

# Institutional Processes of Foreign Policy: Foreign Policy Making and Implementation in Nigeria

- It is generally recognized throughout the world that the making of foreign policy is part of the political processes of decision making.
- Whatever the level of development or ideological orientation of any state, its foreign policy emerges from political processes that involve several factors.

- Some of the factors include:
  - The personalities of political leaders who are involved in the foreign policy milieu;
  - The nature of the foreign policy decision making system;
  - Public opinion/pressure groups
  - The nature of the political system;
  - The nature of national attributes; and,
  - The nature of the international system.

- *i) The personalities of political leaders who are involved in the foreign policy milieu*
- This will include the images, values, beliefs and personality or political needs of those responsible for establishing goals, and actions for the state.
- Often, statesmen act and react according to their perception (or misperception) of their political environment; and as far as foreign - policy makers are concerned, it is not the state of the environment that really counts, but **what** policy-makers believe the state to be.
- According to Holsti (1967); "image means an individual perceptions of an object, fact or condition, his evaluation of that object, fact or condition in terms of badness or goodness, friendliness or hostility, or value, and the meaning ascribed to, or deduced from, that object, fact or condition".

- Because even the most articulate expert in foreign policy making may not be aware of all the relevant factors in a situation, his image (of the situation) would be almost always different from reality.
- The discrepancy that exists between image and reality is due in part to physical impediment to the flow 'of information, arising from time, faulty communication, censorship, lack of competent advisors and intelligence source.
- It can also be as a result of distortion of reality caused by attitudes, beliefs and so forth. There have been instances where policy - makers twisted and disregard information that contradicted their preferences and values thereby allowing their psychological environment to color the definition of the situation and physical environment.

- *ii) The nature of the foreign policy decision making system;*
- Organizational Structures Highly structured and developed bureaucracies do play a role in the process of foreign policy formulation.
- Traditionally, information come from and must have already been debated by officials of the relevant agencies that reflect all shades of views.
- In other words, factors that define a situation are usually complex and diverse because the involves a myriad of rival and competing institutions and interests.
- Example of such government agencies include: the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Nigeria Institute of International Affairs (NIIA), the National Advisory Committee on Foreign Affairs or Policy (NACFP).

- *iii) Public opinion/pressure groups*
- In a political system where fundamental human rights and freedom of expression form part of the national life, the role of public opinion in the process of formulation of foreign policy is formidable.
- There have been instances where public opinion has influenced foreign policy-making.
- In Nigeria, the Tafawa Balewa government abrogated, in 1962, the Anglo-Nigeria Defense pact entered into in 1958, as a result of the anti-pact demonstration led by the university students at Ibadan.
- But, it is important to say that the rate at which domestic pressure group influence decision-making is highly dependent on the type of government, such as democratic or authoritarian, informed public opinion about the external environment, and political institutions that enjoy popular political support.

- *iv) The nature of the political system/Prevailing Domestic Needs*  
Foreign policy formulation focuses on general social needs and specific interest of domestic groups, political parties and economic organizations because demands and expectations are placed upon the government (state) in its interaction with others.
- Examples are when a government negotiates a tariff agreement (bilateral or multilateral) to protect its domestic industries, or intervene diplomatically or militarily in another country to protect the lives and properties of its own citizens.
- Another is when country A establishes trade links with country B to create an avenue for a steady supply of a natural resource (from country B) population can influence the process of formulating the foreign policy.;

- *v) The nature of national attributes/Capabilities*
- The ability of a nation-state to significantly achieve its foreign policy objectives is dependent on its attributes and capabilities.
- Most significant capabilities available include: diplomatic personnel and quality of diplomacy, military capability, technology communication, level of industrialization and so forth.
- Such attributes as country's size, population, distribution of natural resources, climate and topography (geopolitics) do influence socio-Political and economic development, including access to other areas of the world.
- Also these have military and defense policy implications. The nature of the topography can be particularly attractive for military adventure or outright invasion by predator states. It can also suggest the best line of defense.

- Economic characteristics and distribution of natural resources determine a nation's autarchy or dependence in wartime as well as during peace.
- Climate imposes restrictions on the types of warfare that can be conducted in a particular area or kind of agricultural practices to be promoted.
- A country with a relatively larger quality population can more easily mobilize and can more confidently project its foreign policy across the international system with higher expectation of a fairer degree of success.
- On the other hand, a country whose population is uneducated in modern skills may not easily mobilize to achieve national security and survival goals in a reasonable time frame.
- Such as state can only be said to possess potential capability.

- *vi) The nature of the international system*
- Policy-makers of different nations perceive major structural changes in the international political system in almost the same way, and through a series of gathered information tend to modify their states' foreign policies to fit that structure.
- For instance in a "polar" structure, policy-makers of some newly independent countries have calculated that their security can best be achieved by alliance with one military bloc leader or other, without an option of neutrality.
- Thus they are compelled by conditions in the international political system to either be on the side of US or USSR to safeguard their national security interest in order to survive as nations.

- Margaret G. Hermann, Charles F. Hermann and Joe D. Hagan in “How Decision Units shape Foreign Policy Behaviour”(1987:309) have observed that
- **“although we recognize that numerous domestic and international factors can and do influence foreign policy behaviour, these influences must be channelled through the political apparatus of a government which identifies, decides and implements foreign policy”**
- This political apparatus of a government is the foreign policy decision making system.
- Thus, the foreign policy decision making systems of a state yield understanding about its foreign policy dynamics.
- Charles Hermann in “Decision Structure and Process Influences on Foreign Policy” (1978) has postulated that the nature of the decision structures affects the nature of the decision process, which in turn affects foreign policy conclusions.

- The ***decision structures*** can comprise:
- A predominant leader with a small subordinate and pliable staff;
- An authoritative leader with individuals who have some autonomy and independence;
- An authoritative leader with individuals who represent the views of some bureaus or groups;
- A small or large group of individuals who can act on their own;
- A small or large group of individuals who represents the views of some outside entities to which they belong.
- Please note that these different decision structures result in different decision processes in terms of independence of decisions and speed to reach decisions.

- Many theorists have provided conceptual models of decision making . Example: Graham Allison's study contained in his book, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis* (1971) identifies rational actor model, organization process model and bureaucratic politics model.
- The rational actor model sees the decision making process as being based on goals being prioritized, and actions being taken, based on rational, logical and unified dynamics.
- The organization process model is seen as a decision making process that follows the standard operating procedures of organizations.
- The bureaucratic politics model describes the decision making process that involves several bureaucracies representing their separate interests. These bureaucracies compete and then bargain among themselves, giving rise to a compromised decision output.

- The foreign policy decision making system can also be viewed as consisting of stages.
- These are:
- The information collection and interpretation stage;
- Options formation stage;
- Choice stage;
- Implementation stage.
- The decision structures vary in different countries. Also, in a particular country, the decision structure also changes in relation to issues and time.
- Thus, foreign policy decision structures may be prime ministers, presidents, politburos, juntas, cabinets, interagency groups, coalitions and parliaments.

- When examining decision-making in foreign policy, it should be stressed that it comprises a diversity of decisions, ranging from those that are strategic and of vital importance to those that are less important.
- Decisions are either expressions of one's own initiatives or responses to the initiatives of other States.
- Decision-making in foreign policy is an on-going, dynamic process, which is, in a sense, simultaneous decision-making on several related, interrelated or unrelated matters.
- Within the foreign policy decision making system, we also have the ultimate decision unit.
- The ultimate decision units are often “at the apex of the foreign policy decision making in all governments or ruling parties” and these groups of individuals, “if they agree, have both the ability to commit the resources of the government in foreign affairs and the power and authority to prevent other entities within the government from overtly reversing their position.

- For vital foreign policy issues, the ultimate decision unit will be at the apex of the foreign policy decision making system while for routine foreign policy issues, “the ultimate decision unit may be at a much lower level”.
- Decisions are likely to have numerous consequences, many of which are difficult, if not impossible, to foresee.
- Often a decision has to be taken in a limited timeframe.
- The decision making process often involves, directly or indirectly, a wider circle of actors, ranging from persons in the government and professionals authorised to make decisions, to various pressure groups and other high-ranking individuals.
- This requires coordination in decision-making, though at the same time makes it more difficult.

- This is because very often those who have most say in reaching a decision are less skilled and have less knowledge and understanding of the possibilities and effects of the decision than those who propose the decision and will be implementing it but are not entitled to take the decision.
- It should be noted also that very often it is impossible to identify those who actually had an important, perhaps even a decisive role, in the adoption of a foreign policy decision, and to attest how significant their influence was, since in decision-making the roles and influence of various factors intertwine.
- Foreign policy decisions are often expressed in a particular form.
- It could be a statement delivered by a government functionary, commonly a representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

- It could be a diplomatic note or some other form of diplomatic communication, such as a protest, official recognition, or an objection.
- A foreign policy decision can also be accepted and implemented without having been first issued in a particular form, which is often the case.
- It is simply a conclusion or decision on how to handle a particular case, how to respond to actions or statements of the other side— in short, an agreement on how to act in a particular matter of foreign policy.
- Such an arrangement is sometimes defined in instructions sent to the country's own diplomatic missions abroad and other authorities of the State.
- Sometimes foreign policy decisions lead to the signing of a document, to a treaty, or to accession into an international organisation.

- In every case, before a decision is finally taken, whatever it might be, there is a longer or shorter process in the course of which the decision is prepared.
- This process involves various formal and informal actors, different interests, and different influences, which suggest incentives or restrictions, and promote the decision or oppose it.
- The pattern of the process of foreign policy decision-making varies.
- Sometimes decisions require certain formalities, especially as to the time when a decision is formally adopted and when it is announced.
- Sometimes, however, informal acceptance of a decision is allowed, but in accordance with the traditional process of accepting such particular type of decision.

- In every case, informal decision-making is intertwined with the formal decision-making process.
- The decision-making process depends on the nature of the constitutional and political system, the importance and the type of the decision, as well as the urgency of the decision.
- Acceptance of important foreign policy decisions, such as ratification of international treaties, recognition of a new country, the appointment of ambassadors, decisions on entry into international organisations, opening of negotiations, and the like, is formalised and defined in a State's constitution and its laws, which also define who formally takes these decisions.

- **Foreign Policymaking in Nigeria**
- From independence to date, foreign policymaking has been the exclusive preserve of the Head of State or President as the case may be, and their small political group.
- The chief executive personalizes and personifies foreign policy making in Nigeria. Power-politics in Nigeria is a zero sum game with the winner taking all-and this extends to the foreign policy domain.
- In fact, foreign policy is seen to be understood only by the government, and the hierarchy of power favors the chief executive to call all the shots.
- To be fair, universally the President is the primus in external diplomacy of a state; there are however, mechanisms and structures that compel the President and the Presidency to accommodate domestic pressures and constraints in foreign policy decision making (Akinyemi, 2009).

- In Nigeria, during military rule, at the helm of affairs was the Soldier-President from whom order flowed down to the bottom of the political ladder.
- There was no room for questioning or checkmating him.
- Decisions literally made at informal times and places among a thinner group outside the cabinet, called the inner caucus were ratified and legitimated at the meeting of the high command.
- Such were transmitted to the MFA who heads the clearing house for all external affairs, without any National Assembly, research institutes, or pressure groups consulted or acting as checks (Fawole, 2003; Adeyemo, 2002).

- The nature and functioning of the foreign policy decision making structures since Nigeria's independence reflect both changes and continuities.
- Various organs, ministries and agencies have been involved in Nigeria's foreign policy decision making in all its facets – political, security, cultural and economic.
- Major foreign policy structures that have played key roles in the formulation and implementation of Nigeria's foreign policy include:
  - Office of the Prime Minister/President;
  - The Cabinet/Federal Executive Council;
  - The Ministry of Foreign Affairs;
  - The Ministry of Defence;
  - The Ministry of Petroleum Resources

- The Ministry of Finance;
  - The Ministry of Economic Planning
  - The Ministry of Information
  - The Ministry of Commerce and Industry;
  - The Ministry of Education;
  - Parliament/National Assembly.
- Ufot Bassey Inamete in *Foreign Policy Decision Making in Nigeria* (2001) classifies the organs, ministries and agencies of government involved in the foreign policy decision making processes into 3 categories, namely:
    - Foreign policy formulation structures;
    - Foreign policy implementation structures ; and,
    - Foreign policy advisory structures.

- An example of entities that can be exclusively described as foreign policy formulation structure are the presidency and the Federal Executive Council.
- Structures such as the Ministries of foreign affairs, finance, petroleum resources, commerce, national planning, defence, and information can be classified as both foreign policy formulation structures and foreign policy implementation structures.
- These entities occupy dual categories because they also supply the information and analyses for decision making; work with national leadership organs to formulate foreign policies in various dimensions of foreign relations and help to implement important aspects of the country's foreign policy.
- Such structures as the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA); the National Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS); and the Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research (NISER) which are semi-autonomous think-tanks owned and funded by the Federal

Government are primarily foreign policy advisory structures, since they mainly provide rigorous intellectual inputs into the foreign policy decision making system in the form of foreign policy analyses, generation of foreign policy options and alternatives and general foreign policy advice.

- Although other structures and entities already mentioned play key roles in the decision making processes of Nigeria's foreign policy, the major player in the foreign policy formulation and implementation is the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- According to Chibundu in *Foreign Policy with Particular Experience to Nigeria* (2003), the primary responsibilities of Nigeria's Ministry of Foreign Affairs include:
  - Establishment and administration of Nigeria's diplomatic and consular posts;

- Conduct of government business in the legislature relating to foreign and commonwealth relations;
  - Training of Nigerians for overseas representation;
  - Emigration;
  - Relations with diplomatic corps in Nigeria;
  - Consular matters affecting Nigerians outside Nigeria;
  - Passports and travel certificates.
- Several reforms had, at one point or another, been initiated to reorganize the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) for greater effectiveness. These include:
    - Iyalla Reorganization and foreign policy proposals in 1972;
    - The Adedeji Committee on the review of Nigeria's foreign policy, 1975;
    - Chief Boloko Report, 1981;

- The report on foreign policy review;
- Regional seminars of heads of Nigerian missions abroad, 1982;
- Presidential Advisory Council on international Relations (PACIR), headed by Chief Emeka Anyaoku.
- Despite these efforts at reforming the MFA, not much seemed to have changed as its administrative and organizational structures as well its operational modalities that existed in the immediate post-independence era are still the same.

- **A Closer Look at Major Institutions of Foreign Policy Formulation**
- There are three major institutions that are responsible for the formulation of Nigeria's foreign policy: the *Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)*; the *Presidential Advisory Council on International Relations (PACIR)* and the *Nigerian Institute of International Affairs*.
- ***Nigeria's Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)***
- The MFA is the main institution for foreign policy formulation. It operates at two levels – within the Cabinet or the federal executive council or at the presidential level.
- The Minister for foreign affairs acts as the main presidential adviser on foreign matters.
- Administrative issues are handled by the permanent secretary, who is often assisted by a deputy, and other officials.

- In the early phase, the *Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)* was headed by a bureaucrat, the permanent Secretary assisted by the deputy Permanent Secretary and heads of divisions.
- However, between 1968 and 1969, there were two permanent secretaries, and it reached a point in the 1980s and 1990s when there was the main minister, a minister of state, a permanent secretary as director-general and five others of the same rank overseeing five regions.
- In the 1960s, the *Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)* comprised eleven divisions based on the functional and geographical classification of their responsibilities and activities.
- These divisions were headed by first secretaries.
- Recruitment of personnel was done through the Federal Public Service Commission with the presence and involvement of top Ministry officials.

- In terms of policy formulation, much depends on the relationship between the President and the Foreign Affairs Minister.
- Policy could be initiated from within the ministry and articulated by the Minister in the form of advice to the President on special foreign policy issues.
- On the other hand, the President may seek the Ministry's opinion on some issues.
- But in the final analysis, after consulting with the Minister of Foreign Affairs and other related ministries, experts and advisers, the president ultimately formulates Nigeria's foreign policy

- ***Presidential Advisory Council on International Relations (PACIR)***
- The PACIR is a relatively recent creation. It was established by former president Olusegun Obasanjo in 2001 and comprises distinguished Nigerians who are widely respected for their experience and expertise in the fields of diplomacy and international affairs.
- Their assignment is purely non-stipendiary, implying that they work not for personal gains, but in the spirit of selfless service to the Nigerian state.
- PACIR's main objective is to provide alternative policy options to the president.
- The Council is chaired by Chief Emeka Anyaoku, a former Minister of Foreign Affairs and retired Secretary-General of the Commonwealth.
- Other members include Amb. Hamzat Ahmadu, Amb. Jibrin Chinade, Amb. Akporode Clark and Prof. U. Joy Ogwu, former Minister of Foreign Affairs and former Nigeria's Permanent Representative to the United Nations.

- The Council meets periodically to brainstorm on issues pertinent to Nigeria's foreign policy or in response to specific presidential requests.
- It meets with the president to review international developments and examine policy options.
- According to Osuntokun, PACIR's advice and recommendations led to:
  - ‡ The restructuring and rationalization of the *Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)*;
  - ‡ The streamlining of foreign policy institutions, and,
  - ‡ The reduction in the number of Nigerian embassies in ways that would promote professionalism, efficiency and cost-cutting.
- PACIR has been advocating the professionalization of the *Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)* and limiting the number of politicians appointed to diplomatic positions.
- One point to be noted is that PACIR only plays advisory role. The president is not under obligation to accept their advice.

- ***The Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA)***
- ***NIIA*** was established in 1961 but inaugurated in May 1963, with the support of the then Prime Minister of the Federation of Nigeria, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa.
- The primary financial support for the Institute came from grants from the Federal and Regional Governments of Nigeria with assistance from certain foreign governments and from the Ford Foundation of the United States and membership fees from both individuals and corporate members.
- The Institute recruited its staff from the mid-1960s onwards and, by 1971, the federal government took over.
- This action reflected the mood of post-civil war nationalism when Nigerian military rulers had learnt to appreciate the relevance of informed opinion and research on the policy process.

- **Objectives of NIIA:**

- According to the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA) Act 18th August 1971 (CAP 311), its objectives are as follows:
  - To encourage and facilitate the understanding of international affairs and the circumstances, conditions and attitudes of Foreign Countries and their people;
  - To provide and maintain means of information upon international questions and promote the study and investigation of international questions by means of conferences, lectures, and discussions and by preparation and publication of books, reports or otherwise as may seem desirable so as to develop a body of informed opinions on World Affairs;
  - To expand the ranks of the attentive public” in matters of Foreign Affairs with a view to raising the incidence and quality of debate on international question in Nigeria.

- NIIA is a policy-research body with core activities revolving around:
- conducting research and producing policy papers for government;
- Organizing policy dialogues and conferences, seminars, round tables and workshops; and,
- Publishing books, monographs and a journal
- NIIA'S Directors- General and Research Fellows serve on special government committees and official delegations to various multilateral forums.
- NIIA has been able to intellectualize the discourse of Nigerian foreign policy and play a role in the articulation of Nigeria's role in Africa, including West Africa.
- NIIA plays complementary and supportive role in the foreign policy process and its relevance in making input is dependent on the relationship between the DG and the president.

- **Constraints to Foreign Policy Making and Implementation in Nigeria**
- As already observed, the foreign policy of a given state is the continuation of and extension of its domestic policies.
- As observed by Ogunsanwo in his book, *Our friends, their friends: Nigeria's external relations, 1960-85* (1986:8), “bold foreign policy positions and stances are hardly sustainable for a considerable period without the domestic infrastructural underpinnings which form the solid foundations for such policies”
- As corroborated by Okolie (2009), foreign policy derives from the domestic environment and in most cases, in response to external stimuli.
- There is no agreement among scholars about which of the two, that is domestic factors or external variables, that could be regarded as preeminent in the conduct of a state's foreign policy.

- Saliu (2006) has affirmed that the difficulty in situating which factors are preeminent could be located in the thin line that separates domestic policy from external policy in the life of a state.
- For instance, the execution of Ken Saro-Wiwa, though Nigeria's domestic concern attracted consolidated condemnations and criticisms by the international community.
- This led to the suspension of Nigeria from the Commonwealth of Nations and subsequently the international community, thus reducing Nigeria to a pariah state.
- Also, all the elections conducted in Nigeria since 1999 attracted international observers and comments from diverse international actors on their outcomes. This is in spite of the fact that elections are Nigeria's domestic affairs.

- Okolie (2009) has articulated the basic constraints to the conduct of external relations to include:
- The challenge of professionalism
- Nature of the political institutional structure in the country;
- Public opinion (which may be generated by mass media, pressure groups and parliament);
- The nature of the country's economic structure;
- Difficulty of collecting information and the reliability value of such information;
- The attitude of other governments, international organizations;
- The direction of world opinion; etc.

- *1. Challenge of Professionalism*
- The institutional framework for foreign policy formulation and execution, particularly with regards to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, faces teething challenges.
- When Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala was appointed foreign affairs minister in August 2006, she discovered that the ministry had no internet connection with the outside world, including its missions abroad, and that the lifts in the building were not functioning (Mustapha 2008).
- Embassy buildings in Khartoum, Teheran and others in Latin America were said to be leaking. This sort of context is hardly conducive for creative and professional thinking. Staffing, training and funding combine as formidable challenges that glare at the professional practices of Nigeria's foreign policy.
- This is debilitating to the overall output of foreign policy in Nigeria. Nigeria's foreign policy practice is challenged by professional deficiency.

- Most Nigerian diplomats and foreign policy practitioners seem not to have received the requisite training and orientation to meet up with the diplomatic realities and challenges of the present global age (Fawowara 2008).
- This is especially so because no further official training is arranged for officials as they progress to very senior positions in the ministry.
- The Foreign Service Academy which was established in the early 1980s only serves the training needs of newly recruited into the service.
- Another challenge to professionalism is the role of federal character principle in the appointment and placement of persons in positions of importance in Nigeria's Foreign Service. This has demonstrably undermined merit, talent and efficiency.

- The Federal Character principle has led to the recruitment pattern which brings a significant number of ill-qualified personnel into the professional cadre of the Foreign Service.
- The consequence is that officers with proven capacity for high standard performance, innovative thinking, creative solutions and proactive approaches to policy execution are passed over in appointments and promotions.
- On the other hand, mediocrity and incompetence are blindly rewarded, while misconduct and unprofessional behaviours thrive under a culture of impunity.
- A much stronger assault on the morale of professional Foreign Service officers derives from the recent practice of appointing a significantly larger number of politicians than careerists to ambassadorial posts abroad.
- The injection of politics into recruitment process in the Foreign Ministry has impacted negatively on the quality and professionalism in the foreign affairs service.

- *2. Nature of the political institutional structure in the country*
- A major manifestation is the difficulty in relationship between the executive and legislative arms of government.
- Besides the difficulty in getting the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' budget approved by the National Assembly, ambassadorial nominees also have to be confirmed by the Assembly.
- In the routine conduct of foreign affairs, the foreign affairs department and officials encounter hitches with the legislature.
- This organ of the government often times injects itself directly in the foreign policy implementation process.
- In many instances, the legislative organ of the government reacts or deals with aspects of Nigeria's foreign relations without the benefit of institutional knowledge and information about best practices and processes.

- The net effect of this policy of incoherence is that this organ of state then works at cross purposes, making Nigeria's foreign policy goals and objectives unclear and ambiguous.
- For instance, in January 2003, some members of the House of Representatives visited Pakistan, apparently seeking to mediate in the dispute over Kashmir, without consulting the Foreign Affairs Ministry. The ministry under Sule Lamido wrote to the chairman of the committee, pointing out the risk of such a trip without background knowledge of the delicate balance of alliances.
- The lawmakers reacted angrily that "...nobody is here as an appendage of Sule Lamido's ministry. We are not his boys. We are not bound by his whatever foreign policy strategy" (Sule 2013: 4).
- There has been considerable resentment by the other ministries against the foreign ministry.

- Personality conflicts, rivalries and petty jealousies are only part of the problem.
- The larger problem has been the lack of any focal point of coordination for the activities of the ministries of foreign affairs with those of other ministries where external relations are concerned.
- When inter-ministerial meetings take place, they tended to be ad hoc in nature, and participation rarely included the ministers themselves.
- Enquiries and communications between the foreign affairs ministry and other ministries vice versa are often left unanswered even on crucial or urgent matters of trade and economic relations with other countries or international organizations.

- *3) Public Opinion and Citizen Involvement in Foreign Policy*
- The centrality and fundamentality of public opinion in foreign policy process is not in dispute (Chuka 2007).
- Ideally, public opinion inputs in, and impacts on a country's foreign policy determination (Rourke 1997).
- Especially in democracies, the assumption is that the chance of foreign policy process is enhanced by public opinion.
- But since Nigeria's independence in 1960, a number of test cases exist, that point to the contrary.
- Foreign policy decisions in Nigeria are personalistic, with political class as independent actors, having free and unfettered hands in policy making.
- According to Joy Ogwu, as "a practical matter, Nigerian decision makers have often formulated policies on an exclusive basis, relying mainly on the kitchen cabinet...On the broadest level, group pressures have not heavily influenced foreign policy."

- *4) The nature of the country's economic structure*
- The monocultural nature of Nigeria's economy has debilitated the country's foreign policy to protect the national interest, and project it effectively in the international arena.
- It is a truism that a state's foreign rating and influence in a very fundamental sense is a reflection of the health and size of the country's economy.
- While Nigeria has large economy, it equally has serious economic crisis that makes it difficult to realize its full potential.
- The economy of Nigeria exhibits largely a neo-colonial structure, depending on export of primary goods and importation of finished commodities.
- This, unarguably, disallows her to play the critical roles she craves for in the international system. Connected to the issue of economy in Nigeria's foreign policy challenges is the challenge of globalization.

- *5) Security Threats from Subnational groups and Terrorists*
- Terrorism is another important foreign policy challenge for Nigeria.
- In international relations, states have a monopoly of the use of coercive force.
- In a situation whereby there are non-governmental groups contending with the state in the use of coercive force, a situation of order and counter order ensues, hence, disorderliness assumes the defining characteristic of the state in question.
- One challenge of this development, especially as they linger, is creating an impression of a weak government that does not have the capacity to maintain internal security.
- This, again, can send wrong signals to foreign tourists and investors, especially where the economic diplomacy of the government is anchored on attraction of foreign direct investments, deepening of trade, and enhancing domestic productivity.

- 6) Corruption