

Foreign and Defence Policies: The Nigerian Case 1985-1993

DELE JEMIRADE

York University, Toronto, Canada

delej@yorku.ca

Abstract

This article investigates the changes to and achievements of Nigeria's foreign and defence policies from 1985 to 1993. It also examines the economic, political and sociocultural implications of these policies on the nation. The article argues that the foreign and defence policies of the Ibrahim Babangida Administration were successful even if other aspects of the administration were a failure. The article also addresses the interlocking relationship between defence and foreign policy execution and concludes with recommendations on how these can be managed to promote the effectiveness of Nigeria's external relations. The article depended largely on archival materials from the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, supported by scholarly journal articles, books and newspaper materials.

Keywords: Nigeria, foreign policy, defence policy, diplomacy, security

Introduction

This article examines the foreign and defence policies of Nigeria from 1985 to 1993, when General Ibrahim Babangida was the Military Head of State of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. It also examines the impact of the policies on the economic, political and sociocultural conditions on the country. A lot of research and studies have been done on the foreign policies of various Nigerian governments, including that of the Babangida administration, but few have shown the relationship of these foreign policies to the defence policy objectives of the government and the overriding effect on the nation. This research is a synthesis and reassessment of the foreign and defence policies of the regime.

Many scholars and researchers, including (Iyayi, 1989), (Ake, 1995), (Falope 2019), (Agbese, 2012) (McDikkoh 2010), (Mimiko, 1995), (Bamikole, 1995), (Ihonvbere, 1995), (Fawole, 1995), (G. Ajayi, 1995), (Sa'id, 1995) (Kolawole, 1995), (K. Ajayi, 1995), (Adekanye, 1993 and 2005), (Okafor, 2006), (Bamidele, 2012) and many others, have condemned the Babangida government as a failure in most of its policies, but this article intends to show that despite this being so, it was successful in foreign and defence policies. The article is divided into four sections. Section One reviews Nigeria's foreign and defence policies from 1960 to 1985, Section Two addresses the foreign policy of the Babangida's administration, Section Three examines the defence policy, and Section Four analyses the relationship between the foreign and defence policies and its impact on the nation.



Review of Nigeria's Foreign and Defence Policies 1960-1985

Before independence on 1 October 1960, Britain, as Nigeria's colonising power, represented its interest in foreign and defence matters (Ogunsanwo, 1985). Even after independence, Britain continued to influence the country's foreign policy because of the colonial influence on the new ruling elites who inherited Nigeria's foreign policy from Britain. This is the reason why there were no immediate visible changes in Nigeria's external relations after independence (Ogunsanwo, 1985). According to a publication of the Federal Ministry of External Affairs, 1991, 'Nigeria at the United Nations: A Partnership for a Better World', the principles and objectives of Nigeria's foreign policy are:

1. Protection of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Nigerian state
2. Promotion of the socio-economic well-being of Nigerians
3. Enhancing Nigeria's image and status in the world at large
4. Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other states
5. Non-interference in the internal affairs of other states
6. Promotion of the unity and solidarity of African states
7. Total political, economic, social and cultural emancipation and rejuvenation of Africa
8. An unflinching commitment to the elimination of apartheid and racism
9. Emancipation of countries still under colonial rule as well as the removal of the remaining vestiges of colonialism in Africa
10. Promotion of international cooperation and understanding conducive to the consolidation of world peace and security
11. Enhancing the dignity and promoting the welfare of African and people of African descent all over the world
12. Contributing to efforts aimed at redressing the imbalance in the development and progress of developing countries
13. Promotion of peace, prosperity, stability and development of Africa
14. Promotion of political goodwill and understanding among African countries despite the cultural, linguistic and economic barriers erected by erstwhile colonialists
15. The discouragement of international intervention and presence in Africa
16. The promotion of rapid socio-economic development in Africa through regional economic integration, strengthening of sub-regional economic institutions and the reduction of economic dependence on extra-continental powers
17. The development of cultural cooperation as a means of strengthening political ties with all African countries
18. And the eradication of all forms of racial discrimination in Africa

From independence in 1960, Nigeria never had any well-articulated and documented defence policy until 1979 when General Olusegun Obasanjo's administration finally documented the principles and objectives of Nigerian defence policy. This document remained so until 1988



when General Ibrahim Babangida's administration reviewed it. According to (Babangida, 1988), (Abacha, 1992) and (Osobie, 1988), the following is what is generally accepted as the principles and objectives of Nigeria's defence policy:

1. The defence and protection of the country's territorial integrity, her people, and internal peace
2. The defence and maintenance of the country's independence
3. The defence of the economic and social well-being of the people
4. The defence, preservation and promotion of their culture and way of life, especially their democratic values
5. Defence of the general development of the nation and the effective management of national energy
6. Defence of equality and self-reliance in Africa and the rest of the developing world
7. Promotion of necessary economic and political conditions in Africa and throughout the world that will foster national self-reliance and rapid economic development
8. Promotion of social justice and human dignity everywhere, particularly for black people
9. The enhancement of the country's standing and status in world capitals, especially Africa
10. Ensuring peace and stability in the African continent through mutual collective defence and security system
11. Commitment to the United Nations and the promotion of world peace and international security

After independence, the Prime Minister Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa presented some cardinal points to represent the principles and objectives of Nigeria's foreign policy with Africa as its centrepiece (D.M. Gray, 1965) and (Tukur, 1965). The principles and objectives mentioned above are still relevant today, and most Nigerians leaders have pursued them one way or the other with variations only in style of leadership and implementation.

Under Balewa, Nigeria accepted and honoured all the treaties and agreements signed by Britain; this further increased the British influence on the country's foreign policy. Although Balewa declared Nigeria a non-aligned nation, like most of its members, he never respected the principle behind it because it was clear that he was pro-West, certainly because Nigeria was economically tied to Britain and the Western Bloc. When Nikita Khrushchev, the then Prime Minister of Soviet Union, demanded that Nigeria should permit them to establish its embassy in Lagos in 1960, Balewa replied that "Application for diplomatic exchange would be considered in order of receipts and would be judged on their merits." However, the same request was immediately granted to the United States of America (D.M. Gray, 1965, p.85).

Balewa was anti-communist who turned down scholarship awards to Nigerians from the Soviet bloc and delayed opening of diplomatic relations with them. Balewa invited apartheid South Africa to Nigeria's independence celebrations. He was an advocate of a gradual approach to Africa's decolonisation. He also rejected the Organization of African Unity's (OAU) plan to break diplomatic



ties with Britain because of Rhodesia's (Zimbabwe) Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI). Only Balewa also supported the unpopular Moise Tshombe during the Congo crisis (Tukur, 1965).

Balewa's administration believed that the West and Britain were the best friends of Nigeria. This is seen in his independence speech: "We are grateful to the British officers whom we have known first as masters and then as leaders and finally as partners but always as friends." (Tukur, 1965, p.24). Balewa's foreign policy was weak, inconsistent and contradictory. His government was overthrown in the first military coup on 15 January 1966 (Olusanya, 1985).

Major General Thomas Aguiyi Ironsi became the Head of State after the assassination and overthrow of Balewa following the failure of Major Chukwuma Nzeogwu's bid to take power with his co-plotters. Ironsi was killed in a coup d'état on the 29 July 1966, leading to the emergence of Lieutenant Colonel Yakubu Gowon as the new Head of State, (Ogunsanwo, 1985). Foreign policy under Gowon was quite different from that of Balewa, but Gowon still maintained some of the essential characteristics of the Balewa government. For example, Gowon maintained a moderate view towards foreign policy but strongly believed in 'Personal diplomacy', which is personal involvement or intervention in resolving diplomatic issues. His administration moved closer to the Western Bloc and Britain (Olusanya, 1985). The civil war of 1967-1970 brought Nigeria close to the Communist bloc because Britain and the USA refused to supply Nigeria with arms to fight the Biafran rebels, which the USSR did (Ogunsanwo, 1985).

Gowon also immediately normalised relations with Gabon, Tanzania, Zambia, Côte d'Ivoire and France in 1971 despite the recognition and support they gave to Biafra during the civil war. With the support of President Gnassingbe Eyadema of Togo, Gowon rallied round other West African countries to form the Economic Community of West African State (ECOWAS) in 1975 (Memos of Federal Ministry of External Affairs, 1991). The leadership role Gowon played at the first Lome Convention, which was a precursor to ECOWAS, was quite commendable. However, Gowon, who ruled Nigeria for more than nine years, had the opportunity more than any other Nigerian ruler before him to make the foreign policy dynamic because of the enormous resources and goodwill at his disposal (Akiyemi, 1980).

Even though Nigeria received fighter jets and other weapons from the Communist bloc, the relations did not go beyond that because, after the war, Nigeria reverted to her old friends, that is Britain and the West. (Akiyemi, 1980). Gowon performed better than Balewa in foreign policy. He increased aid to the freedom fighters like South West Africa People Organisation (SWAPO) in Namibia, African National Congress (ANC) and Pan African Congress (PAC) in South Africa and others in Zimbabwe and Angola. His commitment to anti-apartheid, decolonization, ECOWAS and OAU is commendable (Akiyemi, 1980).

At the eight summits of the OAU in Kampala, Uganda in 1975, Gowon suggested the formation of the African Task Force to handle military problems in Africa. He warned: "Let it be known to friends and foes that the historical tide is irreversible. From now on, we can only move forward. Those countries still under control of foreign powers must be liberated" (*The Sunday Guardian*, 2 October 1988, p.2). Unfortunately for Gowon, he did not have the chance to prove his words

because he was overthrown in a coup d'état before the end of the summit. General Murtala Mohammed became the new Head of State on 29 July 1975 (Aluko, 1977).

The administration of Mohammed witnessed a progressive change in Nigeria's foreign policy implementation. The regime put more emphasis on Africa as the centrepiece of its foreign policy than any other government. He pursued a focused and dynamic foreign policy. Unfortunately for Mohammed, he did not live long to execute his plans entirely. He was killed in a failed coup d'état on 13 February 1976 (Akinyemi, 1980). General Olusegun Obasanjo, Mohammed's deputy, succeeded him and continued with the administration's policies. The most important achievement of his administration was decolonisation in Africa, which were commendable and have never been matched by any other regime before and after it (Obiozor, 1985). The regime contributed immeasurably to the independence of Angola, Zimbabwe and the struggle against apartheid South Africa. It supported ANC, PAC and SWAPO in Namibia (Akinyemi, 1980). The administration, for the first time in Nigeria's diplomatic history, took unilateral decisions without support from most African states (Garba, 1981). Alhaji Shehu Shagari became the president on 1 October 1979 and tried to continue with the work started by Mohammed and Obasanjo, but the momentum was never kept because of the moderate views of his administration (Garba, 1981).

Nevertheless, Shagari's administration continued the support for anti-apartheid groups and assisted Zimbabwe with funds before and after independence (Ogunsanwo, 1983). It was during Shagari's administration that Nigeria witnessed some of the worst border attacks from its neighbours, particularly Cameroon. When the Cameroonian troops killed a Nigerian contingent patrolling borders in May 1981, Nigerian did not do anything even though Cameroon refused to apologise or pay compensation (Ogunsanwo, 1983). Shagari's foreign policy lacked focus and was uninspiring.

Shagari's government was overthrown in a military coup on 31 December 1983, which saw the emergence of Major General Muhammadu Buhari's short-lived government. Buhari introduced the Concentric Circle Policy in pursuance of the country's foreign and defence policies, which is addressed in the next section. Babangida's regime later adopted the Concentric Circle Policy (Imobighe, 1987). Buhari's foreign policy was antagonistic to the West, confrontational and reactionary. Because of his hard posture and the failed Umaru Dikko kidnap attempt, the regime fell out with Western powers, Britain notably, which led to the withdrawal of their respective High Commissioners (Olusanya, 1985). Buhari rejected and refused to sign the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Brown Card System of free movement of citizens, goods and services within the sub-region. He also refused to host the 1984 ECOWAS Summit (Olusanya 1985). His rigid attitude towards foreign policy was not the type a country like Nigeria deserves. Buhari was overthrown in a palace coup by General Ibrahim Babangida, his Chief of Army Staff (Olusanya, 1985).

Before independence in 1960 and even after independence, there was no documented Nigerian defence policy until 1979 during the Obasanjo government. The British did not leave or hand over any formal document on defence policy (Vogt, 1990). The Armed Forces grew out of the British Colonial Army, which was the West African Frontier Force (WAFF), established



in 1890 (Imobighe, 1987). The first set of Nigerian officers were trained under the Royal West African Frontier Force (RWAFF). Even after independence, they continued with their inherited British traditions and all the officers were trained in British military institutions, namely Sandhurst and Aldershot. They were trained in British military traditions with British weapons, which made it challenging to eliminate Britain's influence on the country's defence policy. (Vogt, 1990).

Successive Nigerian leaders Balewa, Ironsi, Gowon and Mohammed operated without a formal written defence policy. Obasanjo finally documented the first defence policy in 1979; it remained so until 1988 when Babangida reviewed it and gave the defence policy a better focus. Up till then, the full content of the document remained shrouded in secrecy for security reasons (Vogt, 1990).

Babangida's administration

Babangida came to power on 27 August 1985 through a palace-military coup-d'état when the economic, political and social situation had become intolerable in the country. Buhari imposed draconian measures in the country and on its people. Nigerians were happy when Babangida ended the dictatorship of Buhari (Osuntokun, 2000).

Foreign policy thrust

For the first time in the history of Nigerian foreign policy and diplomacy, the emphasis was shifted from Africa as the centrepiece of Nigeria's foreign policy to issues that were directly related to Nigeria, such as economic diplomacy. On coming to power, Babangida appointed people of proven integrity and good knowledge in the field such as Bolaji Akinyemi as Minister of External Affairs to handle foreign affairs and advise him, which helped in the success of the administration's foreign policy (Adeniji, 2000).

At the time Babangida came to power, the relationship between Nigeria and the western powers, particularly Britain, its traditional friend, had become strained because of the disagreement they had with Buhari's administration, especially on the prosecution of corrupt politicians, which led to the Umaru Dikko kidnap affair and the recalling of high commissioners of the two countries (Adeniji, 2000). The international community was well disposed to the Babangida regime mainly because of his competent advisers and the policies pursued by the administration (Adeniji, 2000).

Before that time, no government has received support like Babangida's from international financial institutions such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF), the International Finance Corporation (IFC) and the Islamic Development Bank (IDB) (Obiozor, 1994). The boycott of the Edinburgh Commonwealth Games in Scotland in July 1986 was a landmark decision in the success of the regime's foreign policy (Olukoshi). Nigeria led 32 Commonwealth countries to boycott the games because of the British stand against the imposition of economic sanctions on apartheid South Africa (Obiozor, 1994). At the Commonwealth Heads of Government Summit in Nassau, the Bahamas on 16 October 1985, Britain led by Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher rejected sanctions on South Africa because she believed that the effect would be felt more on



the blacks than on the whites. Because of the deadlock, the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group (EPG) was established to study the situation and make final recommendations. The EPG, co-chaired by Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria and Malcolm Frazer of Australia, later recommended sanctions, which Thatcher still refused to accept (Ogwu, 1986). Despite this, Britain continued to relate to South Africa on sports and trading matters. This made Nigeria lead a successful boycott of 32 out of 49 members of the organisation, which was described as 'one of the high points of decision-making in Nigeria's foreign policy' (Olukoshi, 1990, p.448).

Nigeria also intensified the struggle against apartheid and racial discrimination in South Africa. Nigeria contributed immensely to the attainment of independence of Namibia on 29 March 1990 and renewed diplomatic relations with Israel on 4 May 1992 (Duke-Abiola, 1999). It was a decision all the previous governments of Nigeria avoided because of the controversy it was likely to generate in the country. In the same year, President Frederik de Klerk of South Africa visited Nigeria, the first by a South African leader (Duke-Abiola, 1999).

Concentric Circle Policy

The Concentric Circle Policy was first introduced by Buhari when he was Head of State and later continued by Babangida (Ekoko, 1990). The policy was applied to both the foreign and defence policies since the two are interrelated. Ekoko (1990) described it as "the most comprehensive, clear-cut and operationalisable Nigerian Defence Policy ever enunciated since 1960" (Ekoko, 1990, p.12).

According to Muhammadu Buhari:

The pattern of concentric circles may be discernible in our attitude and response to foreign policy issues within the African continent and the World at large. At the epicentre of these circles are the National Economy and the Security interest of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, which are inextricably tied-up with the security, stability, the economic and social well-being of our immediate neighbours (Buhari, 1984).

Babangida pursued the policy throughout his administration in his relation to ECOWAS, the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) and particularly the ECOWAS Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) during Liberia's civil war, where Nigeria was not only involved in the peacekeeping/peace enforcement operation but led and financed most of the operations. Babangida restated this policy in his defence of Nigeria's involvement in Liberia, where he claimed that:

The foreign policy of Nigeria is built on three concentric circles. The first ring being Nigeria and the defence of its territorial integrity and sovereignty, the second ring comprising its immediate neighbours with contiguous boundaries and the third ring being the ECOWAS Subregion... and the three elements are obviously interlocking and coterminous (Babangida, 1990).



The Concentric Circle policy was based on the method of delimitating and prioritising the strategic boundaries of Nigeria's national defence. Inside the three concentric circles are three dimensions to note, which are strategic-military, economic and political dimensions. (Ekoko, 1990). These are also based on Nigeria's geographical situation and threat analysis. These include the border clashes with neighbouring states, particularly Cameroun, French activities in the West African sub-region, and the possibility of a South African attack on Nigeria (Ekoko, 1990).

The policy, to some extent, guaranteed Nigeria's safety with Chad, Niger, the Republic of Benin, Cameroon and Equatorial Guinea. The policy also worked to some extent, based on Nigeria's achievements in its relations with other countries in the West Africa sub-region (Ate and Akinterinwa, 1990). However, one cannot say the same thing of South Africa since Nigeria's foreign policy towards apartheid was not backed by a corresponding defence policy. It was evident that Nigeria's foreign policy on South Africa could not be supported at that time with its defence capability because its defence forces were far more superior and advanced regarding capability and weaponry (Amin, 1992).

Economic diplomacy

It was Babangida's administration in the history of Nigeria's foreign policy that first changed the thrust of the foreign policy from Africa as the centrepiece of the country's foreign policy to economic diplomacy. Economic diplomacy was the active pursuit of foreign policy objectives that were designed to promote trade and investment and to complement domestic economic reforms, such as trade liberalisation and commercialisation of public enterprises (Federal Ministry of External Affairs, 1991). To give backbone and strength to this internal economic policy, the government adopted the economic diplomacy as its focus (Obiozor, 1992).

Although the SAP, the deregulation of the economy based on economic diplomacy drew much criticism internally due to the hardship it caused, it also drew attention to the country internationally, particularly from Western Countries and their investors. (Duke-Abiola, 1999). Economic diplomacy, according to Osuntokun, means "tempering our pre-occupation with political issues such as decolonisation and non-alignment with concerns about domestic development" (Osuntokun, 2000, p.5). Nigeria shifted to economic diplomacy because the fall of apartheid in South Africa was around the corner and the independence of Namibia would leave no room for continuation with the anti-colonial policies, previously the preoccupation of Nigeria's foreign policy. The fall of the Soviet Union and the emergence of the USA as the only superpower made non-alignment irrelevant (Osuntokun, 2000). All these made Nigeria decide that economic survival and development should be the focus of its foreign policy without abandoning its policies of the liberation of African people (Osuntokun, 2000).

To facilitate and encourage foreign economic investment, the Nigerian Investment Promotion Commission (NIPC) was created to aid the registration of foreign companies without the bureaucratic bottlenecks (Osuntokun, 2000). The Ministry of Foreign Affairs established a trade and investment unit to supervise the economic efforts of the embassies and high commissions abroad



towards the promotion of the economic policies and development of the country. Ambassadors and high commissioners were told that their success or failure would be determined by the number of investors they brought into the country from their host nations (Osuntokun, 2000). The Indigenisation Decree was abolished to allow foreigners to participate in all business activities within the country. The decree that made the Central Bank the only route for transferring money outside the country was scrapped. Bureaux de changes were licensed to trade in currencies at a controlled rate. All these were made possible to enable freedom of entrepreneurship and make the movement of capital and profit easy (*The Sunday Concord*, 1 October 2000).

The mantra of economic diplomacy was carried to all international forums, including UN, OAU, ECOWAS and bilateral sessions. Because of all these, the issue of Nigeria's debt was reconsidered; it was later rescheduled instead of cancelled, which Nigeria wanted (Obiozor, 1994). However, at the same time, the country was offered a lot of financial facilities. Although the collapse of Communism and the opening of Eastern Europe and China for market and investment harmed the policy of economic diplomacy pursued by the Babangida administration, it was a new and positive direction for the country (Obiozor, 1994).

Apart from its commitment to the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), which it belonged to for the protection of its oil interests, the primary foreign exchange earner for the country, Nigeria initiated the formation of African Petroleum Producers Association (APPA) in Lagos on 27 January 1987 (Adeniji, 2000). Nigeria realised that other OPEC members belonged to the Organisation of Arab Petroleum Exporters (OAPE) in the Middle East, the Organisation of Latin American Petroleum Exporters (OLAPE) in Latin America and Asian Countries Petroleum Exporters (ASCOPE) in Asia. Only Africa had no specialised regional organisation to protect its oil interest in the World (Adeniji, 2000). This new organisation, with members like Libya, Algeria, Gabon, Angola, Benin Republic, Cameroon, Equatorial Guinea, Congo and Egypt (as an observer), some of whom were not even OPEC members, increased the economic cooperation among them, which was beneficial to all, including Nigeria because it gave them opportunity to review the value of the cooperation as a single bloc that protected their mutual interest in oil revenue (Duke-Abiola, 1999).

The controversial decision to make Nigeria a full member of the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC) in Fez Morocco on 6 January 1986 was defended based on economic diplomacy. Babangida argued that Nigeria stood to benefit economically and financially from the membership of the organisation because of access it would have to the zero-interest loan from Islamic Development Bank (IDB), financial assistance and insurance coverage, including technical and economic assistance and benefits from the rich members of the organisation (Duke-Abiola, 1999).

Economic diplomacy was a policy that was pursued based on the economic realities of Nigeria at that time. It was evident that the major world powers, with the USA as the most powerful country in the world, considered economic interests first in their relations with other countries. It went together with a security interest, and that is why Western countries control the financial institutions of the world like the IMF, World Bank and IFC and are ready to defend their economic interest anywhere in the world. This was manifested when the USA led other Western powers to force Iraq



out of Kuwait in 1990. General Babangida summed up his strong belief in the policy thus:
...it became obvious to critical observers that the ability of a country to attract substantial foreign aid and investment capital for its economic development depended very intimately on the foreign policy orientation of its government regarding many issues (Babangida, 1985).

Environmental issues

Environmental issues constituted one of the new concerns of the Babangida administration. In 1988, radioactive and hazardous toxic waste was dumped in the Nigerian port of Koko by some Italians led by Gianfranco Raffaelli with the collaboration of some Nigerians (Osuntokun, 2000). Later, it was discovered that similar radioactive toxic wastes were dumped in South Africa and the Republic of Benin, where they were told that it could be used for road construction. In reaction to this, Nigeria established the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (FEPA) in 1988 to handle issues like this. With the support of other West African states, the country also established a dump-watch to monitor the movement of vessels suspected of carrying hazardous wastes (Osuntokun, 2000).

The country took the initiative by proving its leadership in Africa; it persuaded other countries in ECOWAS to support the protocol against toxic waste dumping in the sub-region. Nigeria also presented its position to the OAU and then the UN, which was adopted and ratified (Osuntokun, 2000). This led to an International Treaty, the Basel Convention in Switzerland, which was finally passed and ratified in 1989. The protocol prohibited the transboundary transfer of hazardous and toxic-radioactive waste to countries, which have no mechanism for handling them (Osuntokun, 2000). The Basel Treaty further led to the 1991 Bamako Convention in Mali, which finally prohibit the dumping or transfer of hazardous and toxic radioactive waste to countries. The issue of the environment was a significant foreign policy achievement for Nigeria. It brought Nigeria out once again and made it prominent in the international community.

Concept of Medium Powers

The concept of Medium Powers was brought into Nigeria's foreign policy during Babangida's administration as "The coming together of influential medium-income and resource-endowed countries into an informal association to influence the direction of world affairs, particularly the economic aspect of these relations" (Osuntokun, 2000, p.10). It was meant to be a counterforce by major regional powers such as Brazil and Argentina in South America, Nigeria and Egypt in Africa, India and China in Asia against the ideological and economic dominance of the two blocs led by the USA and Union of Soviet and Socialist Republic (USSR).

Nigeria's foreign policy formulators believed that the non-aligned movement was too unwieldy to achieve this and the Commonwealth too informal and unsuitable for the purpose. Some of their aims included making sure that the question of international peace would no longer be the exclusive preserve of the two world powers and their alliance system of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact (Osuntokun, 2000). The idea was formally abandoned because of a lack of popularity; the target countries did not take the idea seriously, which made them not



show interest. The idea of medium powers was not new; there were too many organisations in the international system claiming or wanting to fight the political and economic dominance of the two blocs led by the USA and the USSR respectively.

Technical Aid Corps

The Technical Aid Corps (TAC) was introduced into Nigerian Foreign Policy by Babangida's administration. It was first introduced in 1987 and it was designed to help some African countries with the technical workforce to assist their struggle for self-reliance and economic development (Akindele, 1990). Internally, the government saw it as an opportunity to settle thousands of unemployed Nigerian graduates by sending them to countries where their skills and knowledge could be utilised adequately. The government believed that the TAC programme could make other countries have confidence in the Nigerian graduates, institutions of higher learning and the educational system by accepting assistance in that form. The foreign policy planners also believed that the programme would boost the country's leadership role in Africa, particularly in the West African sub-region.

The TAC was an expensive venture because the people sent to foreign countries had to be paid in US dollars, but it was quite a success, and the successive administrations continued it. Countries like Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Gambia that benefitted from TAC were so enthusiastic about the programme that they started making specific requests for experts in some fields (Akindele, 1990). It was so acceptable and welcomed by Nigerian graduates that so many of them applied, including the ones who were gainfully employed. It was a good idea and a plus for the success of Nigeria's foreign policy and economic diplomacy.

Defence policy thrust

Babangida's administration changed the focus of Nigeria's defence policy. As mentioned earlier, the first time that Nigeria's defence policy (Principles and Objectives of Nigeria's Defence Policy) was ever documented was in 1979 under Obasanjo, and it remained so until 1988 when Babangida reviewed it. Since independence, Nigeria's defence policy up till Babangida's administration was based on self-defence and defence of the territorial integrity of the country (Ekoko, 1990). The defence policy was not based on territorial expansion, or aggression. Babangida continued with this policy – he only changed the thrust or focus from a sole or single defence mechanism to a Mutual Collective Defence and Security System (Ekoko, 1990).

The administration of Babangida reviewed every aspect of Nigeria's defence policy and security. It is important to note that every modern nation requires a carefully structured plan of action on how to define its national interest. Babangida's administration did that with the defence of the country. The main thrust of Babangida's defence and security system was the Mutual Collective Defence and Security System; the other aspect was the concept of 'a Regional Power,' which the administration pursued and exhibited in its defence policy and implementation (Ekoko, 1990).



Concept of a regional power in a mutual collective defence and security system

After the Babangida administration reviewed the first documented defence policy of Nigeria in 1988, it was decided that the focus was to bring other West African states, particularly its immediate neighbours, into a mutual collective defence and security system. The decision was based on the threat analysis and its results on the possible areas of conflicts that Nigeria could face as a country (Ibrahim, 1988). This thrust was also based on the Concentric Circle Policy in which the security and defence of Nigeria's immediate neighbours like Cameroon, Chad, Niger, Benin Republic and Equatorial Guinea were linked to the country. This policy was based on the principle that any threat to Nigeria's immediate neighbours, politically economically or security-wise, was a threat to the country (Osobie, 1988).

Despite the newly-added focus of a Regional Power and the Mutual Collective Defence and Security System, the primary mission of Nigeria's defence policy remains defensive. Nigeria has no territorial ambition; it has never been manifested in any way in its foreign or defence policies' implementation and practice. Abacha, (1992), argues that:

Since Nigeria does not possess and probably will be unable to possess the means to defend herself in isolation against all forms of external aggression, she would have to rely, for strategic reasons, on military interdependence at least in the sub-region to provide security – and it is imperative that Nigeria's defence policy gives priority to the propagation and eventual establishment of a regional and mutually collective security system among African states with a view to warding off any threats to her political and economic independence.

A collective security system could take the form of a bilateral or multilateral arrangement, and it involves the joint deployment of troops from the countries participating at different periods of training and operations. The command must also have a structure, which Nigeria, with its population, wealth, size, and geographical location, fitted into the position of its leadership.

This policy pursued by the Babangida regime was quite an innovation in Nigeria's defence policy. For the first time, it showed that there was indeed a serious effort to articulate and execute a National Defence System for the country, not on the general notion of Africa as the centrepiece of its foreign policy, but based on threat analysis of the country and other relevant factors. If defence experts formulated a mutual collective defence and security system because the country was not capable of handling her defence problems alone, then a formalised alliance would be the goal of the policy in which Ekoko (1990, p.7) argues that, "For states unable to achieve their foreign and defence policy unilaterally, alliance formation becomes a national necessity."

According to Miller (1981, p.52), "Alliance formation is based on need, expediency and pragmatism; alliance exists because they have more than compensating advantages because they are believed to add external power to the power of each member, because they deter potential



aggressors and because they define the strategic frontier". (Ekoko, 1990, p.8) summed it up by saying, "An alliance enhances national defence." Looking at all the advantages mentioned above towards an alliance policy, one can see that if Nigeria truly wants to achieve the objectives of its new thrust in defence policy, it must formalise it into an alliance.

The formation of ECOMOG forces in 1990 to solve the Liberian problem was quite an attempt to realize the aim and objectives of the mutual collective defence and security system. It was a step in the right direction and could be improved upon and adapted to form the nucleus of an alliance based on the new joint defence system in the West Africa sub-region (Olowo-Ake, 1996). Nigeria was able to persuade the rest of the countries in the West African sub-region of the need to send troops to Liberia to bring peace and sanity into the war-ravaged country. Although some critics insist that Nigeria's 'misadventure' in leading the Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) troops to Liberia was done because of the personal relationship between Babangida and President Samuel Doe of Liberia, the most important thing was that the decision fell within the Concentric Circle Policy and the Mutual Collective Defence and Security System and it helped to solve the problem in Liberia.

Through the ECOWAS standing mediation committee, Nigeria was able to persuade Gambia, Sierra Leone, Senegal, Ghana and Guinea to provide troops for the peacekeeping force, which later changed to a peace enforcement force. Later, even Uganda and Tanzania from East Africa provided troops for the ECOMOG forces (Olowo-Ake, 1996). The success of ECOMOG operations as a step forward to the success of the mutual collective defence and security system, which could lead to a formalised military alliance in the West Africa sub-region, cannot be underestimated. Babangida (Babangida, 1990), made this clear when he said:

There is no gainsaying the fact that when certain events occur in the sub-region depending upon their intensity and magnitude, which are bound to affect Nigerian politico-military and socio-economic environment, we should not stand by as helpless and hapless spectator. We believe that if the events are such that have the potential to threaten the stability, peace and security of the sub-region, Nigeria, in collaboration with others in this sub-region, is duty-bound to react or respond [in an] inappropriate manner necessary to either avert the disaster or to take adequate measures to ensure peace, tranquillity and harmony.

The success of ECOMOG can only be seen from what independent and objective observers had to say about it. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, "The ECOMOG remained the only example of a Regional Organization with a long term, truly multilateral peacekeeping operation underway"(SIPRI, 1995, p.77). Salim Ahmed Salim, the former OAU scribe, described it as, "The first real attempt by African countries to solve an African conflict" (Vogt, 1992). President Yoweri Museveni of Uganda praised Nigeria for its "proper role as peace-maker by being the premier participant in ECOMOG" (Vogt, 1992). David Rowson, the Director of the State Department's Anglophone West Africa Affairs, stated that, "The US is fully behind



the West African states in what we think has been a very successful, though a very difficult and prolonged period of statesmanship and diplomacy” (Vogt, 1992). Lieutenant General Teddy Allen, the Director of the US Security Assistance Agency, visited the ECOMOG headquarters and applauded them by saying, “the World owed ECOMOG a debt of gratitude for rendering service above and beyond the normal call of duty” (Vogt, 1992). President George Bush of USA with the endorsement of the Senate and House of Representative praised President Babangida for his efforts to resolve the Liberian conflict (Vogt, 1992).

The success of ECOMOG, led by Nigeria, cannot be overemphasised given the peace it brought back to Liberia, which brought Nigeria a lot of regard and respect internationally and confirmed its leadership role in the sub-Region. Although it cost the country material wealth and men, it was one of the sacrifices the country had to make to be a regional power and be successful in its defence policy objective.

External defence system and the Nigerian armed forces

The primary function of the armed forces of the Federal Republic of Nigeria is to defend the physical territorial integrity of the country and its people (Imobighe, 1989). The Babangida’s administration completed the reformation and reorganisation started by Obasanjo’s government.

During Babangida’s regime, Nigeria witnessed unprecedented military training and courses at home and abroad for the Armed forces personnel, thus improving its quality and modernisation. The administration pushed for modernisation in equipment and weaponry, which led to the procurement of new materials and the service and maintenance of the old equipment (Okolo, 2000). The administration established the Nigerian Army Resettlement Centre (NARC) and National Reserved Mobilisation Scheme (NRMS) that dealt with retiring armed forces personnel and the personnel that remained in the strategic reserve (Imobighe, 1989). According to Bali, (1986, p.9), the Minister of Defence, the strength of the armed force was reduced from 150 000 to 120 000 to improve quality in personnel and effectiveness. He notes that, “Emphasis was now laid on a medium-size, effective, disciplined, educated and well-equipped armed forces than large, illiterate, ignorant and ill-equipped armed forces that lack discipline”.

Another critical innovation made by the administration towards the growth of the armed forces was the establishment of the National Guard. The Babangida administration decided after the first threat analysis and the review of the nation’s defence policy in 1988 that the armed forces was established, trained and equipped for large-scale campaign, the type needed for a full-scale invasion or defensive war but developed no capability for small-scale operations like commando operations with swift and effective action and results (Ndiomu, 1996). These led to the establishment of the National Guard, which was under a commander that reported directly to the Commander-in-Chief. The primary purpose or use was for the protection of the strategic installations in the country and quick response to terrorism, mercenaries or commando invasion of any part of the country. Another important reason was that the Nigerian police were not equipped and trained to handle some internal uprisings, so also was the Nigerian army (Ndiomu, 1996). These were the reasons



for the establishment of such a force specially trained and equipped for specific responsibilities. The National Guard, which was mainly a counter-terrorist force, was described as people “who are supposed to be endowed with certain intrinsic capabilities, such as mental and physical stability, secrecy, speed, adaptability and above-average intelligence higher than the men of regular military units” (Nweze, 1990, p.3). The USA has the Marines, Britain has Special Air Service (SAS), Israel has Sayret Matkals, France has Gigenne, Germany has Grenzschutzgruppe 9 (Border Protection Group 9 – GSG9), and the Dutch have the Royal Marines. Nigeria needed a similar special force.

Regarding tactical doctrine and strategic planning, the administration made much impact on the Nigerian Defence Policy. To effectively handle and implement the new tactical doctrine and strategic planning, the Nigeria Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) was established as the think tank of the military. It was after this that the first-ever threat analysis was made in Nigeria’s defence policy. Votti defined doctrine as “a body of theory which describes the environment within which the armed forces must operate and prescribe the methods and circumstances of the deployment” (Votti, 1974, p.3). Marshall Andrei Grechko (Grechko 1972, p.322), the former Defence Minister of the Soviet Union, defines military doctrine “as a national perspective, a product of national goals and objectives.” He argues that a nation’s doctrine must address the following issues:

1. Identification of the potential enemy and his capabilities
2. The sacrifices the country is willing to make and the price it is ready to pay in a possible war
3. The national aim and objectives and the force structure of the armed forces to be used in such a war
4. Military and political mobilisation policy, the means and methods to be used to prosecute a war
5. Assessment of threat and the determination of the military measures to counter the threat (Grechko 1972, p.322)

According to Henry Kissinger (1969, p.166), “It is the task of strategic doctrine to translate power into policy whether the goals of a state are offensive or defensive, whether it seeks to achieve or prevent transformation, its strategic doctrine must define what objectives are worth contending for and determine the degree of force appropriate for achieving them.” Summing up all these definitions, one can see that they are saying the same thing in different ways. Right from independence, Nigeria did not incorporate any strategic defence doctrine in her national interest until the coming of Babangida’s regime. For the first time, military commanders had what is known as the operational standing order. That is, the precise and exact action to take in case some things happened or in reaction to issues that are related to their command. Although the policy of Babangida’s administration might not conform entirely to the conditions laid down by Marshall Grechko and Kissinger, the effort was made to give the country the best it could afford at that time.

Babangida’s defence policy laid the effective institutional structure for the formulation of strategic, tactical doctrines that were to form the structure and use of the armed forces (Osobie, 1988). The office of the Chief of Defence Staff was consolidated and expanded to provide an adequate umbrella



for effective strategic planning and action. The strategic defence planning and tactical doctrine introduced to the Nigerian armed forces by the regime might not be perfect or what is expected from a country like Nigeria, but it was an improvement and a step in the right direction.

Defence procurement and Defence Industries Corporation

The issue of procurement was an area that the Babangida administration tried to sanitise in Nigeria's defence policy. According to Amin, (1998, p.25), "there were two dimensions to acquisition in the armed forces: procurement and production". Procurements dealt directly with buying or purchasing directly from many factories that were mostly foreign, while production related directly to the capabilities and the use of Defence Industries Corporation (DIC). Right from independence in 1960, Nigeria has depended mainly on procurement (importation) of military hardware and software, mostly from Britain and other Western countries. The situation did not change until the outbreak of civil war in 1967 when Britain and the Western allies refused to sell some categories of weapons to Nigeria. This forced Nigeria to turn to the Communist Bloc for weapons that were used to prosecute the war (Amin, 1998).

The civil war caused Nigeria's procurement policy to change from single client policy to multi-client policy. Nigeria now possessed two different types of military hardware, one from the Western capitalist bloc and another from the former Eastern communist bloc (Amin, 1998). The situation continued even during the time of Babangida's regime. Babangida's administration organised a procurement pattern that conformed to its defence policy and threat perception. Weapons and materials were no longer acquired randomly without due process and due consideration to the national interest and objectives. The inter-service rivalry was eliminated on weapons and other hardware procurement (Amin, 1998). Before the three-armed services headed by the Chief of Army Staff, Chief of Naval Staff and Chief of Air Staff usually channelled their demands directly to the Minister of Defence, but Babangida's administration changed it and made the three-armed services to send their demands to the Chief of Defence Staff who vetted and made final recommendations to the Defence Minister for proper harmonisation before budget consideration and final approval (Amin, 1998). This helped considerably in proper coordination, harmonisation, and prioritisation to conform to the defence policy and national interest.

The Babangida administration also introduced weapons and ammunition standardisation to eliminate a situation whereby troops under the same command had different weapons and ammunition utterly different from their colleagues (Ibrahim, 1988). With the fall of communism, the administration decided to concentrate on the Western powers for its weapons procurement. Emphasis was laid on repairs of weapons instead of procurement; new procurement was allowed only under extraneous circumstances (Amin, 1998). The role of intermediaries or defence contractors was abolished and the country decided to buy directly from manufacturers.

The administration encouraged the local manufacture of military hardware for the armed forces. DIC, which was established in 1964, has never been utilised for hardware acquisition. It has been entirely neglected in favour of procurement (Ibrahim, 1998). The Babangida administration did not



do much to change the situation, but at the same time, its efforts in DIC was far above what other administrations have done. An attempt was made to encourage research and development of local weapons production through DIC; an attempt was also made to encourage indigenous repairs of the hardware acquired through procurement (Ibrahim, 1998). Despite its failure to ultimately develop DIC, the Babangida administration was still praised on DIC: "Apart from the first republic that established DIC, it is only the Babangida regime that has shown strong determination to put it on a good footing as a complement to weapons procurement" (Amin, 1998).

Defence budget

There was no significant difference between Babangida's overall defence budget and that of his predecessors. Right from independence, the defence budget has always received a substantial percentage of the total federal budget. This did not change much with the Babangida regime. Regarding allocation, the defence budget always came among the top three competing mostly with education, agriculture and health (see Appendix 1 for details). The only noticeable difference in policy change was that the three heads of the armed forces, army, navy and airforce now channelled their various demands to the Chief of Defence Staff for proper harmonisation and control instead of each one sending theirs to the Ministry of Defence directly (Imobighe, 1987).

Imobighe (1987) argues that "Even though the vast amount was always budgeted on defence, most of the allocation always goes to recurrent expenditure and welfare for the officers and men at the expense of capital expenditure for military hardware and software". Babangida's regime did not do much to change the situation. Despite all its attempts to present a well-articulated and planned budget, the administration lacked financial discipline. Cars were purchased and given to officers of the armed forces, but it was never reflected in the defence budget of the government (Imobighe, 1987). Also, ECOMOG expenditure of more than eight billion US dollars was never reflected in the federal defence budget throughout that period (*The Nigerian Tribune*, 9 October 1999). Apart from not being reflected in the defence budget, the amount was not reflected in the federal government budget, even as a security vote. Such action was not useful for strategic planning and the administration of defence policy. The defence budget was an area where the Babangida administration had challenges, particularly in implementation and transparency.

Relationship between the foreign and defence policies and their impact

It is agreed by scholars, experts, and defence personnel such as (Osuntokun, 2000), (Akinyemi, 1980), (Aluko, 1988), (Garba, 1981), (Oyebanjo, 1989), (Jackson and Sorensen, 2003), (Sutch and Elias, 2007), (Webber and Smith, 2002), (Ojanen, 2006), (Smith, 2003), (Palmer, 1990) and many others that foreign and defence policies are interrelated and somehow defence policy is an integral part of foreign policy. For the success of all, one cannot be separated from the other – they go hand in hand. According to Okolo (2000, p.162), "defence policy is that aspect



of foreign policy that deals with the national security because it deals with the very survival of the nation; it is the most important aspect of foreign policy.” He also goes further to say that “it is the branch of foreign policy which not only anticipates the antagonistic dimensions of inter-state relations but rationalized and prepared the nation’s resources especially the military component to ensure the national objective.” For a nation to be prosperous in her foreign and defence policies, the two must be adequately harmonised for maximum results (Okolo, 2000). The success of any foreign policy must be backed by a corresponding defence policy to make it credible.

The defence policy of a country should be the backbone from which the foreign policy derived its strength. The inability of Nigeria’s foreign policy to derive its strength entirely from the defence policy is a minus for the country. The foreign and defence policies of Nigeria based on the Concentric Circle Theory and the Mutual Collective Defence and Security Systems on the West African sub-region correspond with each other, and the foreign policy is adequately backed by the country’s defence policy and capability. However, the same cannot be said about Nigeria’s relations with South Africa, which happened to be one of the main areas of possible threat at that time because of its stance on apartheid (Okolo, 2000). The policy towards regional power status was supported by a clear military doctrine, which was communicated to her neighbours, but the foreign policy towards South Africa could not be backed by corresponding defence policy. Even if the country could back it up with a defence policy, it lacked the military capability to implement it (Amin, 1998).

Although this situation did not start with Babangida’s regime, it has been the case since independence. Nigeria’s foreign policy since independence, which was anchored in Africa as the ‘centrepiece,’ was never backed up with sound defence policy. All of Nigeria’s donations and contributions to fighting apartheid and colonialism in Africa could not be supported by any credible defence policy, which made the country’s activities and speeches look like mere ranting. However, Babangida at least succeeded in giving the country a defence backing to its foreign policy towards her immediate neighbours and the West African sub-region. A good example was the ECOMOG Peacekeeping Operations (Olowo-Ake, 1996). Good or bad, the foreign and defence policies’ thrust of Babangida’s regime one way or the other affected the nation positively and negatively. The impact was felt politically, economically and socio-culturally.

The general impact

Politically, the most significant impact the foreign and defence policies of Babangida’s regime had on Nigeria was the success of the Concentric Circle Policy and the Mutual Collective Defence and Security System. Nigeria, leading other countries to solve Liberia’s problem, projected Nigeria as a regional power and confirmed its leadership in the West African sub-region. The ECOMOG peacekeeping and later peace enforcement troops served as a deterrence to any country in the West Africa sub-region that wants to disturb the peace of the area. This showed president Babangida as a confident president projecting his nation’s power abroad (Vogt, 1992).

Since foreign and defence policies reflect the domestic policies or situation of a country,



Babangida's policies portrayed Nigeria as a country with a strong domestic base. The policies attracted attention and respect to Nigeria internationally; encomium and praises were showered on Nigeria and Babangida for his leadership role in ECOMOG peacekeeping operations (Vogt, 1992). For the first, time defence and foreign policies were harmonised concerning the West African sub-region. It enabled Nigeria to successfully project its military power outside its territory and showed that "a little bit of sabre-rattling does no regional power any harm as long as this ultimate weapon of diplomacy is rarely and wisely used" (Osuntokun, 2000).

The two policies also reduced the level of threat posed to the country by some of her immediate neighbours, particularly Cameroon and Equatorial Guinea (Vogt, 1992). It made the countries in the sub-region realise that Nigeria was the main force to be reckoned with and its feelings on any issue cannot be ignored. The policies increased the influence and prestige of Nigeria in the sub-region and the whole of Africa. The policies also helped the troops to keep in shape and get acquainted with modern tactics and warfare strategy. It allowed some soldiers to have combat and field experience; most had not tasted battle before ECOMOG (Vogt, 1992). It made Nigeria acquire new military hardware, update her equipment, and see the inadequacies in her armed forces.

The two policies that led to the deployment of troops to restore peace in Liberia also had a negative effect in the West African sub-region. It led to the coup d'état and change of governments in Gambia in 1994 and Sierra Leone in 1996. Both Lieutenant Yahaya Jammeh of the Gambia and Captain Valentine Strasser of Sierra Leone were part of ECOMOG troops on routine rotation who decided to use the military and field exposure to take over their home governments (Olowo-Ake, 1996).

The effect of economic diplomacy was positive on the country because of the foreign investment it attracted and helped in the rescheduling of the country's debt. However, at the same time, the economic diplomacy went along with the internal economic reforms recommended by the western powers and the world financial institutions they control. The introduction of the structural adjustment programme, devaluation of the currency, removal, and reduction of subsidies on essential commodities, streamlining the civil service (retrenching) had a devastating effect on the poor masses of the country who never supported it. (Mimiko, 1995). The ECOMOG operations cost the nation more than eight billion U.S. dollars and more 500 Nigerian soldiers lost their lives, excluding other material inputs that cannot be quantified. (Olowo-Ake, 1996). Granted, it was for the success of well-articulated foreign and defence policies, but how the fund was disbursed lacked transparency. A substantial part of the money went into the pocket of corrupt officials. Some said it was the price of being a regional power, but there should be accountability on the source of the fund and how it was spent. A substantial part of it would have solved many problems in the country.

The social impact of the policies could be seen in the influx and acceptance of refugees into the country, which one way or the other increased the pressure on the inadequate social amenities available to the populace (Olowo-Ake, 1996). Lives were lost by both soldiers in active service and innocent Nigerians living in Liberia. Many soldiers came back with the HIV virus and some even with full-blown AIDS, which increased its spread in the country (Vogt, 1992). Finally, the loss of lives led to an increase in the number of orphans.



Conclusion

In conclusion, one can see clearly that there was a complete change of focus in the foreign and defence policies of Babangida's regime. The previous policy preoccupation with political issues such as African unity, anti-colonialism and opposition to apartheid was jettisoned and replaced with policies such as economic diplomacy, environmental issues, and concept of medium powers. The Technical Aid Corps also had pride of place in Nigeria's foreign policy. The focus of the defence policy changed to the mutual collective defence and security system based on the Concentric Circle, which also supported the foreign policy.

Summing up all these together, one can say that Babangida's foreign and defence policies were successful. The administration gave the two policies a new direction from their stagnant and moribund positions. For the first time in Nigeria's history, the whole foreign and defence policies were overhauled for proper articulation and redefinition, which projected Nigeria internationally as a respected regional power to be reckoned with. If one compares the policies under Babangida to those of his predecessors, it would be clear that his administration performed better than the ones before him on foreign and defence policies.

One of the reasons for these achievements was the choice of his officials who handled these policies. President Babangida chose to work with intellectuals and scholars of high integrity who assisted him in formulating and implementing these policies. He also allowed his ministers a free hand in the running and operation of their various ministries. Osuntokun (2000) argues that "One of the hallmarks of the Babangida administration was the freedom and latitude ministers were given to shape the affairs of their ministries."

Finally, while reassessing the foreign and defence policies of Babangida's administration, it is concluded that it might be a failure in other policies but not in the areas of foreign and defence policies where there were obvious successes. Even though there were lapses and shortcomings in the foreign and defence policies, the overall performance was successful, and it was a step in the right direction for other administrations to follow.

Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to Professor Akinjide Osuntokun for reading and making suggestions in all the different versions of the article.

References

Newspapers and other publications

- Editorial Opinion. (1988, October 16). Gowon and the 8th Kampala OAU Summit. *The Sunday Guardian, Lagos*, p.2
- Editorial Opinion. (1999, October 9). ECOMOG and Transparency. *The Nigerian Tribune, Ibadan*.
- Editorial Opinion. (2000, October 1). Termination of Indigenisation Decree. *The Sunday Concord, Lagos*.
- Budget Speeches of Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1986-92*, Federal Office of Statistics, Lagos, and Federal Ministry of Information Abuja.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica (2019). *Ibrahim Babangida* revised and updated by Amy McKenna. Accessed on 2 June 2020.

Mr. Prime Minister. (1964). Nigeria National Press for the Federal Ministry of Information.
Nigeria at the United Nations: A Partnership for a Better World. (1991). Lagos: Federal Ministry of External Affairs, Third Press Publishers.
The 1995 Yearbook of Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (1995). London: Oxford University Press.

Articles and book chapters

- Aderinto, A.A. (1990). *Defence Budgeting and Management* in Ekoko, E.A. and Vogt, M.A. Nigeria's Defence Policy: Issues and Problems, Lagos: Malthouse Press Limited.
- Olukoshi, A. (1990). Sports and Foreign Policy: Nigerian Decision to Boycott the 1985 Edinburgh Commonwealth Games Revisited in Olusanya, G.O. and Akindele, R.A. (eds.) *The Structure and Process of Foreign Policy Making and Implementation in Nigeria 1960-1990*, Ibadan: Vantage Publishers.
- Falode, A. (2019). The Military and Nation Building in Nigeria: The General Ibrahim Babangida Regime, 1985-1993', *International Letters of Social and Humanities Studies*, Vol. 85, No. 37.
- Fawole, A. (1995). The Military and the Democratisation Process in Nigeria under the Babangida Regime, in Mimiko, N. (ed.) *Crises and Contradictions in Nigeria's Democratization Program 1986-1993*, Akure: Stenbak Ventures.
- Okolo, A. (2000). Harmonisation of Foreign and Defence Policies in Adeniji, O. (ed.), *Essays on Nigeria's Foreign Policy, Governance and International Security*, Ibadan: Dokun Publishing House.
- Grechko, A. (1990). cited in Ekoko, A.E. and Vogt, M.A. (eds.) *Nigeria's Defence Policy: Issues and Problems*, Lagos, Malthouse Press Limited.
- Nweze, C.C. (Rt. Gen.) (1990). Instruments of National Security and an Alternative Force in Ekoko, E.A. and Vogt, M.A. *Nigeria's Defence Policy: Issues and Problems*, Lagos: Malthouse Press Limited.
- Ake, C. (1995). Is Africa Democratising? in Mimiko, N. (ed.) *Crises and Contradictions in Nigeria's Democratization Program 1986-1993*, Akure: Stenbak Ventures.
- Dipo Kolawole, 'Problems of democratisation at local government level: a personal experience', in Nazeem Mimiko, ed. *Crises and contradictions in Nigeria's democratization program 1986-1993*, (Akure: Stenbak Ventures, 1995).
- Iyayi, F. (1989). The Trouble with Babangida, *Index on Censorship*, No. 2. Benin: Index on Censorship.
- Palmer, G. (1990). Alliance Politics, and Issue Areas: Determinants of Defense Spending. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 34, No. 1.
- Ajayi, G. (1995). Babangida's Transition Programme, 1986-1993, in Mimiko, N. (ed.) *Crises and Contradictions in Nigeria's Democratization Program 1986-1993*, Akure: Stenbak Ventures.
- Ojanen, H. (2006). The EU and Nato: Two Competing Models for a Common Defence Policy, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 44, No. 1.
- Kissinger, H. (2000). Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy. New York: Norton Library, 1969. Cited from Olu Adeniji (ed.), *Essays on Nigeria Foreign Policy, Governance, and International Security*, Ibadan: Dokun Publishing House.
- Babangida, I. (1985). Nigerian Armed Forces Role in Combating Internal Threats: Available Options, *Defence Strategy Review*, Vol. 11, No.10.
- Ihonvbere, J.O. (1995). Is Democracy Possible in Africa?, in Mimiko, N. (ed.) *Crises and Contradictions in Nigeria's Democratization Program 1986-1993*, Akure: Stenbak Ventures.
- Ajayi, K. The 1993 presidential election and nation building in Nigeria, in Nazeem Mimiko, ed. *Crises and Contradictions in Nigeria's Democratization Program 1986-1993*, (Akure: Stenbak Ventures, 1995).
- Bamikole, L.O. (1995). The Babangida Regime: Violence in the Service of Power, in Mimiko, N. (ed.) *Crises and Contradictions in Nigeria's Democratization Program 1986-1993*, Akure: Stenbak Ventures.
- Smith, M. (2003). The Framing of European Foreign and Security Policy: Towards a Post-modern Policy Framework?' *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 10, No. 4.



- Mimiko, N. (1995). The Relative Impact of Internal and External Constraints on the Democratic Process in Africa: The Case of Nigeria', in Mimiko, N. (ed.) *Crises and Contradictions in Nigeria's Democratization Program 1986-1993*, Akure: Stenbak Ventures.
- Olusanya, G.O. (1986). Perspective on Strategic Stability and Mutual Security by the year 2000, *Disarmament* Vol. 2, No. 9, Summer.
- Osobie, A. (1988). The Theoretical and Doctrinal Foundations Nigeria's Defence Policy, *Nigerian Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 8.
- Votti, P.R. (1992). An Essay on Military Doctrine and Corporative Defence Policy, London: University Press, 1974, cited in Vogt, M.A. *The Liberian Crises and ECOMOG: A Bold Attempt at Regional Peace Keeping*, Lagos: Gabumo Publishing Company.
- Adejumobi, S. (1995). The Structural Adjustment Programme and the Transition to Civil Rule Project in Nigeria, 1986-1993, in Mimiko, N. ed. *Crises and Contradictions in Nigeria's Democratization Program 1986-1993*, Akure: Stenbak Ventures.
- Ibrahim, S. (1988). Nigerian National Values and Interest, *The Eagle*. Lagos: Nigerian Armed Forces Publications.
- Miller, T.B. (1981). Alliance in the 1970s and 1980s: Problems of Cohesion and Effectiveness in O'Neil, T. and Horner, D.M. (eds.), *New Directions in Strategic Thinking*, London: Allen and Unwin.
- Unpublished papers and theses*
- Osuntokun, A. (2000). *Nigeria's Foreign Policy during the Babangida Years*, the text of a lecture delivered at The I.B.B. Years Conference, Jos.
- Ndiomu, C. (Rt. Gen.). (August 1990). *25 years of Nigeria's Foreign Policy and Nigerian Defence Policy since Independence*, Lecture delivered at the National Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies, Jos.
- Bali, D. (Rt. Gen.). (11 March 1986). *The National Defence Policy of Nigeria*, Lecture delivered at the University of Jos.
- Gray, D.M. (1965). The Foreign Policy Process in the Emerging African Nation: Nigeria, PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Ekoko, E.A. (April 1990). *The Principles and Practice of Alliance Formation and Nigerian Defence*, Seminar paper presented at the Nigerian Defence Academy, Kaduna.
- Babangida, I. (Rt. Gen.) (October 1990). The Imperative Features of Nigerian Foreign and Defence Policy and The Liberian Crises. Press conference in Lagos.
- Babangida, I. (Rt. Gen.) (15 March 1985). Defence Policy within the Framework of National Planning, Lecture delivered on the occasion of the Gold Medal Public Affairs Series at Eko Hotel, Lagos.
- Babangida, I. (Rt. Gen.) (August 1985). Sound Defence Policy and Nigeria's Foreign Policy Objectives, Lecture given to head of Nigerian Missions Abroad at NIPSS, Jos.
- Adekanye, J.B. (2005). Reforming the Character of the Civil-military Relations for Democratic Governance in Nigeria after 1999, Unpublished lecture series.
- Adekanye, J.B. (1993). Military Occupation and Societal Stratification, Unpublished lecture series.
- Tukur, M. (1965). *United Nations as a Format and Policy Medium in the Conduct of Foreign Policy*, MSc thesis, University of Pittsburgh.
- Buhari, M. (Rt. Gen.) (December 1984). *25 years of Nigeria's Foreign Policy*, Speech delivered at Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos.
- Oyebanjo, D.D. (1989). A viable Defence Policy for Nigeria, Paper submitted to the Army Faculty, Command and Staff College, Jaji, Kaduna.
- Abacha, S. (Rt. Gen.). (15 December 1992). *The National Defence Policy of Nigeria*, Lecture delivered at The National War College, Lagos.
- Vogt, M.A. (1985). Nigerian Defence Policy: A Framework for Analysis, Paper presented at the NIIA on the 25 Years of Nigeria Foreign Policy, Lagos, December

Books

- Ate, B.E. and Akinterinwa, B.A. (eds.) (1992). *Nigeria and Its Immediate Neighbours: Constraints and Prospects of Sub-Regional Security in the 1990's*, Lagos, Pumark Publishers.
- Agbese, D. (2012). *Ibrahim Babangida: The Military, Politics and Power in Nigeria*, London: Adonis and Abbey Publishers.
- McDikkoh, D. (2010). *The Nigerian Health System Debacle and Failure*, Bloomington: Xlibris Corporation.
- Ekoko, E.A. and Vogt, M.A. (eds.) (1990). *Nigeria's Defence Policy: Issues and Problems*, Lagos: Malthouse Press Limited.
- Olusanya, G.A. and Akindele, R.A. (eds.) (1990). *The Structure and Process of Foreign Policy Making and Implementation in Nigeria 1960-1990*, Ibadan: Vantage Publishers.
- Obiozor, G.A. (1992). *Basic Issues in Nigeria's Foreign Policy: I.B.B's Foreign Policy Pronouncements 1988-1991*, Lagos: NIIA.
- Obiozor, G.A. (1992). *Nigeria Foreign Policy in Perspective: Admiral Augustus Aikhomu's Foreign Policy Statements (1987-1992)*, Lagos: NIIA.
- Obiozor, G.A. (1994). *The Politics of Precarious Balancing: An Analysis of Contending Issues in Nigeria Domestic and Foreign Policy*. Lagos: NIIA.
- Amin, L.S. (1998). *Nigeria's Weapon Procurement Process: Its Implication for Her Defence Policy*, Lagos: NIIA.
- Vogt, M.A. (1992). *The Liberian Crises and ECOMOG: A Bold Attempt at Regional Peace Keeping*, Lagos: Gabumo Publishing Company.
- Mimiko, N. (1995). *Crises and Contradictions in Nigeria's Democratization Program 1986-1993*, Akure: Stenbak Ventures.
- Adeniji, O. (ed.) (2000). *Essays on Nigerian Foreign Policy, Governance, and International Security*, Ibadan: Dokun Publishing House.
- Sutch, P. and Elias, J. (2007). *International Relations: The Basics*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Akindele, R.A. and Ate, B.E. (eds.) (2000). *Selected Readings on Nigerians Foreign Policy and International Relations*, Ibadan: Vantage Publishers.
- Jackson, R. and Sorensen, G. (2003). *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*. Second Edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Imobighe, T.A. (1987). *Nigerian Defence and Security: Issues and Options*, Lagos: Macmillan Publishers.
- Imobighe, T.A. (1989). *Nigerian Defence and National Security Linkages: Framework of Analysis*, Ibadan, Heinemann Publishers.
- Okafor, V.A. (2006). *Road Map for Understanding African Politics, Leadership, and Political Integration in Africa*, New York and London: Routledge.
- Vogt, M.A. (1992). *The Liberian Crises and ECOMOG: A Bold Attempt at Regional Peace Keeping*, Lagos, Gabumo Publishing Company.
- Banjo, W.S. (1997). *Nigeria: Political Violence in the Third Republic*, Los Angeles: Afreb Publishers.
- Abiola, Z.D. (1999). *From Abubakar to Abubakar: 40 Years of Nigerian's Foreign Policy*, Abuja: Newsbreak Communications Limited.



Appendix I

Nigeria's Defence Expenditure in Relation to the Total Federal Expenditure 1985-1993 in Millions of Naira

S/No	Fiscal Year	Total Federal Expenditure	Total Defence Expenditure	Defence as % of the Total Expenditure
1.	1960/6	181 132 000	10 538 000	5.8
2.	1961/62	109 240 215	4 048 098	3.7
3.	1962/63	152 808 828	8 819 172	5.57
4.	1963/64	169 466 470	9 696 209	5.72
5.	1964/65	383 941 372	24 699 302	6.43
6.	1965/66	428 721 870	29 189 224	6.8
7.	1966/67	383 482 000	33 994 000	8.6
8.	1967/68	445 389 836	107 503 992	24.14
9.	1968/69	503 381 318	162 622 560	32.3
10.	1969/70	845 230 000	359 910 000	42.6
11.	1970/71	928 417 812	314 846 094	33.9
12.	1971/72	1 417 138 022	285 895 214	20.2
13.	1972/73	1 740 289 870	370 253 689	21.3
14.	1973/74	2 167 728 504	435 638 000	19.85
15.	1974/75	2 625 000 000	532 918 000	10.13
S/No	Fiscal Year	Total Federal Expenditure	Total Defence Expenditure	Defence as % of the Total Expenditure
16.	1975/76	5 600 000 000	1 166 699 000	11.99
17.	1976/77	7 441 557 000	1 037 111 000	14.14
18.	1977/78	7 159 618 000	695 906 000	9.8
19.	1978/79	12 015 194 000	1 304 659 000	10.83
20.	1979/80	9 500 000 000	1 122 000 000	11.80
21.	1980/81	11 323 000 000	989 396 000	8.7
22.	1981/82	12 279 579 000	1 139 169 000	10.74
23.	1982/83	9 784 985 000	1 112 522 000	11.36
24.	1983/84	10 655 000 000	1 178 925 000	11.06
25.	1984/85	10 608 000 000	1 165 900 000	9.4

Source: Aderinto, A.A. (1990). *Defence Budgeting and Management* in Ekoko, E.O. and Vogt, M.A. Nigeria's Defence Policy: Issues and Problems, Lagos: Malthouse Press Limited.

S/No	Fiscal Year	Total Federal Expenditure	Total Defence Expenditure	Defence as % of the Total Expenditure
26.	1985	11 269 000 000	921 100 000	7.85
27.	1986	11 281 732 000	907 658 060	7.83
28.	1987	17 506 929 000	809 979 609	4.36
29.	1988	24 365 232 330	1 270 000 000	5.21
30.	1989	30 170 057 120	1 267 288 410	4.21
31.	1990	39 075 000 000	2 294 000 000	4.93
32.	1991	38 666 000 000	2 380 000 000	9.05
33.	1992	27 594 000 000	3 004 000 000	9.80
34.	1993	21 016 000 000	2 690 000 000	12.80

Source: Compiled from the *Budget Speeches of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1986-1993* by the Federal Office of Statistics (Lagos) and the Federal Ministry of Information (Abuja).

