

**RE-THINKING FOREIGN POLICY IN THE NEW WORLD
ORDER: IMPLICATIONS FOR NIGERIA'S FOREIGN
POLICY**

O. B. C. Nwankwo*

Abstract

From a purely theoretical perspective this paper examines the concept and content of foreign policy. It identifies the traditional characteristics of that concept which are today being challenged by globalisation. The paper undertakes a prognostic analysis of the impact of globalisation for the concept and content of foreign policy and within that framework reconceptualises it. Implications of this re-conceptualisation for Nigeria's foreign policy are finally drawn.

* (PhD), Dept of Political Science, Anambra State University

Introduction

Foreign policy is a very complex phenomenon. It is usually associated with high level politics among government officials. It is, therefore, not immediately and ordinarily within the purview of the ordinary citizen. The citizens only see its output: appointment and reception of diplomats, negotiations and signing of agreements, deployment or engagement of military, etc. Behind each of these activities lie foreign policy values, goals, principles, processes. Because of its complex character it is subject to many definitions. The spectrum of such definitions range from those containing only specific official activities and issues to those containing all official issues and activities in dealing with “strangers”. By “strangers” is meant entities beyond the borders of a State. That is to say, that for some, foreign policy is the policy of a State in conducting international politics, and yet for others it is a State’s international relations policy. In the former sense, foreign policy deals only with high politics of States. In the later sense, any decision or action which, to some appreciable extent, involves relations between one State and another is a foreign policy decision (Frankel, 1975).

The operative phrase above is “some appreciable extent”. Not every international relation or contact can be conceived as foreign policy. To be considered as such, it must be directly or tacitly directed by Government. Each Government acts and reacts in the best way it deems fit to achieve set objective/s. Over the past two decades, however, the capacity of each State to act alone towards others in the best way it perceives which is at the foundation of traditional conception of foreign policy, has continued to decline just as the State-centric view of international system and its territorial organisation of politics is being questioned. The new word is globalisation. At the latest since the 1980s, globalization has been one of the central buzzwords in social science discourse (Gerhards/Rössel 1999, 325). What is the implication of this transformation for the concept of foreign policy and what are the implications for Nigeria’s foreign policy. These two key questions define the focus of this paper.

Conceptualising Foreign Policy

If we bracket the semantics and substantive differentiations between international politics and international relations, (Cf. Nwankwo, 2008), we note that Foreign Policy as a field of study is located in the broader study field of International relations. Though it is not easy to get a one simple definition of the concept whether from practitioners or from scholars, it is necessary to have a clear definition that is also as comprehensive as possible. Rosenau (1974) for example conceives of foreign policy as authoritative actions taken by Governments or are committed to take in order either to maintain the desirable aspects of the international environment or to amend its undesirable aspects. It is necessarily calculated and goal-oriented, and it has unintended consequences which greatly affect the kind of adaptation that the society makes during a certain period of time; its initiation is purposeful. Rosenau's(1987) interpretation of foreign policy as reflecting the decisions of an individual, the deliberations of a committee, the outcome of a policy-making process, the sum of clashing interests of groups, the values of a dominant elite, the product of a society's aspirations, the reinforcement of a historical tradition, the response to an opportunity or challenge elsewhere in the world, though comprehensive is analytically inadequate for the study of Nigeria's or any other nation's foreign policy. It remains useful for indicating the various analytical layers of foreign policy. Add to this the innumerable definitions offered by innumerable scholars and the complexity of conceptualising it become more obvious, and most importantly is the question of determining analytically relevant ones.

With so many available definitions of foreign policy, how could one determine an analytically relevant one? To begin with, in order to arrive at such a desired analytically relevant definition, it is unnecessary and in fact impossible to examine each and every definition. On the contrary, a broad categorisation relative to the point of emphasis of international relations scholars can be undertaken. Definitions of various scholars can then be grouped and subsumed under each broad category. For instance, one could group all such definitions emphasising process under procedural definition category and those emphasising substantive issues under substantive definition or even a category that is a composite of both. Although this categorisation is an option, we don't intend to adopt it again because of its little analytical relevance. Instead, categorisation based on author's emphasis on three identifiable dimensions of the system of foreign policy, consisting of input-transformation process-output, will be adopted. Rosenau

(1976) had emphasised the need for this differentiation in the process of analysis of foreign policy to avoid confusion.

Along the line of input-transformation-output, three main clusters of definitions of foreign policy can be identified. The first sees foreign policy as a cluster of orientations, goals, principles that function as guidance for State officials when they are confronted with external conditions requiring them to make decisions and take actions. Foreign policy is defined by scholars under this cluster in terms of principles, goals or general objectives that guide the State in its relationship or interaction with similar entities abroad. Thus for Decay (1957), foreign policy is the formulation and implementation of a group of principles that shape the behaviour pattern of a State while negotiating with another State based on security and other vital interests. According to Lerche and Said (1979), it refers to the general principles by which a State governs its reactions to the international environment. Frankel (1975) sees it as the formulation of desired outcome which are intended to be consequent upon decision adopted by those who have the authority to commit the machinery of the State or a significant fraction of national resources to that end with a view to securing advantages in international relations. It spells out the Objectives State leaders have decided to pursue in a given relationship or situation, as well as the general means they intend to pursue those objectives (Goldstein, 2003).

We are thus in the realm of foreign policy when nations define goals or set targets they desire to achieve in their dealings with other similar entities or enunciate guidelines that will govern or governs their international relations. Understood as definition of goals or principles or statements of intent, foreign policy is part and parcel of national policy broadly understood as statement of intent that should guide action of authorized actors to ensure the protection of vital interests of State and society. Such statements are usually succinctly and sparsely conceptualised with key vital information shielded away from the public. In other words, what emerges to the public as a country's foreign policy are structured official statements which tend to guide the State's actions in the international system. Foreign policies are those general principles and tendencies that underlie the States behaviour in the international arena. Only expert analysis can bring out the practical import of such systematic statements. It encompasses everything from general policy orientations that persist over long periods to discrete decisions.

According to Anderson and Christol (1957), foreign policy is the formulation and implementation of a group of principles which shape the behavioural pattern of a State while negotiating with other States to protect or promote its vital interests. Two key words of this definition are *formulation and implementation*. They are process oriented encapsulating firstly the first cluster above, namely definition of principles and which focuses on the formulation of goals and objectives that should act as blueprint, or provide guide, for actions of States in the international arena (Cluster one). The second key word in their definition is implementation which implicates firstly choice of specific course/s of action. This is the second cluster of definitions which emphasises plans for action and real commitments including real strategies for the attainment of defined goals.

Such real decisions are taken as a result of translation of the cluster of orientations, values and principles into concrete action plans. Every foreign policy is a conscious choice among alternative courses of action and commitment thereto. Thus a nation that values democracy at home and abroad, may define democracy promotion as a key component or a principle or an objective, of her foreign policy. To this extent such a definition (democracy promotion) belongs to the first cluster, it remains an orientation. When, however, the nation decides and chooses to use force, or sanction as the case may be to compel the restoration of an ousted democratically elected regime in another country, like USA in the case of Haiti or ECOWAS in the case of Mali, it has gone step further: decision to select and implement a course or courses of action which is more concrete than the definition of goals or principle.

The important word above is decision. Decisions reached/taken by policy makers to implement concrete action are foreign policy decisions. Thus the second cluster of definitions encapsulates those definitions emphasising the processes of arriving at decisions to take specific action, to adopt specific strategy in commitment to principles. Deciding on the action implementation is more problematic than defining goals. This is because implementation decision incorporates decisions on instruments and strategies. In other words, decisions about instruments and strategies to be employed towards the attainment of objectives are much more difficult than defining the objectives. Under our second cluster of definitions, therefore, foreign policy can best

be understood in terms of strategies with which institutionally designated decision makers seek to manipulate the international environment in order to achieve certain national objectives (Chibundu, 2003). It is concerned with the process of making decision to follow specific courses of action (Rodee et al, 1983), the plan of action which the State adopts and is committed to. Commitment implicates the resolve to deploy national resources to the planned course of action. As a set of commitments and plans for action, foreign policy points to revealing strategies, real decisions, and observable policies which are taken when States get linked to their external environments. They consist not just of specific goals but above all means through which these are to be achieved. In other words, identifying the most effective means towards the attainment of defined goals is a foreign policy decision.

Implementation concretises policies and remains a critical variable in the definition of foreign policy. Yet the decision to implement must be distinguished from the actual implementation. Behind each observable action (to any ordinary person) like war, targeted assassination, imposing of sanctions, giving of aid, etc, are decisions which are less clearly observable. The third cluster encompasses such definitions that see foreign policy in terms of these observable behaviours of States like military deployment and engagement, economic sanction, giving of aid, etc. specifically taken to solve a problem, uphold some changes in the international environment or alter the behaviour of other States. It refers to concrete actions of national governments with respect to areas and objects lying beyond their territorial boundaries. According to Wilkenfeld et al (1980) foreign policy consists of official actions (one may add, and reactions) which sovereign States initiate for purposes of altering or creating a condition outside their sovereign boundaries. It is the empirical phase involving concrete steps and activities that follow the definition of goals (cluster 1), the translation of goals into real decisions (cluster 2) and observable behaviour which may be conflictive or cooperative (cluster 3).

Defining foreign policy only in terms of each of the dimensions above makes the definition very restrictive. The three dimensions can best be viewed as the tripod upon which any system of foreign policy rests and the concept is flexible enough as to accommodate them. Accordingly, foreign policy

- spells out the objectives that States through their leaders decide to pursue in a given relationship with entities outside their borders as well as
- the decision to commit the resources of the State towards the attainment of the objectives and
- the actual execution of the decision for the attainment of the defined objectives.

According to Legg and Morrison (1971), it is not only a set of explicit objectives with regard to the world beyond the borders of a given socio-political unit, but also encapsulates sets of strategies and tactics designed to achieve those objectives.

Even when some authors would want to define foreign policy only in terms of the observable behaviours, the observable behaviour of the State is a reflex or indeed, the output of her foreign policy. One can from the pattern of behaviour of the State get to the principles underlying them and in fact into the black box of the decision making process by the relevant actors. In other words, through the study of the behavioural patterns of the State one can arrive at the explanation for such behaviours: one would be able to understand why States do what they do. This type of study is located within the framework of foreign policy analysis and does not concern us here.

An element common to all the three clusters of definitions above is the centrality of the State in defining foreign policy. The definitions are conceptualised within the framework of neo-realist paradigm, which accepts a State-centric view of the international system. This theoretical framework makes sharp distinction between domestic and foreign domains with the instrumentality of national boundary. The organised structure of the domestic domain is contrasted with the anarchic structure of the international system. Foreign policies are specifically States' affairs (part and parcel of national policies) set against the background of ever changing and competitive international arena. It is an arena characterised by struggle for power (Morgenthau) whether as an end in itself or as a means for their security and prosperity. In fact national security is the paramount goal of foreign policy of States. To compete successfully in that arena, each State, including Nigeria sets her goals, orders her priorities, activates the governmental policy-making-machinery, and above all employ, deploy human and material resources and strategies in the efforts to maintain preferred arrangement of things and people abroad. That is to say that the definitions limit the concern of foreign policy to States' actions (and reactions) across States' boundaries (Okoli and Okoli, 1990).

The consequences of the clash of individual States' foreign policies are part of the study field of international politics. Realists characterise the States as unitary actors that interact and collide with each other in almost the same way. Foreign policy decisions are made in a "black box" in response to external sources. This again is common to all the definitions. How a State behaves (foreign policy behaviour) is determined by its relative power position within the international system. This relative power position is a function of distribution of power in the international system and which depends on the configuration of the elements of power.

Foreign Policy and the Challenge of Globalisation

Common to all the definitions above is the fact that non-State actors do not significantly matter, if at all in defining foreign policy. It is a State's affair as it relates with other States or similar entities like inter-State organisations and exacts demands on them on a variety of issues – social, economic, political, etc. Relative to its power position, the State decides and acts towards others in the best way it perceives. Let us refer such conceptualisations of foreign policy as "traditional" in essence. These conceptualisations are however increasingly being challenged today by globalisation. Driven mainly by capitalist economic expansionism and technological development, globalisation entails above all the gradual transformation of social relations from territorially bound forms of organisation, into what Schelte (2005) called "super-territoriality" or what others have referred to as "de-territorialisation of social life (Beisheim&Gregor, 1997). It can be broadly understood as "the extension of boundaries of social transactions beyond national borders" (Zangl/Zürn 1999, 140). Baumann, and Stengel, (nd) while observing that globalization is commonly seen as been driven mainly by economic developments and consequently most of the literature focuses on the economic aspects (e.g. Genschel 2003) insists that it should not be seen as one single homogenous process but as a number of related processes, encompassing economic, social, political and cultural aspects (Shaw 1997).

Globalisation implies the 'collapsing of the traditional State boundaries', 'the thinning down of the demarcation between foreign and domestic arenas', 'the denationalisation of governance', the emergence of new social and political spaces that are not attached to specific territories but based on networking of groups. A major and critical consequence of globalization is the convergence

of values. Important values such as democracy, representative government have increasingly been accepted and adopted as the world's shared values. This enables common experiences for a vast number of regions across the globe. State and non-State actors are defending and inculcating values like human rights, transparency, accountability, democracy, disarmament, environmental and other similar codes. It is noteworthy that these codes have today become barometers for measuring the legitimacy of even the internal (domestic) processes of the State as well as the goals that they pursue externally.

Held *et al*, (1999) advanced four concepts that would enable concise conceptual capturing of globalisation. The first is *extensity* which refers to the stretching of economic, social and political activities across borders. The second is *intensity* which refers to the growing magnitude of interconnectedness in various domains. The third is *velocity* which refers to the degree to which global interactions and processes are speeding up. The fourth is *impact* which assesses the effect of globalisation. Measured on all these parameters, it is apparent that significant changes are taking place in the traditional domains of both national and international politics on account of the extensity, intensity, the velocity and impact of globalisation.

The End of Foreign Policy?

What do these changes mentioned above portend for the concept and practice of foreign policy? By way of speculation, as the world gets smaller, is it possible today to think of notions of Foreign and Domestic - Us and Them as obsolete? Can we begin to contemplate the End of Foreign Policy, in much the same way that a few years ago, an eminent American academic concluded that History had ended with the resolution of the Cold War? Mark Leonard, Director, Foreign Policy Centre in the United States captured the emerging scenario succinctly:

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

According to Whiteclay (2000), "it is worth speculating that global conditions have changed so rapidly recently that traditional conceptions of foreign policy may be becoming anachronistic".

With the radical expansion of international trade, travel, and communications, the international system has become perhaps unprecedentedly interdependent, and there is little prospect that this “globalization” trend will reverse direction. Borders that traditionally have divided sovereign territorial States no longer separate and buffer them from external influences as in the past. As a result, the classic distinction between “domestic” and “foreign” policy is collapsing. If this trend continues, if “domestic” policy truly becomes “foreign” policy, and vice versa, then the very meaning of foreign policy—its goals and implementations—will require re-conceptualization

Already to people like Hill (2003) the traditional concept of foreign policy is being steadily emptied of content and rendered redundant. According to the new theory, traditional divisions between Domestic and Foreign Policies are no longer valid. They've been rendered obsolete by globalisation - the growth of economic, cultural and technological connections across State borders. In other words, by rendering distances increasingly meaningless and altering the importance of frontiers, globalisation has blurred the distinction between inside and outside that is central in the determination of the “foreign” in foreign policy. The traditional conception of foreign policy usually formulated within the borders of the States and implemented in the foreign arena of inter-State relations appears moribund. But how far can one argue this thesis?

Undeniable is the fact that globalisation is one of the greatest challenges facing the concept and content and indeed every other variable of foreign policy. Especially in the last two decades, nothing about foreign policy has remained the same. For instance, through the steady transferring of authority to non-State actors who now make and “enforce” decisions even on the States through the triple processes identified by Genschel and Zangl (2009) as internationalisation, privatisation and transnationalisation (IPT), foreign policy and the state itself, the traditional lone actor in foreign policy are being transformed. A few words on IPT will make the matter clearer. Genschel and Zangl used internationalisation to refer to the transfer of authority to international or supranational institutions under public law like UNO, AU, ECOWAS and EU – which is fast emerging as a supranational entity. Though these bodies were set up by sovereign States, they have, through various forces including spill over effects, come to increase the range of their powers, the areas in which they are involved, and as Keukeleire&Schunz (2008) observed even to the core areas of Statehood like security. Privatisation on the other hand refers to the transfer

of authority to private actors at the national level. Genschel and Zangl, argued that with growing privatisation the State sooner than later loses control over how and by whom certain organisational tasks are handled. Privatisation is presently in full swing in Nigeria and most third world nations. State's authoritative allocation of values, its power to determine who gets what when and how continues to dwindle. In most developed countries, there is virtually no area of domestic interest that private actors are not involved.

Transnationalisation on the other hand occurs when national non-State actors, especially organised associations and groups coalesce across border and regulate cross border exchanges. Many NGOs, MNCs, religious movements, epistemic communities, fit this definition. Amnesty International, Transparency International, Human Rights Watch, etc., are typical examples. These alongside other international regimes are daily increasing their decision making authorities as well as their cross-border organisational powers as to move even sovereign States in a specific direction. Problems like terrorism, organized crime, environmental problems, or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, which cannot be addressed unilaterally (Zangl/Zürn 2003) partly add impetus to transnationalization. Partly it is also due to non-State actors like NGOs and business firms, which pursue their interests abroad. These interests might be in line but might also conflict with States' interests. Since these actors are not territorially bound, regulating their behaviour often necessitates new inter- and transnational modes of governance, for instance in public policy networks (cf. Dingwerth 2003; Reinicke/Deng 2000).

It has been estimated that by the mid 1990s, that nearly 40,000 multi-national companies accounted for one fifth of the total global economy. There is also a sense that giant corporations such as Microsoft or Shell are beyond the control of any individual State. This gives ground for the transferring of authority. This feeling of powerlessness in the face of huge multi-national conglomerates helped fuel the violence of anti-globalisation demonstrations around the world, from Seattle to Genoa. The targets of the demonstrators' anger are international organisations like the G8 group, G 20, WTO and indeed all political and economic organisations involving the capitalist industrialised countries. Today the WTO is the only international organisation which deals with the global rules of trading between nations across the globe. Thus, constantly confronted with similar transnational problems, sovereign States are increasingly shifting

governance to the international arena. The conglomerate of all these formal and informal institutions, define today's global governance, understood as a "complex of formal and informal institutions, mechanisms, relationships, and processes between and among States, markets, citizens and organizations, both inter- and non-governmental, through which collective interests on the global plane are articulated, rights and obligations are established, and differences are mediated" (Weiss and Thakur, 2006). Increasingly also, the problems that confront foreign offices are of a new and intractable kind that do not respond to traditional diplomatic solutions. They range from HIV and AIDS, international drugs' trade, climate change, piracy, terrorism etc. affecting individual citizens directly and most of which are consequences of choices made by ordinary individuals on a daily basis.

Where does the traditional State and the traditional concept of foreign policy stand in the face all these? According to some schools of thought, the State, in spite of globalisation, is certainly not in a hurry to die. As long as the distinction between "WE" and "THEY" persists, as long as differences between groups of whatever dimension and configuration persist, and certainly for a very long time, foreign policy understood as an activity directed towards "others" to influence them along "our" desire may remain relevant. Arguing the above position, Keukeleire&Schunz (2008) contended that globalisation does not equal universalisation and that the differences between groups will continue to make foreign policy relevant. According to them, foreign policy does not vanish or become empty as such on account of globalisation rather it *transforms*. They reasoned that if liberal democracy and the free market economy consequent upon globalisation, become the dominant organising forms of social interaction in all parts of the world, not much would be left to negotiate about.

The important word above in Keukeleire&Schunz's (2008) thesis is "transforms". Understanding the nature and direction of this transformation is important to reconceptualising foreign policy. The transformative implication of the changes noted above for the concept and content of foreign policy is unravelling. It is increasingly becoming difficult to speak of foreign policy in the traditional sense of policies across boundaries. It is not so much the "foreign" that is necessarily bound to disappear but the "policy" (Keukeleire&Schunz, 2008) since the policies will be basically determined by international regimes. Practically all aspects of traditional foreign policy

are already regulated by one international regime or another. Indeed, many foreign policy initiatives of States today are already being channelled through such regimes which today serve more as international clearing houses. Threat to peace and the decision to go to war, for instance, lie with the Security Council while NATO has assumed the right to intervene militarily without regard to State sovereignty. States are worried about their ranking by Transparency International and make use of their ranking in dealing with each other.

If foreign policy “was” concerned with the processes of making decisions to follow specific courses of action (Rodee et al, 1983) which State leaders have decided to pursue across their borders, it may soon in essence be understood in terms of such States’ simply adjusting to the demands of international regimes. Foreign policy will then transform to “world’s domestic policy”. Nations will spend more time adjusting their own activities to the international environment, to the policies of international regimes. Though they may or may not have contributed in creating such regimes, they have wittingly or otherwise accepted their authority. The emerging importance of non-State actors and regimes that are impacting today on the overall form and dynamic of the international system, is in addition beginning to imply States’ adjusting their behavioural pattern, (relative to their power configurations) to the dictates of non-State actors. While individual Governments cannot control what these organisations do, their opinions can and do carry considerable weight. When Amnesty International questions a country's human rights policy, its voice is heard around the world. In other words, with globalisation the international arena has been made more complex through its domination by increasingly assertive non-State actors. Where once there were a few hundreds, now there are thousands of such organisations working across the world. This multiplicity of actors is a feature of contemporary foreign policy (Williams 2004). Within the context of this internationalised community in which transnational civil groups are banding together to define and defend their common objectives and values like human rights, environmental discipline, bound by the pursuit of such universal values and codes which, we noted earlier have become barometers, a definition of foreign policy need encapsulate the dealing with such non-State actors including organised criminal and terrorist gangs.

The corollary is equally significant. If nations are moved towards adjusting their behaviour to international regimes and less a matter of altering the behaviour of other States themselves, then the dominant issue for nations' foreign policy becomes that of creating and maintaining the kind of environment, the type of regime/s that are placid and conducive to them. This goes beyond the milieu goals of foreign policies of States which under the traditional concept aim at creating or maintaining a reasonably favourable international order but which has no room for non-State actors. It would imply rather the creating and shaping of structures, of regimes and influencing them as the key "surrogate actors". The United States of America is already using the UN and its agencies as well as NATO as such instruments. It tries in all instances to shape both the structure and direction of these organisations for instance, in line with its dictates. US usually punishes any recalcitrant organisation directly or indirectly. Thus when UNESCO voted to admit Palestine as a member against her foreign policy intent, USA immediately stopped its funding to the organisation. USA and other western countries are currently manipulating the International Atomic Energy Secretariat to deal with Iran as much as they are using the international criminal courts and other similar entities to deal with perceived "enemies" especially from the third world states. The president of Sudan Bashir has been indicted by the international criminal court while Saleh, the President of Yemen who has committed even more atrocities has been granted immunity from prosecution with the backing of USA. The rules of such organisations must usually be designed to suit the policy objectives of these powerful nations, and when not, as is currently the case with environmental matters, agreement is impossible.

Keukeleire and MacNauschtan (2008) used the novel concept of "structural foreign policy" to emphasise this current dominance of foreign policy with the quest for structures. Structures here refer to "relatively permanent organising principles and rules of the game that shape and order the political, legal, socio-economic and security fields". These according to them are usually made operational through complex organisational and institutional setups. Accordingly, they defined foreign policies as those policies which seek to influence or shape sustainable political, legal, socio-economic, security and mental structures that characterise not only States and inter-State relations, but also societies, individuals, relations between States and societies, and the international system as a whole.

One can generalize from the above that the strategy of strengthening international norms and institutions, not only on the bilateral and regional level but also globally, is the essence of today's foreign policy. This concept of foreign policy may have simply recomposed elements of the traditional concept by injecting new ideas into them without necessarily replacing them (cf. Keukeleire&Schunz, 2008). States for instance would remain. They will continue to pursue interests, even when no longer the central actor in the international arena. This is the logic of Realpolitik which determined the traditional understanding of foreign policy. According to this logic, foreign policy is something that a State and its machinery produce on behalf of a nation using all the instruments they can muster in competition with other similar actors. However, from our attempt to redefine foreign policy, not only are the states no longer central, and therefore foreign policy more than focusing on the interaction between countries, goes on to encapsulate non-State actors, while focusing on changing the very parameters within which such interaction takes place, devising new rules of the game internationally. Actors in the new foreign policy focus more on changing the rules of the game (regimes) as well as the playing field on which the game of foreign policy is played. We may not have reached this stage fully, but it is emerging.

Implications for Nigeria's Foreign

What is the implication of all the above for Nigeria's foreign policy? To begin with we reaffirm the growing recognition in many quarters that the machinery of today's foreign policy is not optimally designed to deal with the unique properties of an international environment that is rapidly being reconfigured in important respects by the information revolution, globalization, and the end of the Cold War. Over the past decade, global changes have unleashed pressures that render the international policy environment far more turbulent and complex than ever before. These pressures present new challenges as well as opportunities for Nigeria's foreign policy. Presently, devising and implementing optimal responses to the challenges will remain very difficult if not impossible for Nigeria. This is basically because the nation's foreign policy structures have not changed in tandem. Accordingly, there is the urgent need for organizational reform of the policy machinery.

Just as Drake and Metzl (2000) observed with regard to the United States, it would be useful to step back from the internal dynamics of one or the other lead agency, look at the bigger picture, and ask how well the entire ensemble of foreign policy-related structures fits with today's changing global environment. This is especially so because globalization has blurred the boundaries between domestic and foreign affairs. For instance, the fact today is that powerful capabilities are increasingly in the hands of governments and non-State actors around the world. In the new configuration, while the key State foreign policy apparatuses will remain central to any consideration of the foreign policy process, other domestic agencies including non-governmental ones with relevant expertise, stakes in policy outcomes, and direct involvement in international affairs need be involved in decision-making. Because the empowerment and behaviour of non-State actors will continue to alter some of the key dynamics of world politics by challenging the primacy of States and inter-State relations, creating the prerequisite environment for the emergence and development of the domestic private sector that can partake in the redistributing of both hard and "soft" (persuasive) power, with their counterparts is a necessity. Such will determine the capacity of Nigeria to contribute to global policy debates. The private sector could be in the field of economics, communication, culture, etc.

One of the fundamental consequences of democracy is the proliferation of non-State actors: civil society groups, business circles, academicians, etc. In conjunction with the unfolding of the democratic processes in the country, those non-State actors are becoming more exposed to issues under the domain of foreign policy. As their interests and knowledge of foreign policy-related issues increase, they give more attention to those issues and to persons and institutions involved in foreign policy making. Democracies recognize the contribution of the non-State actors to the formulation and implementation of national policies, including foreign policy. Under a framework for constructive participation, they should be able to contribute to the consensual definition of foreign policy goals. The State needs to listen to their wishes, and on the other hand, the non-State actors are to be supportive and offer constructive criticism of the State's policies. Nigeria must not be different here. Her foreign policy must be formulated and implemented under democratic dynamics. Foreign policy in the new millennium demands that it should be based upon as wide a consensus as possible. At the least practical level, this means that diplomacy will be effective if only backed by significant sectors of society in its broadest

meaning, while retaining for government the role of key player. The emerging significant role of non-State actors, including mafia and terrorists groups (including *Boko Haram sect*), and their world-wide networking in reshaping public affairs and attitudes to foreign relations unless responded to carefully and managed properly, will erode government's role as the key player of governance sooner or later. More specifically, it is important for Nigeria to start creating potential constituencies and social networks associated with specific issues.

Secondly, the outdated Information and Communications Technologies as well as rigid organizational culture that weaken decision making in the key ministries, require attention. Specifically the present organisational culture of frontline ministries makes it difficult to marshal the sorts of expertise that are needed to operate effectively in the new global environment. The increasing complexity of foreign issues encompassing social, economic, environmental and other non political issues, dealing with foreign policy problems requires multi-perspective or multi-functional solutions. The era of struggle between ministries and agencies over issues that fall within their respective competencies is over: the era of bureaucratic turf competition for relevance. The new watch word is inter-agency coordination even with those specifically designated as domestic, if the nation must formulate rapid and effective responses to new problems.

The relevance of such coordination even with domestic agencies may be debatable but it is based on the reality of the blurred distinction between domestic and international affairs today. The working of foreign relations should reflect the dynamic domestic needs and preferences of the nation. Therefore the ability to comprehend the important link between domestic issues and international affairs is very important in order to generate compatible policy and effective diplomacy particularly in this age of globalization. Making domestic policy compatible with international affairs should be the central issue of foreign policy making. This linkage is referred to as "intermestic affairs". This means that the nation's foreign policy should be able to address domestic issue while adjusting them to the international forum with the clear goal that foreign policy can be advantageous to domestic interests. To satisfy both spheres, domestic and international, requires a strong State and leadership.

Thirdly, Nigeria's foreign relations have been essentially a State to State affair in its implementation. By this we mean that the central focus is on the institutions of government that are chiefly responsible for the formulation and administration of foreign policy. Apart from the very little amount of interest in foreign policy on the part of the general public, the ineluctable requirements of secrecy imposed by the demands of national political and military strategies continue to hinder people participation. This is the traditional foreign policy which conceives foreign policy as State's use of capacities in order to influence others so as to promote goals. To it belongs also the occasional usage of international organisations like OAU (AU) in the pursuit of policies. In this new millennium the liberal, rationalist, democratic ideology, has to be made relevant in the nation's foreign policy formulation and implementation. This ideology is founded on the convictions that the people can make liberal and wise decisions in foreign policy once they are educated and that man could improve his political institutions and their policy outputs if he would only think about them intelligently. Through such people participation public values and common sense would be more freely admitted into policy-making circles, and "better" policies in form of responsible international participation will emerge.

Adapting Drake and Metz (2000), these in sum require of Nigeria that

- the best available expertise be brought into a given foreign policy problem.
- the various state and non-state actors dealing with international and transnational issues be coordinated
- the planning process be coordinated and developed to encourage proactive efforts to address and pre-empt future problems
- the private sector vitality be harnessed for the greater public good
- the culture, organization, and management of government foreign policy institutions be revitalized to match the dynamism of the non-state sector

All these new additions can well be articulated in the "Citizen Diplomacy" initiated by Yar'adua administration. The effort is to formulate a foreign policy which is able to play within all the four spheres of diplomacy simultaneously and in an integrative manner.

Conclusion

The structure of the global community is changing rapidly and this is impacting everything. With specific reference to concept and content of foreign policy, the direction of the slow but certainly irreversible change may sooner or later make the “foreign” in foreign policy redundant. This in itself has serious consequences for all nations including Nigeria. As the concept of 'foreign' becomes ever harder to define in future Foreign Ministries will become perhaps Departments of Global Affairs. In the process we will see an end to traditional foreign policy and the evolution of a new foreign policy for a world in which there is no longer any such place as abroad" (Mark Leonard, Director, Foreign Policy Centre). At the present, if only for purely administrative reasons, there will probably always be a division between governments' domestic and foreign agendas. But the trend of the past few years has been to play down that distinction. To adapt the sophistry of K. O. Mbadiwe, the traditional concept of foreign policy is the “Be(ing)” while the emerging concept is the “to come”?” Until the “Be(ing)” comes to “Become”, we can only acknowledge its gradual transformation more and more as a system of activities through which the State adjusts her behaviour to international and transnational regimes, and through which it attempts to change or actually changes (subject to power configurations) structures that compel adjustment of the behaviour of other States to conform. Nigeria needs to start now to build her capacities to remain relevant in the evolving scenario.

References

- Baumann, R. and Stengel, F (n.d.) "Globalization and Foreign Policy Analysis: Neglect of or Successful Adaption to Changing Political Practices?" http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/4/1/5/0/7/pages415075/p415075-38.php Downloaded 18/12/2011
- Beisheim, M., and Walter, G. (1997) "Globalisierung" - *Kinderkrankheit eines Konzeptes*. *Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen* 4 (1): 153-180.
- Chibundu, V. N (2003) *Foreign Policy, Ibandn: Spectrum*
- Dingwerth, K (2003), "Globale Politiknetzwerke und ihre demokratische Legitimation. Eine Analyse der Weltstaudammkommission", in: *Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen*, 10 (1), pp. 69-109
- Drake W.J. and Metz, J. (2000) "Rethinking Foreign Policy Structures" Carnegie Background Note for December 8-9, 2000 Conference, Airlie House, Warrenton, Virginia <http://www.carnegieendowment.org>
- Frankel, J. (1963) *The Making of Foreign Policy*, London: Oxford University Press
- Frankel, J (1975) *Britain's Foreign Policy*, London: Oxford University Press
- Genschel, P (2003) "Globalisierung als Problem, als Lösung und als Staffage", in: Hellmann, Genschel, P & Zangl, B. (2009) "Metamorphosen des Staates — vom Herrschaftsmonopolisten zum Herrschaftsmanager", in: *Leviathan*, 36 (3), pp. 430-454
- Gunther / Wolf, Klaus Dieter / Zürn, Michael (eds.), *Die neuen Internationalen Beziehungen. Forschungsstand und Perspektiven in Deutschland*, Baden-Baden: Nomos, pp. 429-464
- Gerhards, J & Rössel, J (1999), "Zur Transnationalisierung der Gesellschaft der Bundesrepublik. Entwicklungsn, ursachen und mögliche Folgen für die europäische Integration", in: *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 28 (5), pp. 325-344
- Goldstein, J. S (2003) *International Relations* (4th ed.), Delhi: Pearson Education
- Held, D., McGrew, A. G., Goldblatt, D. & Perraton, J. (1999), *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press
- Hill, C (2003) *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Keukeleire, S. & Schunz, S (2008) "Foreign policy, globalization and global governance - The European Union's structural foreign policy" Paper prepared for the ECPR Standing Group on the European Union Fourth Pan-European Conference on EU Politics, Riga, 25-27 September

- Legg, K.R and Morrison J (1971) *Politics and International System*, New York: Harper and Row
- Lerche, C. O. and Said, A.A (1979) *Concepts of International Politics in Global Perspective*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Morgenthau, H (1973)*Politics Among Nations*, N/Y Alfred and Knopf
- Nwankwo O. B. C (2008) “Fundamentals of International Relations” in O. B. C. Nwankwo (ed.) *Fundamental Issues in Political Science*, Enugu: Quintagon
- Okoli, F. C. and Okoli E. F (1990) *Foundations of Government and Politics*, Ibadan: Africana-Feb Publishers
- Reinicke, W. H. & Deng, F. (2000), *Critical Choices: The United Nations, Networks, and the Future of Global Governance*, Ottawa: International Development Research Centre
- Rodee, C. C., Anderson, T. J., Christol C. Q. and Greene T. H. (1983) *Introduction to Political Science*, New York: McGraw-Hill
- Rosenau, J (1967) “Foreign policy as an Issue Area” in James Rosenau (ed.) *Domestic Sources of Foreign*, N.Y: The Free Press, pp 11 – 50.
- Rosenau, J. N (1972) “The External Environment as a Variable in Foreign Policy Analysis,” in James N. Rosenau et al (eds.), *The Analysis of International Politics*, New York: Free Press
- Rosenau, J. N (1974) “Comparing Foreign Policies: Why, What, How,” in James N. Rosenau (ed.), *Comparing Foreign Policies, Theories, Findings, and Methods*, New York: John Wiley & Sons,
- Rosenau, J. N (1976) “The Study of Foreign Policy,” in James N. Rosenau, Kenneth W. Thompson, Gavin Boyd (eds.), *World Politics: An Introduction*, New York: Free Press
- Rosenau, J. N (1987) “Introduction: New Directions and Recurrent Questions in the Comparative Study of Foreign Policy,” in Charles F. Hermann, Charles W. Kegley Jr., James N. Rosenau (eds.), *New Directions in the Study of Foreign Policy*, Boston: Allen &Unwin,
- Scholte, J.A. (2005)*Globalization - a critical introduction. 2nd ed.* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shaw, M (1997)“The state of globalization: towards a theory of state transformation”.*Review of International Political Economy*, 4 (3). 497 - 513.
- Weiss, T.G., and Thakur, R. (2006). “The UN and Global Governance: An Idea and its Prospects”. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Whiteclay Chambers II, J. (2000) "Foreign Policy." The Oxford Companion to American Military History. 2000. Retrieved October 13, 2010 from <http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1O126-ForeignPolicy.html>

Wilkenfeld, J., Hopple G. W., Rossa, P. J., and Andriole S. J.(1980) *Foreign Policy Behaviour, the Inter State Behaviour Analysis Model*, California: Sage Publications,

Williams, P (2004) "Who's making UK foreign policy?" in: *International Affairs*, 80 (5), pp. 909-929

Zangl, Bernhard / Zürn, Michael (1999), "The effects of denationalisation on security in the OECD world", in: *Global Society*, 13 (2), pp. 139 – 161

