

# Impact of Diplomatic Strategies on Securing External Defense Arrangement in Nigeria

<sup>1</sup>Suradj Allan OLUFADE, <sup>2</sup>Prof. Shuaibu A. IBRAHIM, <sup>3</sup>Dr Muhammad Bello BABAN<sup>4</sup>UMMA,  
<sup>4</sup>Dr Shuaibu Umar ABDUL

Department of Political Science, Nasarawa State University Keffi, Nigeria

Received: 24 February 2022; Accepted: 17 March 2023; Published: 15 April 2023

## ABSTRACT

While the war against terrorism in Nigeria is by no means an easy one. Nigeria defense strategy has since combined soft and hard diplomacy to negotiate, persuade and induce both global and regional allies to support her counter terrorism fight. This study examined the impact of diplomatic strategies on securing external defense arrangement in Nigeria. The study adopted mixed research method. The total population covered by this study was 11,535 staff drawn from selected embassies. The study used the Yammane (1967) determination formula to resize and achieve a manageable target population of 400 at  $(0.05)^2$  level of precision using the stratified sampling technique to consider the divers characteristics of the population. Analysis was done using simple percentages, tables and textual contents. The study relied heavily on secondary sources of data such as books, journals, articles, periodical, government reports and publications, magazines, unpublished manuscript, and conference papers; also, on primary sources such as interviews and questionnaires. The study found out that a lot still need to be done to improve the strategies and methods of securing diplomatic arrangements in a way that will favor Nigeria in dealing with the effect of terrorism both locally and regionally. It was commended that Nigeria should use professional diplomats to sharpen her negotiation, inducement and persuasion strategy as most time the use of past leaders with diplomatic baggage may ruin well-crafted diplomatic defense planning, and that the Nigerian state must intentionally be seen to be addressing poverty, unemployment and porous borders which seem to be the key root causes of domestic terrorism in Nigeria.

**Keywords:** Diplomacy, Strategy, Security, Defense, Arrangements.

## INTRODUCTION

The events of the early 1990s, especially the collapse of the former Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War have made it imperative for nations to stop, think and reason before moving ahead. Years after the Cold War was ended and the world witnessed relative peace; nations are constantly still exposed to the unending specter of international anarchy. Event like the subsequent gulf war, the conflicts associated with the disintegration of Yugoslavia, the African tribal wars and the growing terrorism in Sub-saharan Africa and round Nigeria remains the aberration that highlights the continuous charged trends in international politics. Nations continuously face a changing security environment that is complex, dangerous and threatens national security interests across the globe (Baylis, Wirtz and Gray, 2010:11).

It is with the realization of these threats that orchestrated the return of diplomatic strategy to offer the bridge between military means and political goals in countries. Where Kissinger (1957:32) believes there should be an overlap in the political, economic, psychological and military factors in order to deal with the difficult problems of national defense policy. Historically states have demonstrated military mean associated with achieving national aims and objectives in international relations through the use of force. But in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries the coercive use of militaries by colonial powers led to coining of the term

‘gunboat diplomacy’ which involves the pursuit of a foreign policy objectives with the aid of conspicuous displays of military power, implying or constituting a direct threat of warfare. It meant that the military had to have the capability and wherewithal to act; and the decision makers the will to call the enemy’s bluff, if required.

In recent times, defense strategies have often been laced under the instrument of diplomacy which entails the practice of influencing the decisions and conduct of foreign governments or organizations through dialogue, negotiation, and other nonviolent means (Barston, 2006:17). It is the main instrument of foreign policy, which represents the broader goals and strategies that guide a state’s interactions with the rest of the world. Sometimes, it often feels like diplomats make little progress but the world would surely be a mess without diplomacy (Mar, 2013:13). No country is able to address all the challenges alone, strong alliances, arrangements and partnerships are more important than ever. Diplomatic strategies are a part of a state’s security policy derived from its geo-strategic environment and the kind of security threats perceived to be confronting the state.

While democratic norms are gradually taking roots in most African nations, the security outlook remains precarious for states such as Nigeria. The country continues to face oil-fueled militancy in the Niger Delta, widespread insurgency in the North East, Banditry and large-scale kidnappings in the North West and the South West. In the Middle Belt, there are waves of reprisal violence reverberating between Christian farmers and Muslim pastoralists, as the Eastern Security Network (ESN) ravages its insurgency across the South-East. Since 2009, Jama’atu Ahlus-Sunna Lidawati Wal jihad otherwise known as Boko Haram, has waged a bloody insurgency in the North-East. It represents the most acute threat to the Nigerian state since the Biafran war in 1967 (Bala and Ouédraogo, 2018:13). With the evolving problems of terrorism in Nigeria and the formation of numerous new terrorist groups, insurgency in Nigeria has escalated, making Nigeria one of the most terrorized countries in sub-Saharan Africa.

This leaves a question of how Nigeria has rallied defense support to respond to these threats within and around its borders. This paper examines the diplomatic strategies that Nigeria uses in securing external defense arrangement and support.

## **Research Questions**

1. What are the diplomatic Strategies deployed by Nigerian government to rally security support of external defense arrangement?
2. To what extent have Nigerian government defense arrangement strategies impacted on Nigerian security?

## **Objectives of the Study**

1. To identify the diplomatic Strategies deployed by Nigerian government to rally security support of external defense arrangement.
2. To examine the extent at which defense arrangement strategies impacted on Nigerian security.

## **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

### **Conceptual Review**

#### **Diplomatic Strategy**

Scholars had recorded divers of diplomatic strategies that the Nigerian state has applied in response to not only the worsening security threats against Nigeria, but also the threats before Nigeria’s regional stability

and the security of millions of people across the region. The country recognized that its ability to play this regional and continental role was largely dependent on its relations with the global powers. Nigeria went into so many bilateral diplomatic arrangements with the likes of the U.S and France to revitalize its counterterrorism strategy by increasing foreign military sales; enhancing the security forces assistance (SFA) mission to include aviation training and nonlethal effects focused on information, electronic warfare, and cyber support; and incentivizing disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) efforts in Nigeria. Also went into multilateral defense arrangements to guarantee Nigeria's strategic national security interest- some of which were the Multinational Joint Task Force (MNJTF) and the U.S defense cooperation. Leaders have at one point or the other employed one form of diplomatic strategy or the other (William, Jeannine, Abatan and Wendyam 2016:21)

According to Lee and Hocking (2011:42) diplomatic strategies have gone through series of transformation in history. While bilateralism diplomacy (between two states) remained a core diplomatic process during the Great War period, the following decade multilateral diplomacy took off. A significant amount of intergovernmental diplomacy was now taking place outside the more established bilateral diplomatic structures and foreign ministries in the form of intergovernmental conferences of state leaders and other government ministers such as finance and trade. Multilateral diplomacy involving officials from departments across government became a key vehicle for allied cooperation during the war on issues such as food and munitions transportation, as well as intelligence sharing and military coordination.

For Cornago (2008:15) negotiation/dialog is one of the commonest forms of diplomatic strategy in foreign relations. The strategy of negotiation entails an attempt to explore and reconcile conflicting positions among states in order to reach an acceptable outcome for all the parties in areas of common interest. Although analysts usually identify a number of different sequential stages in diplomatic negotiations, the basic model can be characterized as a process in which parties first agree on the need to negotiate and then establish an agenda and the rules of procedure. Later, different opening positions are outlined and explored; and finally, compromises are sought in order to find a point of convergence, forming the basis for agreement. However, it cannot be assumed that any of the aforementioned stages should be necessarily easier than the rest. At times, states do not recognize the need to negotiate or are unable to agree on an agenda for talks, due to either its excessive precision or its vagueness, its eventual propagandistic value, or simply because of their preferences in the order of topics to be discussed. In the same vein, Clavel (1991:41), points to a question that is equally relevant in this regard- the agreement on procedure. Frequently, more than two parties are involved in the talks and the negotiation could require both bilateral and plenary sessions. This can have the effect of making the election of the delegation members more complex according to their level and competence, as well as complicate the decision-making procedures. The procedure by which decisions are made differs considerably depending on negotiation objectives. But, if the parties seek to obtain substantial agreements, it is necessary to clearly establish the rules of procedure. The preparation and discussion of a resolution is usually a lengthy and laborious process. Moreover, the states can sometimes deploy diverse tactical devices of pressure and persuasion to support to gain advantage in the negotiation strategy, according to their objectives, or even quit the table, breaking the negotiation.

On his part, Barston (1988:32) reflects on the diplomatic voting strategy, stating that after discussing different drafts between states, the proposed resolution can be submitted to final approval. Although the adoption of decisions by consensus is very common, the most frequent method is voting. In fact, the unanimity rule might induce paralysis when large numbers of states are involved. There are three particularly relevant aspects of voting. First, the weight of votes, ranging from the classic system of one vote per country, to diverse forms of vote qualification according to some formulas, such as the country's financial contribution to the agreement, or others related to their size or relevance to a particular topic. Second, the specification of quorum requirements in order to elude controversies among the parties during voting; Third, and the most prominent, are majority requirements. Decisions can be made by a single

majority or qualified two-thirds majority of those present and voting, but sometimes unanimity can be required, or even the majority of some specified members, as in the United Nations Security Council.

Berman and Johnson (1977:18) spoke on the guidelines for non-military strategies such as negotiation. Besides the formal aspects, the parties shall also establish a certain agreement as to the level of discretion required in the negotiation, but it must always be developed in accordance with the rules of diplomatic protocol and the general principles of international law. As the enduring relevance of the so-called quiet diplomacy shows, the principle of publicity does not impede discretion in diplomatic negotiations but it is incompatible with the adoption of secret international commitments with compulsory content. Nevertheless, due to contemporary requirements of legitimacy in the democratic political process, diplomatic negotiation must sometimes be extended to society, eventually establishing consultative meetings with nongovernmental organizations, pressure groups, and non-central governments. A sign of the increasing public interest in multilateral diplomacy is also the growing relevance of the international conferences, organized by nongovernmental organizations (NGO), with the objective of achieving influence on the diplomatic agenda, on topics such as development, human rights, peace talks, or environmental issues, among others. This trend is particularly notorious in the field of conflict resolution.

### External Defense Arrangement

A great deal of bilateral and multilateral diplomacy takes place at the level of heads of government. Cornago (2011:42) stated that summitry or the summit strategy is certainly as old as any other form of diplomacy, but during the last decades and due to the fast development of transport and communications it has gained considerable prominence. Both serial and ad hoc summits are usually subjected to greater public attention than standard multilateral or bilateral diplomacy. For this reason, without denying its diplomatic relevance, summitry may frequently be used as an excellent tool for foreign or domestic propaganda, as was clearly exhibited during the Cold War. Because of this, unless it has been meticulously prepared, summitry has come to be seen by professional diplomats as a certain intrusion in their daily work, which sometimes creates more inconveniences than advantages.

Previously, negotiation has been seen as the most prominent and widespread method for settling international differences and the most characteristic method of diplomatic practice. However, Lund (1996:12) has asserted that not always is it possible to easily achieve direct discussion among the parties in a dispute. For this reason, throughout history, the states have developed diverse political and jurisdictional methods of peaceful settlement: (1) 'Good offices' is the participation of a neutral third party in order to facilitate the communication between the parties, but without offering any substantial suggestion on the possible terms of settlement; (2) 'Inquiry' is the process of obtaining evidence by a neutral team of investigators, requested by the parties in conflict. The clarification of facts can be very important in order to avoid misunderstandings and facilitate a political agreement; (3) 'Diplomatic mediation' is another type of third-party intervention that is especially adequate in disputes in which compromise seems to be very hard to achieve, due to the hostility among the parties or the nature of the conflict. Although the mediator ought to be neutral, his or her ability to make substantial proposals in order to see a compromise is particularly important, even if they could be understood by one party as favorable to the other side; (4) 'Conciliation' is another form of mediation in which a particular international institution has been requested by the parties, due to its recognized neutrality and experience in seeking to find an acceptable solution; (5) 'Arbitration' is a method of applying legal principles to a controversy in which the parties have agreed previously on legal principles and procedures, and have chosen the court – permanent or ad hoc – they prefer. In agreeing to submit the dispute to arbitration the parties are bound by the final decision; and (6) 'Judicial settlement' implies that the states in conflict consent in submitting their dispute to the International Court of Justice (Lund, 1996:32)

However, it should be noted that the states are usually more willing to negotiate directly, or even to accept

mediation rather than to consent in a judicial settlement, the sentence of which is of compulsory compliance. Contemporary international law established the duty of peaceful settlement of disputes, but nothing assures its political success. So, for George and Simons (1994:82) it can be reasonably stressed that a good diplomatic method in dealing with international disputes should be the deployment of different strategies of preventive diplomacy both. Those strategies can be of a very different nature, military as well as nonmilitary, according to their diverse objectives, such as crisis prevention, preemptive engagement, or pre-conflict peace building. Although diplomacy is generally defined as the conduct of international relations through negotiation and dialogue or by any other means able to encourage peaceful relations among states, it is difficult to deny that threats and coercion have played an important role in international relations. Moreover, despite the contemporary erosion of militarism and the decreasing role of military force in world politics, nothing seems to suggest that coercion will disappear. A possible solution to this apparent contradiction is to reserve the analysis of international coercion to foreign policy analysis, acknowledging its widely accepted incompatibility with diplomacy. Nevertheless, there is also an increasing amount of literature devoted to the study of coercive diplomatic strategies.

For George and Simons (1994:84) Coercive diplomacy is a defensive strategy that is employed to deal with the efforts of an adversary to change a status quo situation. Coercive diplomacy needs to be differentiated from offensive strategies. The latter employs threats in an aggressive manner against target states. It is also quite different from deterrence, the preventive employment of threats to dissuade an adversary from undertaking a damaging action not yet initiated. This was certainly a type of diplomacy particularly prominent and controversial during the Cold War, but has today lost a great deal of its relevance. According to George and Simons (1994:83) one of the notable proponents of coercive diplomacy, there are three basic types of coercive strategy, which should preferably be used after the failed resort of other more peaceful alternatives, such as a negotiated settlement. The first tries simply to persuade the opponent to stop the hostile action. The second seeks the reversal of the action already accomplished. The third, and undoubtedly the most controversial, seeks to terminate the opponent's hostile behavior through the promotion of change in the adversary's domestic political system.

Certainly, the diplomatic nature of coercive diplomacy can be questioned, given that it can be seen as a violation of contemporary international law. However, it is difficult to deny the relevance of these practices for the contemporary understanding of international relations. Precisely for this reason, it must be remembered that the United Nations' system of collective security, in spite of the growing importance given to preventive diplomacy and peace building, is the only contemporary legal expression of coercive but multilateral diplomacy firmly recognized by international law.

Against this trend, which pretends to make compatible diplomacy and coercion, Diamond and McDonald (1996:61) argued that during the last decades different voices have claim for a more active role of diplomacy in peace building, human development, and global environmental sustainability. This is the case of both the so-called citizen diplomacy and sustainable diplomacy approaches. Citizen diplomacy, also called frequently second-track diplomacy, comes to emphasize the importance of ordinary people and unofficial channels of communication between opposing sides in order to increase trust and foster mutual understanding. Sustainable diplomacy advocates, by their side, defend an explicitly normative approach to diplomacy that instead to promote the particular interest of states shall serve to the whole humanity (Wellman, 2004:32). If the former is largely the result of the growing transnational dimension of social movements and NGOs, the latter appeared within the diplomatic world itself, and is slowly gaining support among the increasing number of disappointed practitioners who refuse the subordination of diplomacy nowadays to economic or strategic interests.

In the same vein, Mohammad (2010:16) cited Werner (1881:152) one of the earliest works on diplomacy, who argued that nations sometimes resort to international diplomatic arbitration when faced with a specific

question or point of contention in need of resolution. For most of history, there were no official or formal procedures for such proceedings. They were generally accepted to abide by general principles and protocols related to international law and justice. Sometimes these took the form of formal arbitrations and mediations. In such cases a commission of diplomats might be convened to hear all sides of an issue, and to come some sort of ruling based on international law. In the modern era, much of this work is often carried out by the International Court of Justice at The Hague, or other formal commissions, agencies and tribunals, working under the United Nations such as Hay-Herbert Treaty Enacted after the United States and Britain submitted a dispute to international mediation about the Canada–US border.

Mohammed (2010:17) further stated that at other times, diplomatic resolutions were sought through the convening of international conferences and summits which results into agreements or even alliances. In such cases, there are fewer ground rules, and fewer formal applications of international law. However, participants are expected to guide themselves through principles of international fairness, logic, and protocol. Some examples of these formal conferences are: Congress of Vienna (1815) – After Napoleon was defeated, there were many diplomatic questions waiting to be resolved. This included the shape of the political map of Europe, the disposition of political and nationalist claims of various ethnic groups and nationalities wishing to have some political autonomy, and the resolution of various claims by various European powers.

Similarly, Collins and John (2006:25) names preventive diplomacy as one of such ingenuous diplomatic strategies adopted by Nations in dispelling threat. These authors argue that preventive diplomacy is carried out through quiet means (as opposed to gun-boat diplomacy, which is backed by the threat of force, or public diplomacy, which makes use of publicity). It is also understood that circumstances may exist in which the consensual use of force (notably preventive deployment) might be welcomed by parties to a conflict with a view to achieving the stabilization necessary for diplomacy and related political processes to proceed. This is to be distinguished from the use of “persuasion”, “suasion”, “influence”, and other non-coercive approaches explored below. Preventive diplomacy, in the view of these authors, is the range of peaceful dispute resolution approaches mentioned in Article 33 of the UN Charter on the pacific settlement of disputes when applied before a dispute crosses the threshold to armed conflict. It may take many forms, with different means employed.

According to Dlamini (2002:17) one form of diplomacy which may be brought to bear to prevent violent conflict (or to prevent its recurrence) is “quiet diplomacy”. When one speaks of the practice of quiet diplomacy, definitional clarity is largely absent. In part this is due to a lack of any comprehensive assessment of exactly what types of engagement qualify, and how such engagements are pursued. On the one hand, a survey of the literature by Tarlebba & Baroni (2010:54) reveals no precise understanding or terminology on the subject. On the other hand, concepts are neither clear nor discrete in practice. Multiple definitions are often invoked simultaneously by theorists, and the activities themselves often mix and overlap in practice. Also known as the “softly” approach, quiet diplomacy is the attempt to influence the behavior of another state through secret negotiations or by refraining from taking a specific action. This method is often employed by states that lack alternative means to influence the target government or that seek to avoid certain outcomes. For example, South Africa is described as engaging in quiet diplomacy with neighboring Zimbabwe to avoid appearing as “bullying” and subsequently engendering a hostile response. This approach can also be employed by more powerful states; U.S. President George W. Bush’s nonattendance at the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development constituted a form of quiet diplomacy, namely in response to the lack of UN support for the U.S proposed invasion of Iraq (Gates, 2017:45).

By and large, Akinloye (2014:13) maintains that over the past five years, Nigeria’s efforts at rallying diplomatic defense arrangements to bring the forces of Nigeria, Cameroon, Chad and Niger with the

backings of the United States and France have made some gains in the fight against Boko Haram. Before the conception of the Multinational Joint Task Force, a number of steps were taken such as the signing of the memorandum of Understanding amongst member’s states, holding of joint diplomatic conferences, contribution of forces, and supply of equipment amongst others. While these successes have strengthened hopes of the elimination of defense and security problems, the optimism is regularly tempered by persistent attacks by newer insurgent groups within Nigeria and around its borders.

## METHODOLOGY

The research design for this study was mixed research method which employed both qualitative and quantitative methods. The total population covered by this study was 11,535 staff of the following institutions: the U.S embassy Abuja, the Embassy of the Republic of Chad, Nigerian embassy, the Cameroonian Embassy, Nigeria Ministry of Defense Abuja, Office of the National Security Adviser, Nigerian Ministry of Foreign Affairs Abuja, and Multinational Joint task Force. The study used the Yammane (1967) sample size determination formula to resize and achieve a manageable sample size of 400 at  $(0.05)^2$  level of precision, using the stratified sampling technique to consider the divers characteristics of the population.

The study collected data from the targeted population using both secondary and primary sources of data collection. Secondary method was aided by use of secondary materials such as textbooks and published materials such as diplomatic defense records from the Nigeria defense ministry, the reports from the embassies and consulates of Chad, Niger and Cameroon. As well as the reports from the office of the NSA and the MNJTF as contained in official documents as released by these institutions and missions. Whereas, Primary data were collected through the aid of first, interviews- where 18 persons were interviewed, 1 each from the Embassies of Niger, Chad and Cameroon in Abuja, and 4 from the Nigeria Ministry of Defense Abuja, 3 from the Office of the National Security Adviser (NSA) Abuja, 4 from the Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs and 4 from the MNJTF out of which 1 each shall be drawn to cover each of the 4 sectors in the Multinational Joint task Force units respectively. Secondly, questionnaires were used, about 400 copies were produced and distributed after which completed copies were retrieved and analyzed. Analysis was carried out using tables and percentages.

## DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

### Data Presentation and Analysis

Data Presentation and Analysis on Diplomatic Strategies that Nigeria used in Securing Support of External Defense Arrangements.

**TABLE 1: DIPLOMATIC STRATEGIES DEPLOYED BY NIGERIA TO RALLY SECURITY SUPPORT OF EXTERNAL DEFENSE ARRANGEMENT**

S/N	Diplomatic strategies that Nigeria used in securing support of external defense arrangements	Strongly Agreed		Agreed		Disagreed		Strongly Disagreed		Undecided	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	Nigeria used non-military diplomatic strategy of negotiation to secure the support of external defense arrangements from neighboring Chad, Niger and Cameroon	89	22.25	163	41	55	14	80	20	13	3.25

2	Nigeria used inducement and persuasion to secure the support of defense cooperation of neighboring states to buy into the multinational joint task force arrangement	104	26	271	68	16	4	9	2.25	0	0
3	Nigeria used regional stabilization strategy to negotiate the creation of the lake Chad basin commission that heads the MNJTF which was instrumental in securing external defense arrangements	110	27.5	143	36	100	25	47	11.75	0	0
4	Nigeria used the summitry strategy such as the Paris summit on terrorism and diplomatic conferences to kick start relations and get concerned international defense actors on board.	127	31.75	149	37	84	21	40	10	0	0
5	Nigeria used joining of coalitions like d-ISIS to secure defense cooperation from the US and experienced defense experts against terrorism	100	25	159	40	67	15	52	13	22	5.5
6	Nigeria used signing of memorandum of understanding with the UK and China on defense and security to secure defense cooperation against terrorism	112	28	242	61	32	8	8	2	6	1.5

Source: Field Survey (2022)

Table 1 reveals a majority of positive opinions from question 1 to 6 with a huge percentage value of 63%, 93%, 64%, 69%, 65% and 89% as against respondents who held other views who were predominantly in the minority. This shows that the assertions across the respective questions were considered valid and significant during the survey.

Data Presentation and Analysis on the extent of impact of diplomatic strategies on external defense arrangements for Nigeria.

**TABLE 2: EXTENT OF IMPACT OF DIPLOMATIC STRATEGIES ON EXTERNAL DEFENSE ARRANGEMENT IN NIGERIA**

Extent of Impact	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percentage
Very Significant	88	22	88	22
Significant	95	23.75	183	45.75
Less Significant	113	28.25	296	74
Not Significant	104	26	400	100
Undecided	0	0	400	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Field Survey (2022)



The table 2 shows that 88 respondents representing 22%, 95 respondents representing 23.75%, 113 respondent representing 28%, 104 respondents representing 26% and zero respondents representing 0%; were of the opinion that the Extent of which the diplomatic strategies used by Nigeria (such as negotiation, persuasion, inducement and building coalitions) impacts on external defense arrangements for Nigeria to combat terrorism was either very significant, significant, less significant, not significant or undecided respectively. Since the cumulative percentage of respondents favoring diplomatic strategies employed by Nigeria on external defense arrangement are less than those seeing it as less significant, it means the strategies are less impactful.

## DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

1. The study found that Nigeria used negotiation, inducement and persuasion as her primary diplomatic defense strategies to secure the defense cooperation of neighboring states into establishing the MNJTF arrangement, but predominantly Nigeria used the summitry strategy to deepen external defense arrangements to gain global counter terrorism support. This finding supported that of Ifabiyi (2013:64) and Isaac (2017:32) who found out that negotiation, inducement and persuasion are major strategies required to secure external defense by African countries. However, in consonance with these findings, more efforts are required as opined by Tarlebba and Baroni (2010:10) in the area of non-military diplomatic strategy of negotiation to secure the support of external defense arrangements aside negotiation, inducement and persuasion.
2. The study also found that the diplomatic strategies used in securing external defense arrangements were desirable but less impactful due to not only external problem of trust but also failure to internally address the root causes of terrorism in states. William, Jeannine, Abatan and Wendyam (2016:41) strongly supported this finding by pointing out the need to address unemployment, food insecurity and religion conflict domestically if end is required on terrorism. This is also supported by Thérroux-Bénoni (2015:18) but added that no external defense strategies would be effective in Nigeria when politics of ethnicity is still in operation.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Conclusion

Since independence, Nigeria have been involved in diplomatic balancing and rebalancing of negotiations with countries of the world, sometimes requiring persuasion and inducement strategies to secure defense support from neighboring states sometimes through the arrangement gained by way of bilateral and multilateral forums. At other times, Nigeria have used the summitry approach to deepen opportunities to deepen defense engagement with defense partners which resulted in Nigeria joining U.S led defense coalitions and signed defense MoUs with the likes of China, UK and Turkey. Typically, hard and soft diplomacy have been one of the few tools used in the conduct of Nigerian defense policy aside direct use of military force over the years; however, a disconcerting trend in this practice is often the limited successes, and sometimes failures of states or regional organizations from achieving their defense policy objectives. Nigeria has in spite of her diplomatic posturing still lack steam in the quest to fulfill her desire to end the intractable Boko Haram terrorism even when it has diplomatically committed itself to regional stabilization and other multilateral strategies to boost defense arrangements.

### Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study and review of relevant literature, the following recommendations are offered:

1. More efforts should be put in place by Nigerian government aimed at developing diplomatic strategies that are citizens-supportive in order to compact the cube the menace of insecurity in the country. This can be achieved through formulation of security-tide favorable foreign and domestic policies.
2. Cross examination of the effectiveness of current diplomatic security strategies should be prioritized at all levels of security agencies and government in order to achieve effectiveness and efficiency in security operations.

## REFERENCES

1. Albert, I. O (2017). Rethinking the Functionality of the Multinational Joint Task Force in Managing the Boko Haram Crisis in the Lake Chad Basin. *Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa*, 47(3), 119-135.
2. Bala, S. & Ouédraogo, E. (2018). National Security Strategy Development: Nigeria Case Study. Working Paper (Preliminary Draft). Africa Centre for Strategic Studies.
3. Clavel, J. D. (1991). *De la negotiation diplomatique multilaterale*. Paris: Bruylant.
4. Collins, P. & John C. (2006). Options and Techniques for Quiet Diplomacy. *Journal of Political Diplomacy*, 10(2), 22-31.
5. Diamond, L. & McDonald, J. W. (1996). *Multi-track diplomacy: A systems approach to peace*. London: Kumarian Press.
6. Dlamini, K. (2003). Is Quiet Diplomacy an Effective Conflict Resolution Strategy? *SA Yearbook of International Affairs*.
7. Drab, L. (2018). *Defense Diplomacy – an Important Tool for the Implementation of Foreign Policy and Security of the State*. Faculty of National Security War Studies University, Warsaw, Poland.
8. Duncan, A. M. (2018). *Revitalizing U.S. Strategy in Nigeria to Address Boko Haram*. Bridge Press.
9. Eric, S. (2016). Military Says Law Barring U.S. Aid to Rights Violators Hurts Training Mission. *The New York Times*.
10. Gates, R. M. (2017). *Helping Others Defend Themselves: The Future of U.S. Security Assistance*, Foreign Affairs.
11. George, A. L. and Simons, W. S. (eds.) (1994). *The limits of coercive diplomacy*. Boulder: Westview Press.
12. Ifabiyi, I.P (2013). Recharging the Lake Chad: The Hydro Politics of National Security and Regional Integration in Africa. *African Research Review* 7 (3), 196–216.
13. Isaac, O. A. (2017). Rethinking the Functionality of the Multinational Joint Task Force in Managing the Boko Haram Crisis in the Lake Chad Basin”; *Council for Development of Social Science research*.
14. Johnson, K. (2014). *The Face of Diplomacy in 19th- Century China: Qiying’s Portrait Gifts*. In Johnson, Kendall (ed.). *Narratives of Free Trade: The Commercial Cultures of Early US-China Relations*. Hong Kong University Press.
15. Lund, M. S. (1996). *Preventing violent conflicts: A strategy for preventive diplomacy*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press
17. Tarlebba, K.N. & Baroni, S. (2010). The Cameroon and Nigeria Negotiation Process over the Contested Oil rich Bakassi Peninsula, *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences*,2(1), 198–210.
18. Théroux-Bénoni, L. (2015). Without Buy-in from Nigeria on the Military Response and Beyond, No Lasting Solution to the Boko Haram Problem is Possible’, *ISS Today*, <https://issafrica.org/iss-today/the-fight-against-boko-haram-tangled-up-in-nigerian-and-regional-politics>.
19. Wellman, D. J. (2004). *Sustainable diplomacy: Ecology, religion and ethics in Muslim–Christian relations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
20. William, A., Jeannine, E, A Abatan & Wendyam, A. S. (2016). *Assessing the Multinational Joint Task Force against Boko Haram”; West African Report*.