

National Security and Nigerian Foreign Policy in a Globalizing World

Nnamdi OKONKWO, Ph.D

Department of International Relations, Admiralty University of Nigeria, Ibusa – Delta State

DOI:<https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.806024>

Received: 15 May 2024; Accepted: 28 May 2024; Published: 28 June 2024

ABSTRACT

Nigeria's emergence at the global scene in 1960 was heralded with great excitement across the world. Her potential prosperity was strong enough to match her promising and purposive behavior at the international arena. Her radical and swift disposition to issues that borders on national interest, national security and liberation of Africa left no one in doubt about her conduct of independent foreign policy. Sadly, however, corruption and economic mismanagement which resulted to national impoverishment and sequential collapse of her republics also witnessed Nigeria's foreign policy took a dive to the realm of timidity. This lack luster conduct has raised doubts about the capacity of a sovereign Nigerian State. In an intensely globalizing world order, therefore, the fact of eroding state sovereignty has had severe implication for Nigerian national security in particular and her overall developmental drive in general. A quantitative study which relied extensively on secondary data including official reports, published and unpublished textbooks, peer reviewed journals and newspaper editorials, the paper adopted as its theoretical framework dependency strand of the neo-Marxist political economy. The paper went on to argue that Nigerian's dependent economy cannot sustain a purposive and dynamic foreign policy that guarantees national security. Relying on study findings, the paper recommends that in a globalizing world order, skills of foreign policy experts as well as sound economic measures be harnessed by Nigerian policy class to navigate through the thorny but necessary route to national security.

Key words: National Security; Foreign Policy; Globalization; International system; National Interest.

INTRODUCTION

As with most states in the international system, Nigeria's foreign policy is basically intended to promote and protect her national interest. In the pursuit of these core foreign policy objectives, Nigeria has often been diplomatic in her posturing, preferring to act in circumspection rather than rudely projecting power and unguided self interest in her relationship with states and institutions in the international system. Even at that, Nigeria took it particularly personal after Independence in 1960 and launched an ambitious project to ensure freedom for all African nations that continued to languish under colonial rule and apartheid. This was especially demonstrated in the Southern and Central African sub-regions where countries like the Republic of South Africa, Zimbabwe, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and the war-torn Angola became the core interest of Nigeria's foreign policy. Nigeria spent billions of Naira and mounted countless diplomatic efforts, sometimes, standing up to the superpowers at her own risk until all African states became decolonized.

In West Africa where she is assumed to be the hegemon, Nigeria played a leading role in the establishment of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). Nigeria also spent billions of Naira in efforts to end the civil wars in Liberia and Sierra Leone through the ECOWAS monitoring group

(ECOMOG). In addition, Nigeria was the major mediator in the regime change crises that had rocked Cote d'Ivoire, the Gambia and Guinea Bissau at one time or the other, and also in obedience to the International Court of Justice ruling, willingly relinquished ownership of the oil rich Bakassi Peninsula to the Camerouns. Nigeria historically has remained the largest contributor of peacekeepers to the United Nations, the African Union and the ECOWAS-ECOMOG (Saliu 2010). Nigerian leaders and people have always believed and celebrated the notion that *we are the Giant of Africa*. To that extent, she has continued to whole heartedly act out this conviction in all her diplomatic words and deeds. This is evidently demonstrated by the sheer urge to establish her presence all over the world. Today, Nigeria has the largest number of embassies and high commissions globally among African States.

However, the central concern of this paper is to investigate if in the current global order, Nigeria still has any justification to continue with her "Afrocentric" foreign policy posturing. This is particularly so, given that the over sixty years of massive material investments on Africa disappointingly yielded little more than vain prestige. It was such observation that informed Akinboye's (2013) insistence that Nigeria's foreign policy is beautiful abroad but ugly at home. In recent years, calls for the need to redirect Nigeria's foreign policy posturing and align it with the current world of globalization have become loud. Many informed Nigerians have stressed the need for an enduring foreign policy that is proactive and problem solving. What this means is that Nigeria must now begin to define her national interest in new settings of nuclear politics, economic competition and technological globalization that must positively impact her national security. Fundamentally, the security of her population at home and in the diaspora should rank uppermost in her foreign policy scaling. Akinterinwa (2011) shared this opinion when he posits that the deeds of Nigeria in foreign relations should strategically centre on the interest of Nigerians.

Given the reality of her allround foreign policy decline in the era of globalization therefore, it becomes necessary that Nigeria galvanize her tangible and intangible assets to strengthen her national security. Effort is made in this paper to operationalize the commanding concepts of national security, foreign policy and globalization in addition to getting them situated within the context of a globalizing world. Findings that emanate from the study guided the recommendations we have put forward.

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

i. National Security

Security is a generic concept that cuts across all human relations, be it political, economic, cultural, social, and environmental and so on. It is value laden in that for any situation, be it at individual, state or global, it is seen as absence of threat, fear, anxiety or danger from within and outside (Akpotor 2011). In economic term, it is the absence of poverty, mass unemployment, hunger as well as the presence of justice, and also, healthy and educated people. A negation of any of these social values invites the presence of insecurity. As a generic phenomenon that expresses itself in all areas of human existence, we can correctly conceive human security, national security, maritime security, food security, environmental security among many others.

National security which is the focus of this study has been broadly conceived as the ability of the government to utilize military force to protect its citizen's safety economic welfare and social institutions from threat of attack by foreign or domestic invaders. Beyond this classical notion of national security, the dynamics of modern society have today altered the configuration of national security to now include consideration for societally generated crises such as youth unemployment, hunger, terrorism, kidnapping, etc (Okonkwo and others 2013). This conception will, therefore, accommodate the totality of social vices that could threaten lives and property and indeed, the peace and tranquility of the nation. For Oche (2000), there are three sets of values that are objects of security and are, as such, protected from threats. While the

first set of values relates to the very idea and conception of the national, the second set of values is the institutions of the state. Lastly, the third set of values is the physical institutions of the state itself. Every state worth its name will adopt both the classical strategy of force and contemporary strategy of peace (diplomacy, economic sanction and propaganda) to defend these values.

Nigeria's national security strategy 2019, therefore, aims at ensuring that Nigeria's sovereignty, territorial integrity, core values, national interests, the well-being of the people and the country's institutions are preserved, protected and enhanced. Beyond the wartime application of military power, the peaceful application of military power is often combined with vital instruments of foreign policy such as diplomacy, propaganda and economic sanctions in maintaining national security in a globalizing Nigeria.

ii. Foreign Policy:

In spite of the persisting difficulties to resolve the definitional puzzles that trail foreign policy, the suggestions of numerous scholars have been helpful. For instance, Plano and Olton (1982) submit that foreign policy is the strategy or planned course of action developed by the decision makers of a state vis-à-vis other states or international entities aimed at achieving specific goals defined in terms of national interest. Numerous definitions with such intellectual breath are available, however, Akinboye's (2013) contribution was adjudged as highly beneficial to scholarship. According to him, foreign policy is the instrumentality by which states influence or seek to influence the external world and to attain objectives that are in consonance with their perceived national interest. Foreign policy, therefore, are actions and inactions directed towards the external environment for the purpose of actualizing the set objectives of domestic development.

By and large, we can conceive of Nigeria's foreign policy as the explicit objectives which Nigeria wants to pursue and achieve in her external relations (Akinboye and Ottor 2006). It is the instrumentality by which Nigeria influences the global environment and through which she realizes objectives that are in conformity with her perceived national interest. Ogwu (1986) has rightly informed that a state's foreign policy is not operated in vacuum and that the main policy instrument in the conduct of foreign policy is the promotion and pursuit of national interest.

The Adedeji Commission that was set up by General Murtala Mohammed to examine Nigeria's foreign policy in all its ramifications was Nigeria's first major attempt towards the pursuit of robust foreign policy. It was based on the Commission's report that General Obasanjo in June 1976 identified the elements of the national interest which also constitutes the objectives of the country's foreign policy. However, since the recommendation was verbose in its original state with most of the grand objectives unrealizable as they seem to extend beyond the capacity of Nigeria, General Obasanjo lays emphasis on three broad objectives – territorial integrity, independence and rapid economic development as central to Nigeria's national interest (Aluko 1978). Section 19 of the 1979 Constitution and Section 20 of the 1989 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria lucidly enact the basic objectives of Nigeria's foreign policy under the fundamental objectives and directive principles of state policy. Among the most fundamental foreign policy goals spelt out in the two documents, the promotion and protection of the national interest emerged uppermost.

The foreign policy objectives of Nigeria, therefore, is the actualization of her national interest the core of which includes territorial integrity, sovereignty of the Nigerian state and economic development among others. However, the capacity to make foreign policy objectives realizable is largely dependent on the economic power of a state. It is this particular indicator that will show why Nigeria has or has not been able to actualize her key foreign policy objectives in a globalizing world. To do this effectively means that we attempt some historical analogies.

iii. Globalization

According to (Alli 2006), globalization is a historical process that started centuries ago and it is characterized by greater integration of the world in the economic, social, cultural and political spheres. Even though some scholars situate the origin of globalization in the modern era, others regard it as a phenomenon with a long history. For Oddih (2000), the concept of globalization seems a modern term while its basic tenets and characteristics had been in existence many years back. It is these varying perspectives that prompted Ibeanu (1997) to conceive globalization as a concept that has the old and the new paradigms. In recent times, sharp disagreements have trailed the actual meaning of globalization with some scholars viewing it from the very narrow perspective of “Financial Integration” and or “Americanization”.

It is our opinion in this paper that broad based definition of the concept will most certainly assist in ascertaining the opportunities as well as the challenges that have trailed a globalizing world. While it is clearly understood that globalization is not just about the deepening of the financial markets but also includes a whole range of social, political, economic and cultural phenomena, two major strands of thoughts on it; the liberal and the radical schools have emerged.

The liberal school on globalization sees it as a framework of complex but growing interdependence among nations. The global socio-political and economic integration has restructured the world into a new and all-inclusive social system and globalization here is associated with liberalization as a policy option for the development of the South through a process of free trade, trade liberalization, investment and capital flow between countries (Akinboye 2008). Promoters of this perspective have consistently maintained that globalization is the rational end point of human development and that it is capable of impacting on the life of states that integrate their economies. While Fukuyama (1992) for instance, conceives globalization as universalization of Western values, Rugumanu (1999) sees it as a new paradigm in international economic relations which apparently signals the triumph of capitalism on a truly global scale following the end of the cold war, the collapse of the Soviet system and the decimation of the planned economies, particularly in Eastern Europe.

Globalization for the liberals, therefore, is one on-going gigantic movement initiated and pushed forward by the developed capitalist and industrialized Western nations. It is aimed at weakening territorial and jurisdictional boundaries as well as barriers of individual nations. Arising from this movement, the world seem to be shrinking and people are increasingly aware of this development as can be seen in the extensive deployment of the world wide web (www), the electronic-mail, the worldwide television communication, the global newspapers etc. Thus, Akinboye (2008), has observed that proponents of globalization as interdependency see a better world if nation-states realize and utilize to the maximum, the opportunities presented by interdependency which results from globalization. This belief is hinged on the premise that interdependency has opened up the world, reduced the abuse of human rights and eradicated to a large extent, social and economic injustices by national governments.

On the other hand, advocates of globalization as imperialism are mainly of the radical persuasion and political economy genre. Scholars of this background have collectively questioned the logic behind globalization and described it as old wine in new wine skin. Alluding to the position that globalization is a transformatory capitalist project which can only serve to impoverish the underdeveloped nations on the fringe of the world capitalism, Mazrui calls it the new global imperialism (Mbah 2012). For Ake (1995) globalization is a capitalist project that is structured to perpetuate the underdevelopment and dependency of Africa and other Third World Countries (TWCs). He construed globalization in terms of profit maximization and refers to it as the march of capital across the world in search of profits; a process that is facilitated by the expansion of the Multinational Corporations and driven by the technical advances in information and communication technologies (ICTs).

Scholars like Madunagu (1999); Assobie (2002); Nabudere (2000); and Oriakhi (2001) share in the radical views on globalization. Assobie (2002) for instance, argues that globalization is not simply the product of the inexorable march of market forces but the outcome of conscious planning and execution, first by the “big business” namely the Multinational Corporations (MNCs) and second by the governments of the US and the UK. He sees globalization as a technique of ideological marketing devised by global entrepreneurs principally to counter a rising trend in the underdeveloped world. This is the trend towards tougher laws, especially in the areas of transfer of technology, patent right, collection of levies, control of foreign business and also prevention of the drain of foreign capital. Nabudere (2000) is of the view that globalization appropriates development for one part of the world and underdevelopment for another. According to him, while strengthening the already developed and advanced North, globalization has marginalized the pauperized and peripheral economies of the South. So manifest are the contentions of the radical scholars that prominent neo-Marxist Eskor Toyo Posits that;

globalization is an alternative imperialist policy deliberately designed to maintain their structure of impoverishment on their satellite states (Mbah 2012).

The two paradigms operationalized above clearly reflect the deep ideological and political convictions of the different scholars. What is of concern to us, however, is that in spite of its modest benefits to the global peripheral regions, its inherent contradiction continues to Pauperize these least developed regions. Globalization has, therefore, been widely conceived as the engine by which the economies of the world’s weaker nations are being opened up and subjected to the hegemony of the developed capitalist economies.

iv. Globalizing World

A globalizing world, therefore, is one that has increasingly come under the forces of technological revolution, economic liberalization and democratic governance on a global scale (Kwanashie 1999). It is one in which technology is increasingly being deployed globally to interconnect the hitherto, unimaginable human activities so that the world takes a semblance of one big village. This interconnectedness also implies worldwide integration of the entire human activities including the politics and policies of different states. In all these, states that are economically strong, technologically advance and politically stable naturally overwhelm the rest and control the trend of human activities. As a phenomenon, therefore, globalization has been both beneficial and catastrophic to states of the world. However, while its benefits have been felt more in the advanced countries of the Northern hemisphere, its catastrophic impacts have been overwhelming on the third world countries of the Southern hemisphere (Azide 2008). It is on this premise that we x-rayed the extent to which Nigeria’s foreign policy has addressed her national security interest in an increasingly globalizing world.

Theoretical Framework

In this paper, we adopted the Dependency strand of the neo-Marxist political economy as the framework of analysis. The justification to use this framework stem from the understanding that in a globalizing world order, there is an established correlation between the development taking place in a state and the foreign policy objectives of the state.

The Dependency Theory

The central insight of the dependency theorists was that it was of limited value to study the development of societies of the third world in isolation from the development of the advanced societies. From their point of

view, it was necessary to treat the world as one single system. This insight was, however, not entirely original as Marx, for one, had stressed the importance of the development of a world capitalist economic system as a force linking the fates of the developed and underdeveloped societies to each other (Roxborough 1983).

From within the neo-Marxist school emerged in later years, the dependency perspective on political economy. In its very early formulations by the Economic Commission for Latin American (ECLA) economists, dependency was seen as a purely economic relationship between two national economies in which the economic development of the dependent nations was conditioned by the economic development of the metropolitan nations. Subsequently, the scope was widened to also accommodate the political, security and social relationships as they exist between the developed and the dependent nations.

Origin of the Theory

The origin of the dependency scholarship dates back to the late Paul Prebisch who in his writing blamed the US-based trans-nationals for the development problems of the Latin American countries in the 1950s. To Prebisch, the unequal trade relationship between the United States of America and the Latin American countries, particularly, the chronic balance of payment crisis which the later was faced with and the structural deficiency of its internal economy were caused by capitalist development promoted by the transnational corporations (Omoweh 2000). Prebisch's writing laid the foundation for other eminent scholars of the dependency perspective.

Proponents of the Theory

Some of the most prominent scholars associated with the Dependency theory include Raul Prebisch, Celso Furtado; Fernando Cardoso, Osvaldo Sunkel, Paul Baran, Gunder Frank, Claude Ake, Dan Nabudere, Samir Amin, Frantz Fanon, Walter Rodney, Bade Onimode and Emmanuel Wallerstein.

Basic Tenets of the Theory:

Omoweh (2000), highlighted the core tenets of the dependency theory, some of which include that;

1. The unequal trade relationship between the centre and the peripheral countries of the world, particularly the chronic balance of payment crisis which the latter was faced with, and the structural deficiency of its internal economy were caused by capitalist development promoted by the transnational corporations.
2. The nature of industrialization initiated by the transnationals of the centre nations in the periphery states was externally – oriented. Thus, the periphery states lacked the capacity to really start self-sustaining industrialization.
3. The basic problems of dependency and underdevelopment which confronted the periphery states were not the state of affairs of these states but, rather, concrete reflection of the past and present relationship between the periphery nations and the centre nations dating back to the period of colonialism.
4. No social, political or economic institution can be understood independent of the mode of production within which it exists.

For O'Brien (1975) therefore, dependent countries are those which lack the capacity for autonomous growth and they lack this because their structures are dependent ones.

Application of Theory to the Study

Like most of Africa, the Nigerian territory lost its external sovereignty following the Berlin Conference of 1884/1885. At this conference, the emergent Nigerian state was among those ceded to Britain. France, Portugal, Belgium and Germany all had their shares. Several years of political control additionally presented European powers the opportunity to ensure economic control of their various territories in Africa. Nowhere else in Africa was this better demonstrated than in Nigeria, the most populous and diverse of them all. This the capitalist Europe achieved through the process of incorporation of the colonial economies into the international capitalist system and also assigning to them the role of producing primary products in the international division of labour. This tailored productive activities in the peripheral states towards the satisfaction of the resource needs of the centre. (Okolie 2005).

The situation was further made worse for Nigeria and other colonial states when the global economic order, designed and established by the Western Industrialized powers at the end of the World War II could not address the fears of the less developed South, but rather, skewed all the economic policies in favour of the centre. Oxfam (2002) report for instance, clearly notes that the rich countries that make the rules of international trade do so to their own interest and in their favour. When developing countries export to rich countries markets, they face barriers that are four times more stringent than those encountered by rich countries. The World Bank (IBRD) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) sanction these unfair rules when they require countries of the South to open up their markets as condition for loan. This, coupled with Multinational Corporations MNCs that are encumbered by government regulations in a free market environment contribute to poverty, insecurity and eroded state sovereignty in the South. The above views were corroborated by Sitglitz (2002) when he asserts that;

the international economic institutions of the World Bank, IMF, WTO and GATT set the rules of International trade that are biased in favour of the more advanced industrialized countries.

He further argues that not only do rich countries create import barriers for the poor countries but that working through the IMF and the World Bank; the rich countries require countries of the South to reduce all barriers which often negatively affect local businesses and consequently the indigenous people.

Given the above scenario, it is clearly seen that the industrialized North extended capitalism to the periphery South in a manner that generated local conditions and stifled the expansion of capitalist ideals in the South. In Nigeria for instance, state capacity to undertake and implement independent socio-economic policies was eroded. Ukeje (2010) was explicit on this when he informed that weak capacity of the Nigerian state in their relationship with International capital continues to make it difficult to meet her most fundamental foreign policy goals. Nigeria's fundamental foreign policy goals as already stated, in particular, the protection of lives and property of citizens; the protection and maintenance of the territorial integrity of the nation; maintenance of peace and security in the nation among others. In due course, we shall see how much Nigeria has fared with her foreign policy in promoting, defending and actualizing her national security interest in a globalizing world order.

Incidents and Threats to National Security in Nigeria

The 1979 and 1989 constitutions of the Federal Republic of Nigeria clearly outlined the foreign policy objectives through which her national interest could be protected in a globalizing world. Central to these objectives as captured in Section 20 of 1989 Constitution is the promotion of Nigeria's national security, in particular, her territorial integrity, external and internal sovereignty, as well as rapid economic development.

Sadly, Nigeria remains embroiled in festering internal political crisis that could undermine its territorial

integrity. The centripetal forces that have held this fragile union of diverse nationalities are waning, due in larger part, to continual political tensions orchestrated by unjust and unfair treatment of citizens, bolstered by ethnic and religious differences (Anejionu and Ahiamunah 2018). Rather than abating, political tensions have been tremendously heightened by the presidential elections of the fourth republic. In particular, the 2015 and the 2019 presidential elections continued to elicit fears that points to disastrous consequences. Many months after the 2023 presidential elections, tensions continue to mount with increasing calls for self-determination in different parts of the country. At one level, it has been calls for restructuring of the lopsided federation mostly championed by the predominantly Yoruba of the Southwest with pockets of support from the minority North-central and South-south geopolitical zones. At another level, it has been a clamour for outright secession from the federation by the predominantly Ibo Southeast geopolitical zone under the command of the now proscribed Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB). While the modus operandi of the IPOB remains violent agitation in which many lives, particularly, state security officials have been lost, other parts of the country, particularly, the vast sahel Northern region remain worse off.

The multiple security challenges posed by the Boko Haram terrorist group, the North-west cross border bandits, the farmer-herder conflicts, kidnappers and abductors among other criminalities are fast eroding the territorial integrity of the Nigerian state. A terrorist group which translates loosely as “*Western Education is Forbidden*” was created in 2002 by the now deceased Islamist cleric, Mohammed Yusuf even though forms of the group have existed under a variety of names since the late 1990s (Loimeier 2012). Boko Haram members mostly come from the Kanuri ethnic community that makes up four percent of the Nigerian Population. Boko Haram aspires to create an Islamic State in Nigeria and is willing to kill Christians and Muslims they deem to be insufficiently pious in order to achieve this. It has attacked Nigerian police and security forces, military facilities, banks, churches, schools and even the United Nations office in Nigeria’s federal capital. It has carried out drives by shootings, car bombs and suicide attacks; and commits kidnappings and bank robberies to finance its activities.

According to Zenn (2014), Boko Haram’s violent Insurgency which began in 2009 had led to over 6,000 deaths, including over 2,000 by May 2014 alone. In November 2013, the UN Human Rights Office stated that the group could be guilty of crime against humanity (VOA News 2013). Progress made by Nigerian Security forces against Boko Haram between the second half of 2015 and the end of 2016 were lost when the terrorists started to reclaim territories hitherto lost to the government forces in the North east. At the end of 2017, Boko Haram together with its splinter group the Ansaru were effectively in control of 14 local government areas in Borno state, two in Yobe and one in Adamawa states. Boko Haram in particular, hoisted its flag on these captured territories, developed anthems and pledge of loyalty melodies, deposed traditional rulers, replaced them with loyalists, levied taxes on inhabitants, collected royalties from farmers, fishermen and herders among other impunities. It was visibly clear that Nigeria’s territorial integrity had been compromised.

Ansaru is a splinter group from Boko Haram that has been operating since May 2011, though only announced its existence in January 2012. The group was banned in the UK in November 2012 and in the US since November 2013. According to International Crisis Group Africa Report (2014), Ansaru was formed in protest against Boko Haram’s indiscriminate killing of Muslims. It emerged primarily to restore dignity to Islam. Ansaru’s charter prevents attack on Nigerians, a clear difference to Boko Haram’s actions. However, they have co-ordinated their activities when it is convenient – for example, in the kidnapping of a French priest in Cameroon in November 2013. Since its inception, Ansaru has largely focused on kidnap for ransom, primarily of Europeans. In 2011 for instance, Ansaru kidnapped and in 2012 killed a British and an Italian hostage in Sokoto (Guardian 2012). The group has attempted to link such kidnappings to broader issues pertaining to Islam – for example, the December 2012 kidnapping of a French citizen was described as retaliation for the French military operation in Mali and their ban on full face veils

Insurgency and banditry in the Northwest and Northcentral geopolitical zones of Nigeria postdates the Boko-Haram terrorism in the Northeast, but have also become as devastating. In Plateau, Kaduna, Benue, Niger and Nasarawa states, ethno-religious conflicts that were often sparked by mild disagreements in the early years of the fourth republic were mismanaged. Regular inter-ethnic, inter-religious and farmer-herder violent clashes have witnessed massive increase in the volume of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALWs) in circulation all over the region. With so much of these dangerous weapons in the hands of the youthful population, criminality has soared to make some of the flash points of the Northcentral geopolitical zone killing fields – the Wukari and Kastina Ala axis In the Benue Valley region; the Agatu area in Benue state; Nasarawa Eggon area in Nasarawa state; the Birnin Gwari and adjoining forests in the Jama'a region of Southern Kaduna; Jos North and Bassa areas of Plateau state; among several other locations. The number of violent deaths being recorded in this geopolitical zone keeps soaring even as security agencies look overwhelmed. For instance, as recent as August 2021, twentyfive Nigerians peacefully travelling on a faith-based mission were brutally slaughtered few kilometers outskirts of Jos, the capital of Plateau state (NTA News 2021). Only three days after, gunmen killed six and abducted an unknown number of indigenes during an inter-ethnic clash in Bassa local government area of Plateau state (Okoye 2021).

In Nigeria's Northwest zone, Zamfara, Kastina and Kaduna states are easily the theatre of insurgency, banditry, and cattle rustling. These rampaging criminalities have been compounded by poor border security which seems to have thrown Nigerian land borders open to all manners of illegal migration. Scores of bandits, cattle rustlers and other criminal elements are known to migrate from the neighbouring Niger Republic, Cameroon, Chad and nearby Mali, Burkina-Faso and Central African Republic (CAR) into Nigeria on daily bases to carry out their nefarious acts. Attacks have regularly been unleashed on villages, cities, farming communities and schools in the North-west states, particularly in the last one year. Scores of people have been killed, hundreds abducted and thousands displaced from their settlements. The bandits have often walked away with their loots, captives and atrocities to the consternation of the bewildered public. Beyond issuing threat messages to the bandits and strongly worded but reassuring releases to the public, the federal and state governments have not shown capacity to contain these criminals. This is demonstrated by the continual rise in criminal incidences. For instance, in February 2021, over 200 students of Government Girls' Secondary School Jangibi, Zamfara state were abducted by gunmen with only marginal number set free after six months (Channels New 2021). By mid-August 2021, several gunmen attacked Zamfara State College of Agriculture and Animal Science in Bakura and killed three workers while three other workers escaped. However, a total of 116 students and staff were whisked away into captivity (The Nation 2021).

While security operatives intensify efforts on their rescue plans with the abductors reducing the ransom placed on the abductees from N350 Million to N150 Million (TVC News 2021), another group of bandits attacked Maru community also in Zamfara state, killed one and abducted 10 inhabitants (TVC News 2021). Elsewhere in neighbouring states of Kastina, Sokoto, Kaduna and Niger, security situation remains as bad with banditry, abduction and cattle rustling rising in frequency and intensity. The outburst coming from former Governor Aminu Masari of Kastina state when he called on the people inhabiting banditry prone areas to acquire weapons and defend themselves against the bandits (Ibrahim 2021) may bear relevance to his frustration with the high level of insecurity in his state. This is coming on the heel of a recent disclosure by the member presenting Sabon Birni North Constituency in the Sokoto State House of Assembly, Aminu Mustapha Boza that over 50,000 residents of the 17 communities in the Sabon Birni Local Government Area of Sokoto State have relocated to the neighbouring Niger Republic over incessant bandit attacks (Sahara Reporters 2021).

Internal sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Nigerian state faces more challenges in the hydrocarbons rich South-south geopolitical zone of the country. International Crisis Group (2006), had earlier informed that less than a year before Nigeria holds its third national elections since the end of military rule in 1999,

tensions are running high in the Southern Niger Delta. A number of militant groups have begun allying themselves with local politicians nursing some electoral aspirations. These groups and others continue to employ legitimate grievances to justify increasingly damaging attacks against government and oil industry infrastructure. However, as difficult as the Niger Delta conflict presented, it was the Bakassi conflict which started in 2006 in the oil and gas rich Bakassi Peninsula that tested the sovereignty and integrity of the Nigerian state (TNT World 2019). The conflict resulted from improperly demarcated land border lines between Nigeria and the Cameroons after the independence of both countries. While the Nigerian government claimed the border was theirs prior to the British-German agreement in 1913, Cameroon claimed the border laid down by the British-German agreements, ceded the territory to her. While the Nigeria-Cameroon contest over Bakassi ownership appeared archived for many years, it was the overthrow of Nigeria's Head of State, General Yakubu Gowon by General Murtala Mohammed in 1975 that brought the conflict to the front burner once again. Mohammed claimed that Gowon had agreed to transfer the oil rich territory to Cameroon when he willingly signed the *Maroua Declaration*. While Mohammed's government refused to ratify the agreement, Cameroon regarded it as being in force (Ngalmi 2006).

Between 1980s and 1990s, the border dispute worsened and almost resulted to a war between the two countries. In 1994, Cameroon went to the International Court of Justice (ICJ) to avoid war with Nigeria after many armed clashes occurred in the disputed regions. Eight years later, the ICJ ruled in Cameroon's favour and confirmed the 1913 border made by the British and Germans as the International border between the two countries. Nigeria confirmed it would transfer Bakassi to Cameroon. In June 2006, Nigeria signed the *Greentree Agreement* which marked the formal transfer of authority in the sub region and the Nigerian Army partly withdrew from Bakassi. The move was opposed by many Bakassians who considered themselves Nigerians and they started to arm themselves on 2nd July 2006. Two year later, the Nigerian Army fully withdrew from the Peninsula and it transitioned to Cameroonian control. This brought to an end, Nigeria's de facto administration of the territory (BBC News 2017).

At the economic front, available records indicate that while global wealth has undoubtedly increased, it has become concentrated in fewer hands and fewer countries (Awake 2002). In its pre-budget memorandum to the federal government, the Organized Private Sector (OPS), comprising the Manufacturers Association of Nigeria (MAN), the Nigerian Chamber of Commerce, Industry, Mines and Agriculture (NACCIMA) and the Nigerian Employers Consultative Association (NECA) raised the alarm that full adoption of World Trade Organization (WTO) treaty has made the Nigerian economy vulnerable and porous in importation of goods that could, otherwise be produced locally (Anyakoha 2003). The point being made here is that as a result of liberalization, a major driving force of globalization, Nigeria has become a dumping ground for all manner of manufactured products. This has necessitated the frequent calls by Nigerian manufacturers for further negotiation of the WTO treaty in order to protect the local industry and by extension, the Nigerian economy from massive dumping of finished goods from the industrialized economies (Ajagu 2006). Additionally, liberalization as presently conceived by the Euro-American scholars, coupled with the overwhelming capacity of the Multinational Corporations (MNCs) to shape foreign policy of host nations, manipulate Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), weaken local initiative and remit excess profit to their home countries cannot support the rapid economic development of a typical third world state like Nigeria.

FOREIGN POLICY AND NATIONAL SECURITY IN NIGERIA

Modern day globalization started to assert itself at about the same era of Nigeria's independence. What was most significant for Nigeria as an emergent state was a leadership that can harness her massive human capital and resource endowment to make her a global voice. Unfortunately, the Nigerian political class at independence was timid and conservative, and thereby, viewed her national interest from the periscope of colonial considerations. This can explain why her foundational weak bureaucracy could not articulate strong foreign policy guidelines. It can, as well, explain why at independence, natural endowments were not properly harnessed for national industrialization that can in turn become a lunch-pad for robust foreign

policy posturing. Beyond academic theorizing and in concrete terms, therefore, what continues to play out in Nigeria's International relations are clear departure from her foreign policy objectives and in outright conflict with her national security interest.

The foundation of Nigeria's weak foreign policy, therefore, was laid during the early years of her nationhood when she freely flaunted the idea that she was not in a hurry to make new friends particularly outside the Anglo-American capitalistic ideology bloc (Dudley 1982). Early political leaders of Independent Nigeria were unequivocal in turning down overtures from the USSR, China and Israel to the extent that these states were refused establishing embassies in Nigeria. Nigeria also showed no interest in entering into serious diplomatic relations with leading socialist countries and callously demonstrated this by playing down the idea of opening diplomatic missions in such countries. Rather, she preferred to join the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) if only to insulate herself from the pressures of global ideology politics of the time. Such decisions continue to have severe implications for her foreign policy posturing on critical issues of national and global interests.

Nigeria has not acquired the capability to make use of assets, technologies, skills and learning increasingly available in today's global community to play robust roles in international politics. The political economy structure which ties her to the apron string of International capitalism continues to diminish her capacity to actualize her foreign policy objectives, particularly her national security interest. The rising security challenges that have turned the entire Northern part of the country into a killing field; the increasing fragility of the sovereign Nigerian arising from persisting agitation for self-determination from the IPOB and OPC groups among others and the seeming helplessness of the Nigerian-state to maintain order in all these have called to question the quality of her foreign policy. In the Sahel northern fringe of Nigeria where the activities of the Boko Haram and Ansaru terrorist groups as well as bandits and other criminal gangs have resulted to the death of many and also disruption of socio-economic activities, the federal government of Nigeria has been unable to fully explore the available windows to defeat the insurgents. However, even though some efforts to coordinate against Boko Haram militants through a Multinational Joint Task Force (MNJTF) have been made, but inconsistent commitment of the four Chad Basin member nations –(Nigeria, Chad, Niger and Cameroon) to the force, funding problems and disjointed planning have hindered its effectiveness (ICG Report 2020). The report singled out the inability of member states, particularly Nigeria to follow military operations with efforts to rebuild and improve conditions for residents of recaptured areas as the most disturbing bane. Additionally, it informs that Abuja tends to see the MNJTF as a face-saving way to portray operations by other countries forces, mainly Chad on Nigerian soil as international cooperation but still aims to preserve primacy in counter insurgency efforts and regards fuller integration among the forces warily (ICG 2020).

In addition, the lack luster performance of Nigeria's federal government in handling issues that borders on agitation and secession continues to embarrass the Nigerian public. For instance, poor handling of Igbo continual agitation even over 50 years after the Nigerian civil war has created crisis of confidence for the Nigerian state. Today, the country is more divided than ever with a heavily rearmed IPOB and O'dua Peoples' separatist agitators. Accusations of human rights abuses by the international community and also multilateral agencies including the Amnesty International and the Transparency International have met with brash and unapologetic responses from the Nigerian state officials. Such posturing, devoid of basic diplomacy and best foreign policy practices have remained the trend in Nigeria's foreign policy even in a globalizing world.

If separatist agitations across different regions of the federation were not seen as enough threat to the territorial integrity of Nigeria, Wakili (2017), informs that the Niger Delta crisis as well as the Nigeria-Cameroon contest over the oil rich Bakassi Peninsula was enough proof that Nigeria's territorial integrity was at stake. The fact that Nigeria timidly accepted the International Court of Justice (ICJ) ruling which removed the ownership of the oil rich Peninsula from her and handed it over to the Cameroon was seen by

many as irresponsible. According to Abughdyer (2018), Nigeria ceding of the Bakassi Peninsula was a gross violation of her foreign policy objectives. Nigeria sadly lost her strategic assets in the Peninsula due to the inability of the leadership of the country to properly apply the military, economic, diplomatic and other capabilities to protect her territory.

In addition to poor deliveries at the political and security realms, the Nigerian foreign policy scorecard in a globalizing world has been abysmally low. Having abinitio been rail roaded into the international capitalist system as an ill-equipped subordinate, the Nigerian state lacked the capacity to articulate foreign policy that will impact positively on the security and economic environment.

Economically, globalization with its propelling dynamics of liberalization, Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and Multinational Corporations (MNCs) undermine national development. Nigeria's amateur industries cannot compete with industries in the West which continues to produce and sell cheaply until monopoly is established and then, prices of goods are hiked. In addition, while Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) has continued to sustain capital flight and unemployment, activities of the Multinational Corporations (MNCs) have continued to undermine the development policies of Nigeria. This explains ecological problems wherever they are found. Most foreign companies operating in Nigeria have, for instance, refused to respect the policy of local-content in manufacturing industries as contained in their certificates of incorporation. It has also been observed that control of immigrants by Nigeria continues to suffer defeat due to liberalization a core aspect of globalization. Thus, the Nigerian government has become subservient to the authorities of the multinational corporations and their home governments since they dominate the local economy.

At the social sphere, globalization has exported cultural imperialism to Nigeria. In so far as "cultural promotion" bears relationship with economic power and technology, those who have economic power propagate their culture and thereby, influence others. As a satellite state that has lost her socio-economic sovereignty in the current global order, Nigeria is dependent on Western countries, their institutions and their dictates. With these numerous contraptions, the Nigerian state may not be able to articulate policies that can fundamentally transform her foreign policy, particularly, in an increasingly complex and globalizing world.

However, that Nigeria, like most other developing nations currently lack the capacity for competitive and monopoly capitalism does not make globalization an entirely dangerous venture. There is high expectation that institutional driven foreign policy objectives can provide the platform for Nigeria's strong presence in the globalization process. Prospects of technological adoption and cultural appreciation by all nations that continued to be in constant touch abound. Indonesia, for instance, achieved its present feat through Foreign Direct Investment. Other states of the "Asian Tiger" and the "BRICS" bloc leap frogged quantum developmental steps through the instrumentality of globalization. Globalization has, therefore, shown its visibility through the Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) which remains one of its most impactful mechanisms. Through this mechanism, Nigerians no longer need to travel to far countries to be able to appreciate their ways of life. Additionally, Nigerians are availed the opportunities and privileges of distance learning through browsing the website of libraries for study and research materials. Numerous Nigerians are also enjoying the benefit of e-banking and e-commerce which hastens business transactions between them and those living in other parts of the world.

By and large, therefore, in a rapidly globalizing world, Nigeria cannot be said to have adequately benefitted from the dynamics of the process and this results basically from her lackluster and timid foreign policy posturing.

CONCLUSION

In this study, we attempted to examine the relationship between two critical variables; national security and

Nigerian foreign policy within the context of a globalizing world. This we did using appropriate framework of analysis and standard methods for qualitative data gathering and treatment. Findings show that despite having clearly-spelt out foreign policy objectives capable of securing and stabilizing the nation, Nigeria's execution of these objectives remains tardy as a result of factors like weak economic base as well as inadequate bureaucratic structures. It is now very obvious that these deficiencies will not enable Nigeria to realize her foreign Policy objectives, particularly, in an era when the world has come under intense globalization process. Capitalism, whether as a political ideology or economic philosophy is not known to listen to the prayers of the weak but can only oblige the will of the strong. As presently trending, globalization has become a project of the capitalist world and as such only the industrialized and wealthy capitalist nations (mostly in the West) can today push through their foreign policy objectives with relative ease. Given the numerous obstacles therefore, realizing Nigeria's foreign policy objectives of territorial and national value integrity, security of lives, property and national institutions as well as engendering economic prosperity in the current globalizing world order will continue to remain herculean.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To develop foreign policy implementation capacities that can also support the actualization of her national security interest in a globalizing world order, Nigeria must strive to:

Identify and fully harness her economic potentials in agriculture, hydrocarbons and abundant critical metals that she possessed. She must draw up policies that deploy science and technologies on her abundant natural endowments. Once she gets her economy industrialized through this process, the foundation for a dynamic foreign policy is laid. She can now, robustly stand against the myriad of national security threats that crystallised against her in an intensely globalizing world.

Initiate intensive diplomatic consultations with governments of the immediate neighbours to "sound them out," build confidence and consensus on the general proposition of a joint development and integration agenda for the subregion. As the incontestable sub-regional hegemon, Nigeria will encounter no problem driving this.

Initiate and drive the idea of free movement of people and goods to allow for unhindered participation in the larger economy of the respective neighbouring countries. For instance, in the markets of Dantokpa and Ifonyin in Benin Republic, it is reported that Nigerian-made products have nearly displaced local goods. Yet, such products were not exported officially to Benin, but through smuggling. The same applies to Nigeria and Cameroon. Existing restrictions significantly harm the development outlook and well-being of the trans-border people.

Initiate and nurture to fruition the idea of broadening of areas of co-ordination and unified operations to include Defence and Intelligence; Fisheries and Mineral Exploitation; Customs and Immigration; Agriculture and Food production; Language and Cultural Development; Research and Small-Scale industries. These initiatives if driven by competent institutions and appropriate legal frameworks will impact positively on a broad range of interests that operate in countries and communities that share border with Nigeria. Once engagements are mutually and relatively beneficial, resentments that breed terrorism, belligerency, insurgency, banditry and militancy are naturally doused.

Regularly consult and engage the services of foreign policy experts for informed decisions on critical issues of foreign policy. A typical test case was the Nigeria-Cameroon Bakassi conflict which saw Nigeria's ceding of the Peninsula as a gross violation of her foreign policy objectives. Nigeria lost her strategic assets in the Peninsula due to the inability of the leadership of the country to articulate and properly apply the military, economic, diplomatic and other capabilities to protect her territory.

In all, Nigeria should strive to acquire the capability to effectively make use of assets, technologies, skills and learning increasingly available to other states in an era of globalization. It is only by so doing that she can develop a foreign policy with which she can actualize her national security interest. Nigeria must, therefore, do all that is legitimate to detach from the global economic arrangement which has tied her to the apron string of the international capitalist system.

REFERENCES

1. Abughdye G (2018) Nigerian Foreign Policy and Territorial Integrity: Understanding the Bakassi Peninsula Conflict in Fuduma Journal of Politics and International Affairs; Vol 2, No 2.
2. Ajagu A (2006) "Globalization: Challenges of Industrial Development in a Free Market Economy" *The Guardian Newspaper*; Lagos: March 4.
3. Ake C. (1995) "The New World Order: The View from Africa" In Hans-Henrick and G Sorrenson (eds) *Whose World Order: Uneven Globalization and End of Cold War*; London: West View Press.
4. Akinboye S (2008) "Globalization and the Challenges for Nigeria's Development in the 21st Century". <http://www.unilag.org/links/conference/globalization/akinboye.pdf>
5. Akinboye S (2013) Beautiful Abroad but Ugly at Home; Issues and Contradictions in Nigeria's Foreign Policy. An Inaugural lecture delivered on July 17 2013 at the University of Lagos.
6. Akinboye S and Ottoh F. (2006) *A Systematic Approach to International Relations*; Lagos Concept Publications Limited
7. Akinboye S. (1999) "Nigeria's Foreign Policy" In *Elements of Politics*. Anifowose R and Enemufo F. (Eds) Lagos: Malthouse Press Ltd.
8. Akinterinwa B (2011) "Nigeria's Foreign Policy Must Reflect National Interest" In *The Nations Newspaper*; Lagos; June 23
9. Akpotor A (2011) *International Relations: An Introduction*; Benin City: Allen Prints and Publishing Company.
10. Alli. W (2006) "The Impact of Globalization on Conflict in Africa" In Shedrack Gaya Best (ed) *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa*; Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.
11. Aluko O. (1978) "Options in Nigeria's Foreign Policy" in NIIA Lecture series, No 22.
12. Anejionu O and Ahiamunah P (2018) "Can Current Political Developments in Nigeria Undermine its Territorial Integrity" In *Geopolitics of Nigeria*. <https://www.researchgate.net>3290>.
13. Anyakoha E. (2003) "Positioning Nigeria for Development in an Era of Globalization" Fullbright Alumni, Nigeria Book of Readings.
14. Asobie A (2002) "International Relations, Foreign Policy and the Prospects and Problems of Globalization," Paper presented at the ASUU National Conference with the theme; The Crises of the Nigerian State: Perspectives and Challenges. Abuja. October 14-17
15. Azide J. (2008) "Globalization as Imperialism and Underdevelopment" In *Nigerian Journal of Politics and Administration* Vol. 1, No. 2
16. BBC News (2017) Cameroon Forces kill 97 Nigerian Fishermen in Bakassi; 14 July
17. Channels TV News Flash (21.02.2021) Over 200 Students of GGSS Jangibi Abducted in
18. Dudley B (1982) *An Introduction to Nigerian Government and Politics*; London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
19. Faleti S. (2006) "Theories of Social Conflict" In *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies In West Africa*. Gaya – Best S. (Ed); Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
20. Fukuyama F (1992) *The End of History and the Last Man*; London: Hamish Hamilton
21. Guardian Newspaper (2012) "British and Italian Hostages killed in Nigeria", Lagos: March 8
22. Ibeanu O (1997) "Globalization and Peace Building in Africa" In *Peace Research Institute Proceedings of the 1997 Conference on Inter-group wars and African Development*. University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

23. Ibeanu O (2000) *Reflection of Globalization and American Pragmatism: An African View point*; Nsukka: Apex Publishers
24. Ibrahim T (2021) Jibia Killings: Acquire Arms to Defend Yourselves in *Daily Trust*; Abuja: Tuesday August 17.
25. ICG Africa Report (2014) Curbing Violence in Nigeria (II); The Boko Haram Insurgency; Available at <http://www.crisisgroup.org/-/media/les/africa/west-africa/nigeria/216-curbing-violence-in-nigeria-II-the-boko-haram-insurgency.pdf> p26
26. ICG Report (2006) “Fuelling the Niger Delta Crises” In Report 118/Africa, 28 September
27. ICG Report (2020) “What Role for the Multinational Joint Task Force in Fighting Boko Haram” In Report 291/Africa, 7 July
28. Kwanashie M.(1999), “Concepts and Dimensions of Globalization in Nigeria’s Economic Society.” *Globalization and Nigeria’s Economic Development*; Ibadan: NES
29. Loimeier R (2012), The Development of the Militant Religious Movement in Nigeria. *Africa Spectrum*, 47 (2-3)
30. Madunagu E (1999) “Globalization and its Victims” *The Guardian*; Lagos: July 26
31. Marx K and Engels F. (1977) *Manifesto of Communist Party*; Moscow: Progress Publishers.
32. Mbah C (2012) A Critical Analysis of the Impact of Globalization on the Democratization Process in African States. A seminar Paper Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Award of a Ph.D in International Relations, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, August 2012.
33. Nabudere D (2000) *Globalization and the Post-Colonial African State*; Harare: AAPS Books
34. Ngali A (2016) “African Boundary Conflicts and International Mediation: The Absence of Inclusivity in Mediating the Bakassi Peninsula Conflict” *Social Science Research* 9:1-2.
35. NTA News (15.08.2021) Gunmen kill 23 Travellers at the Outskirt of Jos, Plateau State Capital
36. O’ Brien P. (1975). A Critique of Latin American Theories of Dependency In I. Oxaal (Ed) *Beyond the Sociology of Development*; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
37. Oche O. (2000) “Principles of International Relations” in Selected Readings on Nigeria’s Foreign Policy and International Relations; Akindele R. and Ate B (eds); Ibadan: Vintage Publishers.
38. Oddih M (2000) “Globalization and Nigeria’s Socio-Economic Development in the New Millennium” *Journal of Political Science*
39. Ogwu J. (1986) Nigerian Foreign Policy: *Alternative futures*; Lagos: NIIA.
40. Okolie A (2005) “International Donor Agencies and Sustainable Human Development in ” In *State and Economy*. Obi E. and Obikeze E. (Eds); Onitsha: Book-Points Ltd
41. Okonkwo N; Efeurhobo D and Emuebie J (2013) Nigerian Democracy and National Security In *Nsugbe Journal of Arts and Social Sciences NJASS*. Vol.5, No 1. August 2013.
42. Okoye F (2021) “Gunmen kill 6 in Plateau Abduct 17 in Zamfara” In *Leadership Newspaper*, Lagos: Wednesday 18th August
43. Omoweh D. (2000) “Dynamics of Globalization: Impact on Nigeria and Africa” In *Selected Reading on Nigeria’s Foreign Policy and International Relations*, Akindele R. and Ate (Eds). NIIA Enlightenment Course Series; Vol 1 No. 1. Ibadan: Vantage Publishers.
44. Oriakhi F (2001). “Globalization as Imperialism: The Nigerian Experience” In Odion-Akhine S (ed), *Globalization, United Nations and the Fringe Players*; Lagos: CENCOD
45. Oxfam (2002) *Rigged Rules and Double Standards Trade*; London: Oxford University Press
46. Plano J. and Otton R. (1982) *The International Relations Dictionary*; Santa Barbara: ABC – CLIO
47. Roxborough. I. (1983). *Theories of Underdevelopment*; London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
48. Rugumanu M (1999) *Ecology, Politics and Violent conflict*; London: Zed Books
49. Sahara Reporters (2021) “17 Nigerian Communities Flee to Niger Republic Over Continuous Bandit Attacks; New York: August 21
50. Saliu H (2010) “Connecting Nigeria Foreign Policy to the Citizens at Home and Abroad” *Democracy, Governance and International Relations*; Ibadan: College Press and Publishers limited, Lead University.

51. Stiglitz J (2002) *Globalization and its Discontents*; N.Y: WW Norton
52. The Nation (2021) “Bandits Attack College of Agriculture Bakura, kill and Abduct Workers,” Lagos: August 15.
53. TNT World (2019) The Lifelong Consequences of a little known Nigeria-Cameroon Land Dispute; 16 May
54. TVC News Flash (2021) “Abductors of Zamfara College Workers Reduces Ransom to One Hundred and Fifty Million Naira”. Friday 20 August.
55. TVC News Flash (2021) “Gunmen kill One, Abduct 10 in Maru” Wednesday, August 18.
56. Ukeje C. (2010) “Oiling Regional Insecurity: The Niger Delta Crisis, Security and Stability in the Gulf of Guinea. In Nigerian Journal of International Affairs Vol. 36, No.2.
57. UNHR: VOA News (2013) Boko Haram May be Guilty of Crimes against Humanity. Available at <http://www.voanews.com/content/un-boko-haram-may-be-guilty-of-crimes-againsthumanity/html>
58. Wakili I (2017) “Niger Delta Crisis: Nigeria’s Territorial Integrity at Stake In Daily Trust; Abuja: October 15”
59. Zenn J (2014) “Nigerian al-Qaedaism” Current Trends in Islamist Ideology, 16, 99-117. <http://www.hudson.org/content/researchattachments/attachment/1;92/zenn.pdf>