutish and short. In Leviathan, security and the fear of the unknown was the essence of the social contract between the people and the state, in which they people acquiesced their inalienable rights to the state. The state in turn provides or oversees the survival or protection of her citizenry.
The Realist theory of international relations therefore opined that human nature is self-centred, competitive, egocentric and conflictual. To them as Musa and Ajibade recorded:

1. defense of the national security of the state is the whole essence of the state.
2. the first duty of a government is to keep its citizen safe because as Hobbs observed, only the state has the wherewithal to guarantee security and save society from anxiety and preserve the right of the government to the state, the state through its government should provide adequate security to justify its raison d'être. The state exists fundamentally for the protection of lives and property and ensuring therefore, states should be ready to do anything to protect their national interest (Gaskin,1996, in Musa and Ajibade, 2018:3).

From the above therefore, realism sees foreign policy as an instrument used by any country to promote and protect its national interest which must be in tandem with defense of sovereignty and territorial integrity, robust economic and social well-being of the citizenry, promotion of opportunities for profitable trading relationships with other countries and exploitation of the “soft power” through propagation of the cultural assets (Ashaver, 2014:6).
Realism contrasts sharply with liberalism which believes that states are not the only rational actors, but that other actors such as individuals, international organizations and multinational corporations play key role in shaping international relations or in defining foreign policy thrust. The liberalists believe that security can be achieved by cooperation, mutual gaining, applying ethical and moral principles. They believe in the communitization of the international system for the security of all.

How successful the country achieved this foreign policy goal is contentious. However, we shall use the indices of national and regional security to measure this success.

**NIGERIAN FOREIGN POLICY: ISSUES, CONTRADICTIONS, PARADOXES AND IMPLICATIONS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY.**

A critical analysis of Nigeria’s foreign policy portrays issues, contradictions and paradoxes that negates national security. It is axiomatic today that Nigeria is cocononed in serious security and developmental challenges arising from the paradox of ‘Big Brother Foreign Policy’. The paradox of Nigeria’s Big Brother foreign policy towards her neighbors in the past five decades, has entrenched religious fanaticism, criminality especially in the smuggling and proliferation of small and light weapons, borderless irregular migration into the country, exposing the country to the whims of terrorism and comatose economy (Akponmera and Omoiyibo, 2013:94).

Globally, nations undertake foreign policies primarily as a guide to their external relations on one hand, and to promote, protect and defend their fundamental national interest; which are defense of territorial integrity, promotion of economic, military, diplomatic and necessary strategic interest a country may so consider as her fundamental national interest on the another hand (Folarin, 2014 in Ajayi et al, 2015). As it were, without a well-planned, comprehensive and well-articulated foreign policy frame work, a country is doomed in international diplomacy. The foreign policy of any nation deals first with the preservation of its independence, sovereignty and security, and second, with the pursuit and protection of its economic interest. As Teryima remarked, Nigerian foreign policy thrust is predicated on elevating the welfare of Nigerian citizenry over every other consideration. Indeed, the prioritization of the citizenry welfare is to strengthen her value of national interest (Ashaver, 2014:7). According to Gambari, Nigerian foreign policy frame work could be commonly referred to as ‘Concentric Circle’. The dialectics of concentricism, is pivoted on the Nigeria’s national interest as the first, the West Africa Sub-region second; and the rest of Africa (Gambari, in Ashaver, 2014). The overall foreign policy thrust accordingly shall be the “promotion and protection of national interest, promotion of Africa integration, and support for Africa unity: promotion of international peace and mutual respect in all manifestations, respect for international laws and treaties” (Ashaver,2014). Dauda, in complete reportage of Buhari’s sensibilities of the philosophy of concentricism in Nigeria’s foreign policy framework remarked thus:

> While Africa remains the centre-piece of our foreign policy, we cannot but operate within series of concentric circles which now effectively guide our behavior on the African and world scene. The innermost of the circle of national interests involve Nigeria’s security, territorial integrity and political independence and the neighbours of Nigeria. The second circle involves our relations with the ECOWAS sub-region where we intend to take more active interest in development of social, economic and political nature. Nigeria is not a global power, therefore, our commitments, pre-occupation and expenditure of our resources must be made to reflect our capabilities and interests. It is for this reason that our primary focus is on the West African Sub-region since any event occurring in this has an impact directly on Nigeria’s interest. The third circle of national interest involved supporting self-determination and dealing with larger African issues (Dauda, 2006:54).

Conversely, in the real implementation of Nigeria’s foreign policy, “the demarcation among the layers has remained blared” connoting paradoxes and contradictions. As Adenji noted:
In the implementation reality however, the line between the centre of the concentric circles and the outer ones have remained blared; and the anti-colonial and anti-apartheid forces dominated all other considerations, including Nigeria’s interests. Enormous resources were committed to the cause of Africa (Adeniji, 2005:39-40, in Ashaver, 2014:7).

The arbitrariness in the implementation of the principle of ‘concentricism’ in Nigerian foreign policy as noted above, has its daring consequences in the ‘inner circle of the concentric circles’. As it were, Nigeria took so many measures in international diplomacy that were not in consonance with her national interest. There is no doubt that every foreign policy framework of a country, has its costs and benefits. The costs of a good foreign policy thrust include human, material and financial commitments espoused towards its strategic implementation, while the benefits accruing thereto are the derivable achievements earned by the state actors from the pursuit of her foreign policy in the international polity. Accordingly, Ate, stated that: “The Nigerian government is now in a dilemma over the costs and dividends of the prevailing foreign policy thrust of Big Brother or, in effect, good neighborliness in her foreign relations with her immediate neighbors for several decades now” (Ate, 2011, in Akpomera and Omoyibo, 2013).

Afrocentrism or the Big Brother foreign policy thrust of Nigeria, was pivoted on the foreign policy framework of Africa being the window of Nigeria’s foreign policy. The Big Brother matrix was further predicated on Nigeria being the Big Brother to “several African countries less endowed with economic resources and manpower development, and those threatened by environmental and political instability” (Akpomera & Omoyibo, 2013:100). In pursuit of her Big Brother or Father figure posture for the African region, Nigeria has been exploited against the background of a dynamic foreign policy that seeks the welfare of her citizenry as its major objective and interest. Consequently, as Gubak remarked:

The country had overwhelmingly given both solicited and unsolicited supports to African neighbors, intervened positively in their internal crisis, provided humanitarian services, doled out billions of dollars in charity, sent technical aid corps, sent military supports, and so on. In most cases these flamboyant gestures were defiantly done against home interest and survival. Despite such, the economy underperforms and the great majority of citizens have benefited little. In the same vein, there has been continuous frustrations by Nigerians over the failure of the potentially wealthy nation to provide basic human needs, such as education, food, potable and drinkable water, reliable transportation, policies free of rampant corruption, employment and poverty reduction (Gubak, 2015).

To be sure, in Africa and West African sub-regions, Nigeria’s contributions towards her independence, liberation and unification were unparalleled and humongous. It was involved in virtually all the United Nations Peace Keeping missions in Africa and West Africa, contributing both men, money and humanitarian aids. In West Africa sub-region, Nigeria had expended so much money that it was estimated that in 1999, Nigeria spent over 13 billion United States Dollars to peace keeping operations and; that these contributions made it very possible for ECOWAS to achieve her mandate towards the restoration of peace in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Guinea Bissau, Cote d’Ivoire, Togo, Sudan etc (Bamali, 2009, Ali, 2012). It is also in history that Nigeria spent over 20 billion US Dollars in the fight against apartheid regime and liberation of the entire Southern Africa sub-region. It granted 4billion and 2billion naira loans to Ghana and Sao Tome and Principe respectively (Adeniji, 2000 in Ashaver, 2014:9). Significantly, Nigeria has spent her enormous resources in military interventions, human, material and monetary terms to bring about a liberated and united Africa. At the time, Nigeria’s diplomatic relations
internationally, towered over Africa like a great Giant, which earned her the ‘Giant of Africa’ and was respected globally.

The contradiction therefore, is that, Nigeria’s bogus charity and impressionist diplomatic relations abroad as observed above, had only benefited the outside world not Nigerians. Remarkably, the Nigerian citizenry were not seen as a serious digit in the consummate consideration of her foreign policy formulations and implementation. Indeed, as Adeniji noted, that money meant for national development and the welfare of Nigerian citizenry were spent abroad, while her people wallow in abject poverty and penury. Ironically, Nigeria had to pay salaries of workers of some countries in Africa, while her workers are yet to benefit from her minimum wage (Adeniji,2006:41, in Ashaver, 2014:8). Conversely, “our false generosity abroad and penury at home” are clear manifestations that we are exuding what we are not. In the bid for the pursuit of her ‘Father Christmas’ diplomacy abroad, it reneged on the welfare of her people which has resulted into pauperization, deprivation, dilapidated social infrastructure and economic underdevelopment in every sector of her national development. Thus, as Ashaver observed:

Nigerian roads are unfixed, educational system is in shambles, same goes with the healthcare system, portable water is unknown to the majority of the citizens, agriculture the industry that provides source of livelihood for over 80% of the is yearning for improvement, poverty is staggering etc, yet Nigerian leaders are more concerned with African and world welfare, and had since independence being spending the country’s resources for this (Ashaver, 2014:9).

Politically, the paradox of Nigeria’s foreign policy is also seen in the poor handling of her external diplomacy viz-a-viz her inability to protect Nigerians in diaspora. Nigeria as a matter fact, contributed so very much in decolonization and emancipation of the African polity, yet Nigerians suffer dehumanization and abject rejection in Africa. Today, it is axiomatic that the prime targets and victims of Xenophobic imbroglio in South Africa are Nigerians, but this is a country that fought physically, spiritually and on all sides of the prism for the liberation of South Africa. Again, it is trite that, the foreign policy thrust of Nigeria and her leadership quest in the West Africa sub-region has put her on collision cruise with her immediate neighbors of Benin Republic, Cameroun, Chad and Niger Republic. These countries which shares very strong affinity of economic, social cultural and security with France, do not very easily accord Nigeria the leadership role in the sub-region. Indeed, it was these immediate neighboring countries of Liberia, Sierra Leone, Togo and Guinea Bissau that did not vote for Nigeria when she ran for the Presidency of the United Nations Security Council in 2011. Nigeria got 186 votes out of the required 190 votes (Obayuwana, 2012, in Ota and Ecoma, 2015:61). Interestingly, Nigeria spent a whopping 10 billion US Dollars in peace keeping in the war between Liberia and Sierra Leone.

Another issue that need to be mentioned here, is the worrisome situation at the African sub-region where candidates supported by Nigeria have lost elections. This is a sine-qua-non that Nigeria foremost objective of playing the leadership role in the sub-region is mere rhetoric. There is no gain saying the fact that Nigeria is in an open competition with counties of the region. The paradox of Nigerian situation is that those countries she vigorously labored and sacrificed her enormous resources for, have become global phenomenon to the amazement of the country. South Africa and Ghana stands out very clearly on this issue.

On the issue of borderlands, the land borders between Nigeria, Niger and Comeroun measures 1,497 kilometres and 1,690 kilometres respectively. While that of Chad is 87 kilometres. It is further observed that Nigeria’s relationship with her immediate neighbours of Cameroun, Chad and Niger Republics on the North-East is akin to that of the United States and Mexican border in terms of perception, function and security challenges. These three neighbouring countries “have a predominately itinerant Fulani Islamic population that share common
borders with Nigeria’s eight states Sokoto, Katsina, Jigawa, Yobe, Borno, Adamawa, Taraba and Gombe” (Akpomera and Omoyibo, 2013:101). The Cross- Border activities are controlled by the theory of “Push and Pull”. This theory opined that, the push variables are the obnoxious domestic situations in Chad, Niger Republic and Cameroun that are asymmetry to their sustainable development. These include severe pauperization, socio-economic disarticulation, political instability, perennial drought, ethnic and religious conflicts and the search for appropriate refugee camps, while the pull factors are the perceived socio-economic prospects, food security, political freedom, religious and cultural ties with Nigeria ( Alli, 2011, in Akpomera and Omoyibo, 2013).

As clearly stated in the Lake Chad Basin Commission, Nigeria operates a foreign policy of joint border patrol and other Bilateral Boundary commission with her neighboring countries of Chad, Cameroun and Niger Republic. In flagrant display of the power of the Giant of Africa, Nigeria has always implemented the Big Brother foreign policy based on the natural resources in the country, with the poorer countries of Niger, Chad, Cameroun, Benin Republic, Togo and Guinea Bissau. The implementation of this foreign policy has led the federal government to put in place weak immigration policies that accommodates aliens. This in turn has spur irregular cross-border migration of nationals from Niger, Chad and Cameroun into the country in search of improved socio-economic welfare. It has been observed, that in several years, the Nigerian government operated a near borderless foreign policy with her neighbors as mentioned above in the North-East region of the country until the advent of Boko Haram and other religious extremist in 2011, and this has created an enormous security challenge for the Nigerian security architecture. The Nigerian Immigration Services noted that:

The problem is basically the fact that the structure of our borders makes effective policing absolutely difficult. We are talking about over 4000kilometres land borders and over 800 kilometres borders with the ocean. In some places, these borders are mountainous; in some places, they are in jungle. In some places, you have settlements along the borders. There are countless illegal routes into the country. Nobody can tell the number of such unapproved routes. The borders posts are not sufficient. But you cannot increase the border posts without increasing the personnel level. Our officers sacrifice a lot under very difficult conditions. The operational facilities in terms of border barracks, communication facilities and patrol vehicles are insufficient. The problem is with the illegal unofficial routes (Allwell, 2012: 17 in Akpomera and Omoyibo, 2013: 104).

The consequences of the above, is the vulnerability of the country to all forms of cross-border illegal activities ranging from smuggling of all kinds of goods, trafficking in humans, trafficking in Small and Light Weapons through the porous borders. “The influx of small arms and light weapons from the Maghreb into northern Nigeria is complemented by the ease with which religious extremists from the same African region enter the country from Niger, Chad and Cameroun, thus swelling the population of religious fundamentalism in Nigeria”. The hybridization of the influx of Small arms and Light weaponry on one hand, and religious fundamentalists on the other hand in the country, is one of the known reasons of regional insecurity. Thus as Friday stated:
Out of approximately 500 million illicit weapons in circulation worldwide in 2004, it was estimated that about 100 million are in sub-Saharan Africa, with 8-10 million concentrated in the West African sub-region. Regrettably, more than half of these Small Arms and Light Weapons are in the hands of non-state actors and criminal groups. Nigeria is both producer and consumer of SALW in the West African sub-region. Although it is difficult to determine the exact quantity of illegal SALW circulating within and penetrating into Nigeria, it is estimated that over 70% of the 8-10 million illegal weapons in West Africa are in Nigeria. This is manifested in the level of human casualties and material damage recorded in the aftermath of their use in the country (Friday, 2012:5 in Akpomera and Omoyibo, 2013:103).

Indeed, the spate of violence occasioned in the Nigerian polity and its attendant consequences, with the lacklustre security architecture by the Nigerian nation and the lack of the enabling political will to ‘tackle the sources of arms and collaborators as well as confused policy on how to address this insecurity cankerworm is creating fear in the citizenry and stalling development’ (Akpomera and Omoyibo, 2013:97).

Accordingly, Carey (2008) observed that, a Weak State is characterized by its inability to provide basic necessities for sustainable development, poverty reduction and to protect the security and human rights of her citizens. On the other hand, Newman (2009), noted that the indices of a Weak State are measured by the inability of the central government to control public order in its territory, lack of the capacity to control and maintain its borders and public institutions, and is vulnerable to internal domestic challenges (Carey, 2008, Newman, 2009 in Gubak, 2015). It is clear from the above postulations that, while Nigeria savour in her Big Brother foreign policy largess in Africa and the world at large, it was unable to provide basic necessities for sustainable development, poverty reduction mechanism and security architecture for her citizenry. This exacerbated the crisis of personal deprivation and traumatization which metamorphosed into social tension and open conflicts. This further explains the socio-economic underdevelopment, political instability, infrastructural backwardness, marginalization, ethnic and religious conflagrations and the growing spate of insecurity that has manifested into Boko Haramism (with deepening cases of internally displaced persons) in the North-East, Biafranization (with its associated threats of disintegration) in the South-East, Militancy in the Niger Delta region, high profile kidnap and ritual killings in the South-West region of Nigeria.

It is clear from the above that Nigeria's foreign policy hinged on “Concentricism” has not achieved national and regional security, rather the embrace of a new world economic order, the advent of globalization and its concomitant information and communication technology and the contradictions thereof as well as the deepened entrenchment of Nigeria into the international capitalist system in unequal relationship have attenuated the crises of development in the Nigeria state. Indeed, the several criminal and social menaces that have posed a threat to the security of the country, ranging from armed robbery, drug trafficking, kidnapping, communal and electoral violence, money laundering, sea piracy, organized trans-border crimes, proliferation of small arms and light weapons are all symptomatic of a deeper contradiction in our foreign policy rooted in the relations of production, distribution and exchange. Hence, tackling these challenges must primarily deal with these unequal relationships at the domestic and international levels.

Madunagu (2011:9) in an attempt to dissect and give interpretation to the crisis of instability in Nigeria have developed new typologies, such as, "Terrorism in Nigeria" and "Nigeria Terrorism". According to him, Nigerian Terrorism would refer to a Terrorism whose seeds were sown in Nigeria and which germinated and is now flourishing in Nigeria. On the other hand, is Terrorism in Nigeria which might suggest a terrorist invasion of
Nigeria. He pontificated "we may, however, concede that some forms of terrorism might be partly foreign inspired, a possibility not far-fetched, given the reality of our "globalized world" or "global village". He apparently subscribed to the fact of a truncated political economy as fundamental in understanding the prevalent national and regional insecurity. He posited, "it is generally agreed that the Nigerian ruling classes and the Nigeria State, by perpetuating the present political economy and expanding and deepening its gross inequalities, and creating, and reproducing, and expanding, and deepening poverty and misery in the land, are primarily responsible for what I have called, Nigerian Terrorism”.

THE WAY FORWARD
Perhaps, the statement by President Olusegun Obasanjo in November, 1999 at an orientation programme for newly appointed Ambassadors is instructive of a seemingly imperative of a radical paradigm shift of Nigeria's foreign policy. He stated:
"The last years of the 20th century has seen a spectacular rise in the significance of what might be called universal values - representative government, world peace, human rights, international justice, the war against drugs. Since we ourselves endorse these values, it is clearly our duty to support and encourage every effort from diverse parts of the world to enshrine them as fundamental principles of all national and international conduct. This also requires of us a posture in international relations which takes the entire globe not just Africa, as the canvass of our exertion. Nigeria's foreign interest today extends far beyond our concern for the well-being of our continent Africa".

The date 1999 heralded the return of Nigeria to democratic rule and actually saw the radical shift from liberalism to realism, a development she owes to a plethora of factors which are further highlighted below. An x-ray of the above statement by the then newly elected President, Chief Olusegun Obasanjo, clearly shows that Nigeria has embraced a new foreign policy anchored on the logic of market on the basis of which national interest is now viewed as being in tune with the global agenda of capitalism, neo-liberal democracy, globalization and the logic of the market. The view of Alli, (2014:33) is very apt in appraising this policy thrust. He stated that, “Nigeria needed to redefine its national role conception...Nigeria foreign policy has become circumscribed by events in the world. Global issues necessarily conditioned foreign policy. Economic issues have become clearly dominant in international engagements. However, globalization has exacerbated and widened the gap between the North and the South, deepened disparities, intensified poverty and generated instability as a result of the demand for state provisioning. Certainly, the crises of socioeconomic underdevelopment, abject poverty and political instability have combined to create an insecure and weak Nigeria”.

Going from above, we therefore suggest a radical paradigm shift from the present lacklustre national foreign policy frame work of Nigeria to the embrace of the realist theory of international relations which is spontaneous, dynamic, proactive, pragmatic and based on the Principle of Reciprocity as enunciated in Article 2.1 of the United Nations. We further suggest a foreign policy re-engineering that takes into consideration the national security, economic development and the well-being of the citizenry of Nigeria as the cynosure of our foreign policy thrust. This is so because, every dynamic policy relation is built on vital national interest, sound domestic base and political stability. Africa should no longer be the horizon of Nigeria’s foreign policy because it has sacrificed enough for her without any commensurate benefit, but on a global pursuit of the promotion of socioeconomic development, cultural, scientific and technological cooperation with other nations of the world especially in this clime of globalization.
CONCLUDING NOTE
The above narratives have once again put to test the adequacy of the Nation’s foreign policy goals and objectives. In nearly five decades, successive governments have upheld Africa as the centre-piece of Nigeria’s foreign policy. A critical analysis of the situation shows that there are no commensurate returns on the good intendments of Nigeria’s foreign policy thrust. Indeed, public policy makers, analysts and academics are in tandem to linkages between foreign policy on the one hand and national and regional insecurity being propelled and exacerbated by the combined phenomena of globalization, information communication and technology, economic downturn, food security and the associated poverty prevalent in the continent on the other hand. To be sure, human insecurity facing Nigeria in this age of globalization has also made trans-nationalization of insecurity possible in the country as a result of loose border control under the aegis of the paradox of ‘Big Brother Foreign Policy Thrust.’ As a result of these wanton expenditure in African States, Nigeria is now encapsulated in severe social and economic downturns, infrastructural negligence and mass poverty which have triggered forces of lack and marginalism, ethnic uprising, prodigious systemic corruption and morbid insecurity. These, and other insecurity challenges have made Nigeria not to earn her rightful place sub-regionally, regionally and globally. We therefore suggest a radical paradigm shift from Nigeria’s current national foreign policy framework to that of Realist theory of international relation that is proactive, pragmatic and committed to putting the security, economic development and well-being of her citizenry at the centre.
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