

# Nigeria's Foreign Policy, Peace Keeping And Domestic Challenges: Towards A Realistic Foreign Policy.

Obi Emeka Anthony Ph.D

Associate Professor of Public Administration,  
Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University Igbariam Campus

**Abstract:** *A nation's foreign policy is its domestic policy pursued abroad in the pursuit of its national interests. Ideally, a nation's foreign policy is supposed to mirror its domestic realities and future ambitions and expectations As an independent state, Nigeria has been involved in numerous peace keeping operations as part of its foreign policy. This paper looks at Nigeria's foreign policy generally but with particular emphasis on peace keeping operations. Its main objective is to evaluate the place of national interest in Nigeria's foreign policy. We relied on Snyder's decision making model. As an ex post facto research, data was gotten from secondary sources and content analysis used for the analysis. The findings indicate that the consideration of Nigeria's national interest has not been the major factor propelling the country's foreign policy, secondly, the present economic challenges of Nigeria does not justify its bogus foreign policy pursuits, and finally, the country's current security challenges do not justify its continued involvement in peace keeping operations. Based on this therefore, the paper suggests that Nigerian decision makers must be made to base the country's foreign policy on purely its national interest, while Nigeria's economic realities must be considered in foreign policy making and implementation. Finally, since Nigeria is currently facing serious internal security challenges which seem to have overwhelmed its security forces, the international community that have involved Nigeria in solving similar problems in the past elsewhere, should be involved in tackling this challenge.*

**Keywords:** Foreign policy, Peace keeping, national interest and security challenges.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Foreign policy has been defined by Holsti (1995), as the actions of a state towards the external environment and the conditions usually domestic under which these actions are formulated. In the same vein, Rodee (1957, in Obi 2015), sees it "as the formulation and implementation of a group of principles which shape the behaviour pattern of a state while negotiating with other states to protect or further its vital interests". It is important to note at this point that it is not all international contacts that can be really associated with foreign policy, because foreign policy covers only the activities which are sponsored, supported or are known by the government. The implication of this is that actions which are international in character but which are conducted without the knowledge of the government cannot be classified under foreign policy. Secondly, according to Obikeze and Obi (2003), is that it is wrong to assume that the foreign policy of states emanates from the domestic scene, as this notion does not take into cognizance the place or position of weak, dependent or satellite states that lack the capacity for autonomous actions due to their dependent status in the international political economy. Thus, for these unfortunate states, their foreign policy actions emanate abroad, and are confronted by external forces for which they have little or no control, and which they believe they cannot confront.

Over the years it has become axiomatic that the foreign policy of states must be based on national interest just human actions are based on personal interest. This made

the great international relations scholar, Hans Morgenthau to state in his masterpiece 'Politics Among Nations' that "no nation can have true guide as to what it must and what it needs to do in foreign policy without accepting national interest as a guide" (cited in Obi 2015,p.16). He thus sees national interest as "aimed at promoting national image, prestige and respect both at home and abroad", and that national interest is determined by the political traditions, the total cultural contexts within which a nation formulates its foreign policy.

National interest according to Padelford et al (1976), "are centered on core values of the society, which include the welfare of the nation, the security of its political beliefs, national way of life, territorial integrity, and self preservation" and "these goals must be sought by specific policies and programmes that seek to create and preserve a favourable international environment"(cited in Obi 2015,p.15).Chandra (1982), identifies the core of national interest which is the same for all nations. The first is the desire and continuous search for national security, political independence and territorial integrity. The second is the promotion of economic interest, which includes the preservation or acquisition of favourable conditions and terms of trade. The third is the maintenance of international peace, the promotion of international law, or the establishment of global organization.

## 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

**Snyder's Decision Making Theory.**

## DECISION MAKING APPROACH

Decision making approach is an attempt to understand politics from the stand point of the decision making process. Its major premise is that decision makers are human beings who have their strengths, weaknesses, emotions, bias, personal, preferences and world views. These they get to bear on the particular decision, which they take in the name of the state. The approach demystifies the state, and reduces its actions to that of the leaders. It essentially, adopts an inter-disciplinary approach as it draws substantially from sociology, psychology, administrative theory and organizational theory. The approach sees the States as the 'decisional units and the actors are the decision makers. For its perception of actors Van Dyke (1960) in Gauba (2003) posits that:

Every actor is a decision-maker. Those acting for political parties, decide which candidate to nominate, voters decide whether to vote and for whom. Legislators decide which proposals to advance or support. Executives decide what legislation to seek, whether to sign or veto acts of the legislative body, precisely which steps to take in executing or administering the law and what policies to pursue where action is left to their discretion (p.100).

Gauba (2003) asserts that decision making approach is concerned with analysis of political systems, process and behaviour in terms of their decision mechanism and its functions.

He subsequently points out that decision making approach involves the following:

1. Identification of the issues on which decisions are made;
2. the structures involved in decision making;
3. The actors involved in decision making( this may involve study of personality if necessary);
4. the alternative courses of action or options that were considered before making a choice.
5. the factors influencing the choice of the decision makers, ie their range of preferences vis-a-vis the utilities attached to each of the alternatives
6. any external factors, pressures or constraints which influenced their decision and;
7. the out-come of the decision including its political costs

The introduction of the approach to the study of international relations is traced mainly to Richard Snyder, and two of his Junior Colleagues, H. W. Bruck and Burton Sapin, According to Asobie (1990:25) "Snyder developed in 1954 what is perhaps the first published explicit theoretical model on foreign policy decision making". While Rosenau (1969 ) believes that Snyders work was the "first extended and systematic attempt to conceptualize the role of decision making on the formulation of foreign policy and in the

processes of international politics"(p.199). He further sees the approach to the study of international political phenomena, and in the end the decision-making approach proved to be a crucial front in the behavioural revolution in political science.

Since their concern was developing a method of explaining state behaviours, they believed an understanding of all states is to be founded on an understanding of any one state through the use of a scheme which will permit the analytical construction of properties of action which will be shared in common by all specific states (Snyder et al 1969). Being quite aware of differences that exist among states, they advised that a typology of states could be constructed, depending on basic political organization, range of decision-making systems, strengths and weakness of decision-making systems and types of foreign policy strategies employed (Snyder et al 1969)

The approach proceeds with the assumption that the key to political action lies in the way in which decision makers define their situation. Thus the:

setting is conceived as consisting of internal and external parts. The internal setting includes personalities, roles, organizations in the decisional unit, the governmental structures within which the decision maker functions, the physical and technological conditions, the basic values and goals and the various influences operating in the society. The external setting includes all the relevant factors in the total situation of the international system existing at a particular time (Chandra 1986).

In Snyder s own model they identified three main sets of stimuli that shapes foreign policy. They are internal setting, eternal setting and decision-making process.

The internal setting refers to domestic polices, public opinion or geographical position. Asobie (1990), posits that in Snyder's conceptual model the term suggests the hypothesis that clues to the way any state behaves toward the world must be sought in the way its society is organized and functions (ie the basic social structure and behaviour) in the character and behaviour of its people and in its physical habitat. Paying attention to factors and conditions under internal setting especially the component titled 'social structure and behaviour is important because it ensures that foreign policy analysis is carried to the fundamental level of linking social organization (e.g class division, ethnic/religious polarization and antagonisms, e.t.c.).

The 'external setting' means basically those factors and conditions that are outside the boundaries of the state. These include the actions and reactions of other states as represented by their decision makers.

The third stimuli which Snyder and his colleagues consider the most important is the decision making process. Once again Asobie (1990), sees:

the decision making process in this framework as consisting of a sequence of activities carried on by

members of a unit whose behaviour is determined by organizational variables, information variables and motivational factors. Organizational variables include the size and composition of the decisional units, the degree of role differentiation and the pattern of authority relations, as well as the communication network. Information variable consist of the amount and kinds of information possessed by the decision makers and provided by the information gathering structure and the way information flows through the decisional system. And motivational factors encompass the motives, personality perception, values and learning attitudes of the decision makers. In foreign policy decision-making, the officials who act on behalf of the state are supposed to undergo an intellectual process which involves combining values, attitudes and perception (p,27).

With the aid of a diagram, Snyder and his team were able to demonstrate how the three stimuli combine in the foreign policy making process. The domestic social forces have an important impact on the formulation and execution of foreign policy: in turn a state's external actions may have serious consequences for the domestic society itself: and then again, the external and internal settings are related to each other in the sense that inter-societal, inter-cultural non-governmental interactions condition the state's official action. The critical point here, however, is that these links are filtered and fashioned through the perception, motives, experiences and interactions of decision-makers operating from different states (Asobie 1990 ).

It is necessary at this point to state that though Snyder and his team recognized the existence and role of supranational organizations in international politics, they insist that the nation state remains the dominant actor in this sphere. Coming down to the nation-state, they see it basically as a reflection of its decision makers. Thus according to them:

It is one of our basic methodological choices to define the state as its official decision-makers- those whose authoritative acts are to all intents and purpose, the acts of the state. State action is the action of those acting in the name of the state. Hence the state is the decision makers ( Snyder et al cited in Asobie 1990, p.26 ).

The perception of the state from the above perception, derives from the fact that beyond its reification, the actions attributable to a state are in the final analysis, actions by human beings who are the official decision makers of that state. Thus when we say America has done this or Nigeria did that we are simply referring to the actions, reactions or probably the inaction of political actors in these countries.

Snyder and his associates really made a meaningful impact on the study of foreign policy. According to Rosenau (1971), who in any case was Snyder's student at Princeton

University at the time of the study, the major contributions of Snyder and his associates is that it was the first significant step in the process of 'modernization of foreign policy analysis. This was by bringing to an end, quite conclusively the method of foreign policy analysis that was characterized by reification of the state and objectification of its circumstances.

The model also provides a way of empirically tracing the role of domestic variables or sources of foreign policy behaviour. In his own analysis of the model Asobie (1990:29) believes:

the most important aspect of Snyder's contributions is that it smashed the traditional assumption of a direct link between external stimuli and state response. Snyder's model provided a basis for demonstrating that What the contents of a decision are depends partly, on some cases crucially on how it is formulated as well as on the circumstances to which it is a response.(p.29).

He also believes that the model also brought about a terminological shift in foreign policy analysis because it made analysts to now focus on decision-makers instead of states as was hitherto done. Thus, bringing about a shift in emphasis from the "elements of power" to the 'perceptions', 'motives' and 'values' of occupants of 'roles'. There is no doubt that decision makers do have a lot of influence on the actions of states.

## **NIGERIA AND PEACE KEEPING OPERATIONS**

Country like Nigeria in consideration of its global role. A bold and intellectually coherent foreign policy posture is sensible only if is in tune with the public interest and the material resources of the country (Ate 1990,p.461)

The implication of the above therefore is that Nigeria's involvement in African peace keeping operations should be guided not by African sentiments, but on a realistic estimate and acceptance of its condition as a poor under developed country. There is no doubt about this because the foreign policy of a country is, above all a function of the strength cohesion and resilience of its economy, society and policy( Nweke,1985 ).

At present, Nigeria is the largest "exporter of peace" in Africa and the fourth largest worldwide. Nigeria is the fourth largest troop contributing country (TCC) to peace support operations; surpassed only by Pakistan, Bangladesh and India. No African peace which Nigeria has helped to restore in many countries presently eludes a large part of the country, as Boko Haram terrorists have made the Northern part of the country, but mainly the North- East unsafe for years now. Militant Fulani cattle herdsman are ravaging the Middle Belt region with occasional incursions into the South-East and other parts of the country. The resultant effect of these are thousands of deaths and colossal destruction of properties.

Since most states are concerned about a peaceful world, they have found themselves getting involved in peace keeping operations. Peace keeping involves the deployment of an international military force under the aegis of an international organization such as the UN to prevent fighting usually by acting as a buffer between combatants. The international force is neutral between the combatants and must have been invited to be present by at least one of the combatants (Rourke,2008). This over-riding need to make the world a more peaceful place, has led the UN into intervening in different parts of the world in terms of peace keeping. Rourke (2008), notes that between 1945 when the UN was founded to 2007, it has sent over 9 million soldiers, police officers, and unarmed observers drawn from two-thirds of the world's countries to conduct 61 peace keeping or truce observation missions. In these operations, almost 2,300 of these individuals have died. In terms of features, two things to note are that first, most peace keeping operations have taken place in less developed countries (LDCs) and secondly UN forces have generally utilized military contingents from mainly LDCs.

Incidentally Nigeria is one of the LDCs that have contributed greatly in UN peace keeping operations and under other regional organizations like OAU/AU and ECOWAS.

### **NIGERIA AND PEACE KEEPING**

Nigeria's involvement in peace keeping in the world can be said to have its root in Sir Tafawa Balewa's (Nigeria's first Prime Minister) declared principles of Nigeria's foreign policy at independence. Balewa's foreign policy thrusts were outlined in three speeches he made in his foreign policy statement to the House of Representatives on August 20 1960, independence day address on October 1 1960 and his acceptance speech at the United Nations on October 8 1960. In these three speeches he committed the country to:

- 1.Maintenance of peaceful and cordial relations with all states, big or small;
- 2.championing of burning African issues such as continental unity, opposition to racism and apartheid, decolonization etc;
- 3.Maintenance of friendly and cordial relations with Great Britain and other developed Western nations;
4. contribution to the maintenance of world peace through the instrumentality of the United Nations and participation in its peace keeping operations;
- 5.membership of multi-lateral organizations that have a functional relevance

The above which have been reduced to the five principles of Nigeria's foreign policy from independence till date and which remains one of Balewa's most enduring legacies are :

According to Sesay, Fawole ,Adetula, Asiwaju and Rimdap (2011) the fourth principle which states that Nigeria would "join international organizations that are functionally relevant to its needs" not only afforded Nigeria global recognition and

acceptance for new states but also facilitated engagement in multilateral diplomacy and global governance. Based on this therefore, they argue that Nigeria became inserted into fulfilling the UN objective of maintaining international peace and security when barely five weeks after independence, its troops were already taking part in peace keeping operations in the Congo

On the same note according to them:

The fifth principle, which gives prominence to Africa as the corner stone of Nigeria's foreign policy arise from the country's own uniqueness and pride of being home to the largest concentration of Black people in any country of the world. This perhaps is also responsible for the country's occasional messianic posturing and risk taking on behalf of Africa and Africans(pp.20 21)

From all intents and purposes, It was based on these two principles enunciated by Balewa, that both the 1979 and the 1999 Constitutions under the Fundamental Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy as it affects Nigeria foreign policy, did state that:

However despite this clear directive, Nigeria's involvement in peace keeping have been questioned on two main grounds. The first is what are the concrete gains that have accrued to Nigeria through its involvement in these operations? This question arise out of the fact that foreign policy behaviour of states are expected to be based on anticipated gains or simply the state's national interest. The second question has to do with the justification of the amount of the country's human and material resources that have been spent on some of these missions, especially in view of the parlous state of the country's economy, and the poor living conditions of majority of the country's citizens.

Nigeria's first involvement in UN keeping operations was in November 1960, barely five weeks after the attainment of political independence. That involvement was the United Nations operation in Congo tagged O.N.U.C. Since then till date, Nigeria has been involved in about 45 operations globally.

Nigeria has deployed military contingents and unarmed military observers, military staff officers, uniformed Police units, Police Advisors and civilian experts. Presently, Nigeria is one of the largest UN contributing countries with military and civilian personnel deployed in ten UN keeping operations and the African Union Mission Somalia (AMISOM) (Adeniji 2005,p.i)

In all these, Nigeria has no doubt lost enormous resources, both human and material, especially in non-UN missions in Africa, thus Nigeria has spent about 8 billion us dollars in its African missions. A sample of this include:

During the peak of the Liberian and Sierra Leonean civil wars in the 1990s, Nigeria provided over 70% of ECOMOGS military and Civilian personnel, as well as logistical support. In 2003, it deployed 1,500 troops to the ECOWAS Mission in Liberia (ECOMIC), and a medical and signals team to the ECOWAS Mission in Cote d'ivoire in 2003 (ECOMIC). In 2004, 1500

Nigerian troops were deployed in Darfur as part of the AU Mission in Sudan (AMIS). Recently, Nigeria also provided 1200 troops to the African-led International Support Mission in Mali (AFISMA), and 200 Police officers to the AMISON. Nigeria deployed the first set of Individual Police Officers (IPOs) in Africa in ONUC in 1960 while the pioneer Formed Police Unit (FPU) of 120 officers was deployed in Liberia in 2004 (Adeniyi 2015 p.1).

The insity of these involvements have also been questioned by many Nigerians especially its enourmous resource commitment to Africa. This is based on the fact that:

Based on the range of African issues, problems and challenges that it had to champion since independence and, in the process taking considerable political, diplomatic and economic risks and sometimes even putting its own national interests and the lives of its citizens in peril. The predilection of taking the lead and expending considerable resources and energy on African problems is deeply embedded in the psyche of the members of the elite class and intelligentsia (Sesay et al 2011,p.60).

If Nigeria's high level involvement in African affairs were to be justified in the past, presently, Sesay et al (2011), argue that with the;

New and unfolding realities at home and abroad, such as the inauguration of a civilian administration in May 1999, and the global economic meltdown in 2008, the end of the Cold War, globalization, and its attendant consequences, as well as the “disappearance” of the issues that once engaged Nigeria's attention from the 1960's to the late 1980's have brought entirely new domestic and global realities and challenges, which are fast questioning the very basis of the Afro-centric policy... a quick reality check automatically suggests that a critical review of the conceptual basis and modalities for the country's foreign policy, especially its African component, is already long overdone.

On the basis of this questioning, Nigerias involvement in extensive peacekeeping has also been justified by some scholars. Adeniyi (2015) have summerized the rationale for participation to include; political rationale, normative rationale, security rationale, security rationale, economic rationale, and institutional rationale.

**Normative rationale\_** As the largest black nation on earth, Nigeria has a moral burden on it to fight for equal rights and respect for all Africans and black people worldwide. If Nigeria does not fight for the black race, probably nobody would and that might prove disastrous.

**Political rationale\_** Nigeria's participation in peace keeping operations is generally conditioned by four cardinal issues. First, Nigeria's security, independence and prosperity centered on its immediate neighbours-Benin Republic, Niger, Chad and Cameroun. The second relates to events and stability in West Africa. The third has to do with institutions

and countries outside of Africa. As a result, the West African sub-region and then Africa are paramount to Nigeria and its calculations. Nigeria also believes that its active participation in peace keeping would strengthen its case for a permanent seat in an expanded UN Security Council. Finally, Nigeria has been using the mechanism of peace keeping to boost its leadership credentials in Africa and its military and diplomatic status within the international community, as Nigeria has used peace keeping as one of the activities through which it has assumed the position of a key player in international conflict management. This is not in doubt as Nigeria is one of the 5th ranking countries in peacekeeping world wide.

**Security Rationales:** The need to protect Nigeria's territorial integrity, sovereignty as well as lives and properties of Nigerians at home and abroad is a major consideration for engaging in peace keeping operations. Thus, though when Nigeria plays a leading role in addressing Africa's security challenges, it also tightly includes ensuring its own security. In today's globalized world, what happens in one part of the continent or even the globe can have adverse effects on others both far and near. This fear of civil wars spreading to Nigeria and even the contagion effect of similar disturbances in other parts of the world have combined to push Nigeria Into peace keeping operations.

**Economic Rationale:** The economic rationale for Nigeria's involvement in peace keeping has to do with the fact that the UN reimburses all country's involved in peace keeping operations. Even the soldiers are also paid some allowances for participation. The UN pays \$1,349 per troop, while Nigeria pays its soldiers \$600 while retaining the balance of \$740 per soldier every month. This is a source of income for the country. However this is only for UN missions, as Nigeria usually bears the financial burden involved in AU and ECOWAS missions and this has led to expenditures of over \$10billion on ECOMOG operations in Liberia and Sierra Leone alone. This therefore cancels economic rationale as a justification for involvement in peace keeping operations.

**Institutional Rationale:** By getting involved in peace keeping operations, Nigerian armed forces have been able to update the knowledge of its officers. By joint operations with others, they have learnt modern techniques and weaponry. Thus, Nigerian troops have been able to benefit from training programmes like the US Africa Crisis Response Initiative (ACRI) and Africa contingents Operations Training and Assistance (ACOTA), France Reinforcement of Africa Peace keeping Capacities Progamme (RECAMP) and Canada's Military Training Assistance Programme (MTAP). Perhaps without this involvements, the Nigerian armed forces may not have the opportunity of such advanced training programmes given the country's resource constraints.

### 3. CHALLENGES TO NIGERIA'S PARTICIPATION IN PEACE KEEPING OPERATIONS.

There are so many challenges to Nigeria's involvement in peace keeping operations. The first and most critical is the issue of funding vis-a-vis Nigeria's economy. Nigeria today is rated as one of the twenty poorest countries in the world. Over 80% of its citizens exist on less than one dollar a day. What this implies is that over 80% of its population are poor. The most important task facing every Nigerian leader should be what to do with this unacceptable high rate of the population who are living below the poverty line and not to have more interest in what is happening in other countries. Presently, Nigeria is known to have spent over \$10 billion dollars in ECOMOG operations alone.

This amount is simply too much for a poor country like Nigeria to spend in solving another country's problems. This realization made Nigeria's former President Obasanjo to cry out in his address to the UN General Assembly in September 1999 to declare that:

For too long, the burden of preserving international peace and security has been left almost entirely to a few states in our sub region.....Nigeria's continual burden in Sierra Leone is unacceptably draining Nigeria financially. For our economy to take off, this bleeding has to stop (Cited in Ani K.J 2003)

Nigeria definitely has to scale down her involvement in these activities in line with her economic situation. This is because as Atte (1990) has pointed out clearly that:

For any country in the international system, it is important that its foreign policy initiatives be commensurate with the means of implementation at its disposal including its power position system. This is an old axiom in international relations, but one that applies with exceptional relevance to an underdeveloped country like Nigeria in consideration of its global role. A bold and intellectually coherent foreign policy initiative is desirable, but the policy posture is sensible only if it is in tune with the public interest and the material resources of the country (p.461).

We are therefore not saying that Nigeria should allow our African brothers, who are having disputes to decimate themselves rather, Nigeria should be more proactive by helping to solve these disputes before they get out of hand and result in civil wars. By being pro-active, these crises can be nipped in the bud, and as the saying goes, a stitch in time saves nine. Also Nigeria should use diplomatic channels to get the UN more involved in peace keeping missions in the African sub region and Africa generally, so that the cost can be borne by the UN. After all these countries are also UN members and are therefore, part of its collective security system. Whenever Africans insist that any conflict in the continent is an African issue, that they should be allowed to handle it, they should also be ready to bear the cost of handling such conflicts. Finally on this, whenever

Nigeria is involved in conflict resolution that involves spending Nigeria's resources, there should be well laid out blue prints on how to recover such resources after the conflict in line with economic diplomacy,(a quid pro quo) for in international relations, there is no free dinner.

Another challenge facing Nigeria's peace keeping efforts, according to Hamman, Mustara & Omojuwa (2013) are manpower (lack of standardization) Training and Doctrine (different training techniques and doctrine among the different countries), logistics ( lack of sufficient vehicles, medical facilities communication equipment and individual soldier kiting), funding (lack of financial support for ECOWAS & AU peace keeping operations) and Administration (Poor handling of medical care, medical evacuation, burial pay and allowances).

These challenges can be handled by the full take off of the ECOWAS Standby Force (ESF) and the African Standby Force (ASF), which will no longer be adhoc and thereby have its own mechanism of operation, acceptable to all participating countries. The only caveat here, is that Nigeria's involvement and contribution to these forces should be commensurate with its strength and economy.

One other serious challenge to Nigeria's participation in peacekeeping operations is Nigeria's internal security challenges as we have mentioned earlier. Nigeria in the past few years has been confronted with very serious internal security challenges, represented by Boko Haram insurgency, mainly in the Northern parts of Nigeria, militancy in the Niger Delta area, and kidnapping in the South East. All these are over stretching the strength of the Nigerian armed forces. Since charity begins at home, it is expected that Nigeria should first solve its internal security problems before trying to help others. Nigeria's defence budgetary allocation is highly on the increase because of these challenges while other important areas like health and education are deprived of funds. The Nigerian state should also address the fundamental causes of these problems, which are mainly economic and political. This reason for this, is because this would help to solve the problems permanently, thus reducing drastically the resort to the use of arms.

### 4. CONCLUSION

Foreign policy is not an ego trip, but rather a conscious effort to advance the national interest of a country in its interactions with other countries. There is therefore an urgent need on the part of Nigerian leaders to conduct a comprehensive review of the country's foreign policy in line with its economic realities. The era of pursuing ornamental goals is over as the government must have to face the reality of a teeming mass of a poor, hungry, angry and frustrated population at home. While not advocating a policy of indifference to the problems of others, especially our immediate neighbours, our level of involvement must be made to reflect our present realities and challenges. There is

no doubt that peace is a highly valuable resource, but the cost for maintaining peace should not be borne by a fragile country like Nigeria, to the extent of jeopardizing its economy and people. While showing interest in what happens elsewhere, our leaders should show more interest in what happens at home, and with Nigerians abroad. Since it is becoming glaring that Nigeria's internal security challenges as epitomized by the Boko Haram terrorism seem to have overwhelmed the country's armed forces, there is need to invite the international community for assistance. Finally, we make bold to say that its about time, Nigerian leaders should make Nigeria the center piece of her foreign policy. This is the way to go.

#### REFERENCES

1. Adeniyi, A.(2015).Peace keeping contributor profile: Nigeria. <http://www.profilingforpeacekeeping.org/2015/04/24peacekeeping-contributor-profile-nigeria/>
2. Ani, K.J, (2013). Nigeria and the need for economic-driven strategic peace-keeping operations. In O.J. Tangban & C.C.C Osakwe (eds.). Perspectives In African historical studies. Essays in honour of Prof. Chinedu Nwafor Ubah. Kaduna: Pyla-mak Services Ltd.
3. Asobie, H.A. (1990). Decision making models revisited: An analysis of the application of theories and models of foreign policy making to the study of Nigeria's foreign policy. In G.O. Olusanya & R.A. Akindele (Eds.) The structure and processes of foreign policy making and implementation in Nigeria 1960-1990. Lagos : NIIA
4. Ate, B (1990). Personality, the role theory, structural adjustment programme and policy- making in Nigerian foreign relations, 1985 -1987: Focus on the Lagos forum. In G.O. Olusanya & R.A. Akindele, The structure and processes of foreign policy making and implementation in Nigeria, 1960-1990. Lagos: NIIA
5. Aribisala, F (2013). A permanent seat for Nigeria in the United Nations  
[.http://www.nigeriadevelopmentandfinanceforum.org/policy-dailogue.aspx?edition](http://www.nigeriadevelopmentandfinanceforum.org/policy-dailogue.aspx?edition)
6. Danjuma T.Y (n.d). Nigeria's security in West Africa. Retrieved from <http://www.onlinenigeria.com/finance/?b!urb=:544>
7. Fawole, W.A. (2003) Nigeria's external relations and foreign policy under military rule (1966-1999). Ile-Ife: Obafemi Awolowo Universty Press
8. Gauba, O.P. (2003). An introduction to political theory (4th ed.). New Delhi : Macmillan India Ltd.
9. Hamman, S., Mustafa, I.K., & Omojuwa, K.(2013). The role of Nigeria in peace keeping operations from 1960-2013. International affairs and global strategy ISSN 2224-574 (paper) ISSN 2224-8951 (online) vol 21.
10. Nweke, G.A. (1985). National Interest and foreign policy in Nigeria. Journal of International Affairs, Vol 11, No.1
11. Obi, E.A. (2006).Basic concepts and theories of international relations. Onitsha : Bookpoint Educational Ltd.
12. Obi, E.A (2015). Fundamentals of Nigeria's foreign policy : A study on the role of national interest in foreign policy making (2nd ed.). Onitsha :Bookpoint Educational Ltd.
13. Synder, R., Bruck, J., & Sapin, B. (1962).Foreign policy decision making: An approach to the study of international politics. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.
14. Sesay, A., Fawole, W., Adetula, V., Asiwaju, A. , & Rimdap, A.B (2011). Reflections on Nigeria's foreign policy. Abuja: Friedriet Ebert Stiftung.