

## UNITED STATES AND NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY UNDER GEORGE W. BUSH JR. AND OLUSEGUN OBASANJO: A COMPARISON

**Ogunnoiki, Adeleke Olumide**

*Graduate Student, Department of Political Science,*

*Faculty of Social Sciences,*

*University of Lagos, Akoka, Lagos State, Nigeria.*

+2348035286353

[adeleke\\_ogunnoiki@yahoo.com](mailto:adeleke_ogunnoiki@yahoo.com)

### **Abstract**

*In January 2001, the Republican, George W. Bush Jr. was sworn-in as the 43<sup>rd</sup> president of the United States of America. Not long after his administration started, the terrorist group, al-Qaeda, struck the U.S homeland on September 11, 2001. To forestall another devastating terrorist attack from occurring on U.S soil, President George W. Bush Jr. adopted a new grand strategy called the 'Bush Doctrine'. Besides his counterterrorism initiative, Bush Jr. focused on immigration and narcotics control with Mexico, Israeli-Palestinian peace process, North Korea and Iran's nuclear programme, combating HIV/AIDS globally among others. In Nigeria, precisely in May 1999, Chief Olusegun Obasanjo was inaugurated as the president-elect of the federation. Facing squarely the problems his administration inherited i.e. the Nigerian State pariah status, the country's battered image abroad, huge external debt burden among others, President Olusegun Obasanjo embarked on shuttle and economic diplomacy around the world. Still on the international scene, Nigeria during the Obasanjo administration played a major role in conflict management and resolution in Africa as well as in the creation of the economic development framework for the region – NEPAD. The objective of this paper is to critically study the foreign policy of the U.S and Nigeria under President George W. Bush Jr. and President Olusegun Obasanjo after which a comparison would be made. To successfully do this, the historical and comparative approaches were adopted with the qualitative method of secondary data collection as part of the research methodology.*

**Keywords:** Foreign policy, shuttle diplomacy, external debt, terrorism, al-Qaeda, WMD

## Introduction

In the month of January, 2001, the Republican, George W. Bush Jr. succeeded the Democrat, Bill Clinton as the president of the United States of America. Like most of his predecessors, George W. Bush Jr.'s focus was on domestic issues such as tax and education reform, entitlements, and energy production (Prins and Wilford, 2013). But unknown to him, his attention roughly eight months after his swearing-in would be more on the national security of America.

On September 11, 2001, Bush Jr. was in Florida speaking at Booker Elementary School about his education initiatives (Prins and Wilford, 2013) when suddenly, al-Qaeda (Arabic: meaning the Base) struck the U.S homeland through a novel tactic that claimed the life of thousands of people from different countries. Few days after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, President George W. Bush Jr. responded by declaring a Global War on Terror (GWOT) which he planned on fighting based on his innovative grand strategy called the 'Bush doctrine' (Dalby, 2005; Dresner, 2009). Following the Bush doctrine tenets of 'preemption' and 'preventive war', the U.S invaded Afghanistan in October, 2001. The aim of the invasion was to destroy al-Qaeda's sanctuary and support system. In 2002, Bush Jr. called the rogue states – Iran, Iraq and North Korea an 'Axis of Evil' that threatened the U.S national security with Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD), precisely the lethal technology – 'nuclear weapons' that can kill indiscriminately or serious harm a large number of human beings/animals as well as destroy/seriously damage public and private structures built by man. The following year, in the month of March, the U.S invaded Iraq with the help of its ally, Britain, and a 'coalition of the willing' on the bases of a false intelligence gathered by the U.S that, Saddam Hussein possessed WMD.

From the foregoing, one might assume that President George W. Bush Jr. foreign policy focus from his first term (2001-2004) to his second term (2005-2009) in office was only on combating terrorism abroad. But that was not the case. Bush Jr.'s foreign policy, to an extent, was a continuation of Bill Clinton's foreign policy with respect to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), 'Plan Columbia' and, the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA). However, his foreign policy was unique in its own way as Bush Jr. introduced the President's Emergency Plan for Aids Relief (PEPFAR) and, the Africa Command (AFRICOM). Besides these, he focused on immigration and narcotic control with Mexico, Israeli-Palestinian peace process and, North Korea and Iran's nuclear programme.

The year 1999 would be remembered in Nigeria as the year intermittent military rule ended and democracy reemerged in the country. But prior to the rebirth of democracy in the country, a tragic incident occurred during General Sani Abacha's regime that led to Nigeria's pariah status in the international community. This incident is none other than the hanging of the environmentalist, Ken Saro Wiwa and eight other Ogoni activists on November 10, 1995. The Abacha junta hanged them after they were convicted for the murder of four traditional chiefs in Ogoni Land in 1994. Thus, Nigeria was suspended from the Commonwealth of Nations in Auckland, New Zealand, on the 11<sup>th</sup> of November, 1995, after a motion for her

suspension was moved by South Africa (Ajayi, 2005; Alao, 2011; Ashaver, 2014; Badmus and Ogunmola, 2017; Kai, *et al.*, 2017).

Following the sudden death of the dictator, General Sani Abacha in June, 1998, General Abdulsalami Abubakar became the new helmsman for a short period. The transitional programme he initiated led to his handover of the mantle of leadership to the winner of the 1999 presidential election, in person of Chief Olusegun Obasanjo in May, 1999, which marked the beginning of the Fourth Republic in Nigeria. On assuming the office of the president, Chief Olusegun Obasanjo was faced with the daunting task of treating Nigeria's ailing economy as well as repairing her dented image abroad. Hence, President Olusegun Obasanjo embarked on shuttle and economic diplomacy around the world which eventually paid off. The Obasanjo administration also focused on resolving Nigeria's Bakassi Peninsula dispute with Cameroon, Nigeria's space technology development, conflict management and resolution in Africa – Liberia, Sierra Leone, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Côte d'Ivoire etc and, Africa's economic development – NEPAD.

## **1. Conceptual Clarification**

There are two salient concepts that would go a long way in the cerebral understanding of this research paper. These two separate but closely related concepts are – i) foreign policy and ii) national interest.

### **i) Foreign Policy**

To have an understanding of what foreign policy is, it is important first and foremost to know what 'policy' itself is. "Policy can be viewed as a course of action or a reasoned choice emerging from the consideration of competing options" (Akinboye and Ottoh, 2005:115). It can also be viewed as "a proposed course of action of a person, group, or government within a given environment providing obstacles and opportunities which the policy was proposed to utilize and overcome in an effort to reach a goal or realize the objective or a purpose" (Friedrich, 1963:79) or "[a] purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of concern" (Anderson, 1975:3).

There are two types of policy – public and foreign policy. Public or domestic policy as some rightly call it, "is whatever governments choose to do or not to do" (Dye, 1978:3). Having said this, no government can meet all needs or solve all problems with its public policy. Thus, there is a need to continue public policy with foreign policy which is targeted at the external environment.

The concept 'foreign' is traceable to the Latin word "*foris*" meaning outside or abroad. Placing this side by side with the aforementioned definition of 'policy', it can be said that foreign policy simply put are the actions and inactions of the government of a state abroad. As Aluko (1981) rightly observed, "nobody has really formulated a universally acceptable definition of the concept and probably nobody will succeed in doing so". This notwithstanding, quite a number of scholars in the discipline, International Relations, have

confidently composed a befitting definition which best captures what foreign policy is all about. According to George Modelski, foreign policy “is the system of activities evolved by communities for changing the behavior of other states and for adjusting their own activities to the international environment” (Modelski, 1962:6). To Joseph Frankel, the concept “foreign policy refers to those decisions and actions, which involve, to an appreciable extent, relations between one state and others” (Frankel, 1963:1). Succinctly, foreign policy is “an interplay between the outside and the inside” (Northedge 1968:15).

## ii) National Interest

According to Ojo and Sesay (2002), the concept ‘national interest’ remains one of the most controversial concepts in contemporary international relations due to the various interpretations and misconceptions by analysts, practitioners as well as politicians and decision-makers throughout the world.

National interest can either be objective or subjective. National interest is said to be objective if it is an aggregate of the interest of different groups in a country – ethnic groups, religious groups, political groups etc. Knowing full well that the process involved in arriving at the total of the interest of different groups is time-consuming and expensive, national interest has been subjective i.e. what political leaders perceive them to be. Thus, “[w]hen statesmen and bureaucrats are expected or are required to act in the national interest...what is meant is that they are being called upon to take action on issues that would improve the political situation, the economic and social wellbeing, the health and culture of the people as well as their political survival. They are being urged to take action that will improve the lot of the people, rather than pursue policies that will subject the people to domination by other countries...” (Adeniran, 1983:191).

## 2. Theoretical Framework

In the discipline, International Relations, there are several mainstream theories that can be used for analysing a state’s foreign policy. But, the most appropriate theory for the comparative study of the United States and Nigeria’s foreign policy under George W. Bush Jr. and Olusegun Obasanjo is, the Concentric Circles Theory (CCT).

The theory of concentric circles was first proposed by the Sociologist Ernest Burgess in 1925 (cited in Adelusi, 2013). “Concentricism is predicated mainly on two paradigms: geographical and national interest” (Akinteriwa, 2004:429). The geographical paradigm has to do with a country’s relations with other countries in three circles – sub-region, region and, the wider world. For example, Nigeria, the first circle represents her relations with the countries in the West African sub-region, the second circle, her relations with other countries in Africa, and the last circle for relations with countries around the world (Gambari, 1989). Concerning the national interest paradigm, B. A. Akinteriwa had this to say: “Generally, foreign policy concentric circles are not more than three: the core circle in which the common centre point is located and which is regarded as the most important; the middle range circle; and the outer

range circle. The outer range circle or the periphery is important. The middle range is more important while the innermost or the core circle is the most important. Foreign policy interests at the inner most circle are generally not negotiable as they are critically to the survival of the state. This circle comprises the vital interests. On the contrary, foreign policy interests in the middle range circle can be subject of negotiations and guided by the rule of reciprocity. In the outermost circle or the periphery, foreign policy interests can, though important be dispensed with, without adversely affecting the core interests” (Akinteriwa, 2004:429).

### **3. United States Foreign Policy under George W. Bush Jr. (2001-2009)**

George, W. Bush Jr., the son of George H. W. Bush Sr. (the 41<sup>st</sup> President of the United States 1989-1993), is a graduate of Yale University and the Harvard Business School. From 1995, he was the 46<sup>th</sup> Governor of Texas till the year 2000 when he resigned. Same year, Bush Jr., the presidential candidate of the Republican Party, contested against Al Gore, the presidential candidate of the Democratic Party, for the number one seat in the country. During his electoral campaign, Bush focused mainly on domestic affairs, such as health care, education, and the reform of the tax system and Social Security. He also spoke sparingly about his foreign policy plans which centred largely on free-trade and the U.S relationship with Latin America (Dietrich, 2005 cited in Falcone, 2015:8; Prins and Wilford, 2013; Greenstein, 2005).

As the presidential election between Bush Jr. and Al Gore came to a close, it became controversial. As a statement of fact, there was to be a recount of votes in Florida. But after a thirty-six day impasse, the United States Supreme Court issued a ruling that stopped the recount and declared Bush the winner (Greenstein, 2005; Shareef, 2010). Accordingly, on the 20<sup>th</sup> of January, 2001, George W. Bush Jr. was sworn-in as the 43<sup>rd</sup> president of the United States of America with his Vice, Dick Cheney.

The Bush administration inherited several multilateral agreements from his predecessors particularly from the Democrat, President Bill Clinton. Thus, it can be said that in some areas, there was continuity in the U.S foreign policy under the Bush administration. Much as this is true, multilateral treaties perceived by President George W. Bush Jr. to be in conflict with America’s national interest or freedom to act were terminated. The Bush administration began by withdrawing the U.S from the 1997 Kyoto Protocol (that was to reduce countries greenhouse gas emission) which many European countries frowned at. Thereafter was the withdrawal from 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, as it was seen as a stumbling block in the protection of Americans from future terrorists or rogue states missile attacks. The Rome Statute was next – a U.N effort establishing the International Criminal Court (ICC) which was signed by a U.S representative in December, 2000, during the Clinton administration. Taking a step further, the Bush administration negotiated Bilateral Immunity Agreements (BIAs) with some countries that guarantee immunity to Americans from the Court’s jurisdiction within their territorial boundary (cited in Collier, 2003:717; Kelly, 2003; Tian, 2003; Bradley, 2009; Castro Santos and Teixeira, 2013).

Regarding international law, Bush Jr. was not always compliant vis-à-vis the implementation of his foreign policy. At the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq, inmates were maltreated if not tortured by the American military. At the Guantanamo Bay Detention Centre in Cuba, enhanced interrogation techniques were used to get vital information out of the prisoners. Reports suggest that the CIA was authorised to use the so-called “enhanced” interrogation techniques against a number of high-level al-Qaeda detainees, including slapping, forced standing for long periods, light and noise bombardment, and, for three of the detainees, waterboarding at the Guantanamo Bay Detention Centre (cited in Bradley, 2009:72).

### **3.1 U.S Relations with Neighbouring States and Latin American Countries**

Geographically located in North America, the U.S is the fourth largest country in the world in terms of landmass. It is bordered to the North by Canada (the second largest country in the world) and to the South by Mexico. Together, they reached a free-trade agreement in 1993 called North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) during Clinton’s administration, which took effect from January 1, 1994. During President George W. Bush Jr. first term in office, he drafted a proposal for a Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) which would include Latin American countries. But at the 2005 Summit of the Americas in Argentina, Member States of the Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR) blocked the ratification of the FTAA (Miroff, 2006).

Latin America, since the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, has been a sphere of influence of the United States. After the Cold War ended in 1991, a major foreign policy goal of the U.S in the region was the promotion of democracy. But under Bush Jr., the U.S promotion of democracy was not strong enough to prevent the emergence of a Left-wing government in Venezuela, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Uruguay etc in South America. In April, 2002, there was a failed coup d’état against the president of Venezuela, Hugo Chávez, which the Bush administration was accused of supporting, an accusation the White House denied (Dominguez, 2005; Padgett, 2005).

For President George W. Bush Jr., a comprehensive immigration reform was needed in the U.S. That his government may be able to control illegal immigration, necessary steps were taken to increase federal funding for securing the U.S border, to assist the Border Patrol agents with approximately 6,000 National Guard members at the U.S Southern border with Mexico and, to launch the technologically advanced border initiative (The New York Times, 2006). To impede the trafficking of drugs – heroin, marijuana, cocaine etc from Latin America into the United States through the Mexican border, the Bush administration continued Bill Clinton’s ‘Plan Columbia’ – an initiative to eradicate cocaine plantation in Columbia.

### **3.2 The Bush Doctrine**

On September 11, 2001, 19 terrorists from the al-Qaeda network (15 of which were Saudis), hijacked four U.S commercial airplanes, crashed two into the twin tower of the World Trade

Centre (WTC) in New York, one into the Pentagon in Washington D.C while the fourth plane crash-landed in Pennsylvania. Hence, Americans were thrown into mourning over the 3,000 people that died from the terrorist attacks. To prevent such terrorist attacks from happening again on U.S soil, the U.S Patriot Act was passed into law. Signed on October 26, 2001, the U.S Patriot Act allows U.S agencies to gather intelligence on/search Americans or foreigners in the U.S who are suspected terrorists or connected to a terrorist organisation without a search warrant. On November 25, 2002, Bush Jr. signed into law the Homeland Security Act that created the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) which would be responsible for the security of America's homeland from threats. Aside these measures taken domestically, Bush Jr. formulated and executed his foreign policy in such a way that it weakened the al-Qaeda network abroad.

In the aftermath of 9/11, President George W. Bush Jr. foreign policy objectives were heavily influenced by the neoconservative ideologues. The neoconservatives are strongly in support of the U.S maintaining and enhancing its primacy and influence globally by projecting its superior military power. They are of the opinion that it is in the national interest of the U.S to promote democracy overseas through the use of force, particularly, in the Middle East, if it wants to sleep with both eyes closed as well as bring about peace, stability, prosperity and order to the region. This, according to the 'neocons', can only be achieved through regime change that would liberate the peoples of the Middle East from the oppression of tyrants. Most importantly, they believe that in dealing with the immediate or potential threat from rogue states seeking or possessing WMD which they can covertly give or sell to anti-American terrorist groups, America should resort to 'preemption' and 'preventive war' (Record, 2003; Dalby, 2005; Castro Santos and Teixeira, 2013) These neoconservative thought was what the Bush administration considered and used to develop a new grand strategy – the 'Bush Doctrine', which transformed the U.S traditional Cold War strategies from 'containment' and 'deterrence' to 'preemption' and 'preventive war' (Jarratt, 2006).

The Bush Doctrine, explicitly spelt out in the National Security Strategy (NSS) that was issued on September 20, 2002, aims at preventing the U.S enemies from threatening it, its allies and friends with WMD (Record, 2003). There are basically four major tenets of the Bush doctrine – i) *military supremacy* – the maintenance of American's primacy by increasing its superior military capability; ii) *preemption* and *preventive war* – to prevent immediate or potential threat from occurring; iii) *unilateralism* – the audacity to act when necessary without the prior approval of appropriate intergovernmental organisations e.g. the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and; iv) *democracy promotion* – to export liberal democracy to other countries by the use of force when necessary.

### **3.2.1 The U.S and the 'Global War on Terror' in South Asia and the Middle East**

No one doubted that the United States would respond to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The question however was how the U.S should respond to Osama bin Laden-led al-Qaeda network (Daadler and Lindsay, 2003). President George W. Bush Jr. began by addressing Americans and the international community, seeking their unwavering support for his

administration against terrorism. Americans responded positively to his rhetoric, as they exuded the spirit of nationalism. In the international community, a number of countries not only condemned the 9/11 attacks but also supported Bush Jr. in his fight against terrorism in the interest of all around the world.

On September 12, 2001, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) invoked article V of its constituent instrument, which states that an attack on one member would be considered as an attack on all. However, it was not until August, 2003, that NATO took military action in Afghanistan. On September 14, 2001, the U.S Congress gave the president the Authorisation to Use Military Force (AUMF) i.e., “to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons” (U.S Congress 2001 cited in Collier, 2003:716). On September 20, 2001, exactly nine days after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, President George W. Bush Jr. addressed the Joint Session of the Congress, declaring a “Global War on Terror”.

The U.S began by invading the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. But prior to the military invasion of Afghanistan, President George W. Bush Jr. mounted diplomatic pressure on the Taliban government to hand over all the leaders of al-Qaeda that they harboured, close down permanently all terrorist training camps with immediate effect, give the U.S access to those camps to verify their closure among other things. But, the Taliban failed to meet the demands of the U.S (Bush, 2001 cited Kelly, 2003:226; Daadler and Lindsay, 2003). Thus, Bush Jr. gave the order for the invasion of Afghanistan on October 7, 2001. The goal of the U.S operation codenamed “Operation Enduring Freedom”, was first and foremost to capture or kill top al-Qaeda leaders (Daadler and Lindsay, 2003). Secondly, to overthrow the Taliban government that has been in power since 1996 for aiding and abetting al-Qaeda. Lastly, to ensure that Afghanistan was no longer a safe haven for the terrorist group to launch attacks on the U.S or any of its allies the world over.

In December, 2001, there was the International Conference on Afghanistan at Bonn, Germany, for the purpose of setting up of an interim administration for the country. Chosen by an Afghan delegation to be the chairman of the 29-member interim administration for a six-month period, starting from December 22, was Hamid Karzai in the Bonn Agreement concluded on December 5, 2001. At the *Loya Jirga* (Grand Assembly) on June 13, 2002, in Kabul, Afghanistan, Hamid Karzai was chosen to head the Afghan Transitional Administration for a two-year period after which a presidential election would hold (which he won in 2004). But while he was the leader of the Afghan Transitional Administration, NATO took over the leadership of the UN-mandated International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) on August 11, 2003. Their mission initially was to secure the capital, Kabul, and the areas surrounding it. But as time went on, NATO played the combat role of securing the entire Afghanistan which they did until the Afghan forces took over in 2014. With their combat role over, NATO now plays the non-combat role of assisting the Afghan forces in dealing with the



problem of insurgency. This began in 2015 when NATO launched the Resolute Support Mission (RSM) (NATO, 2015; NATO, 2018).

“The 9/11 terrorist attack on the US is central to understanding the war on Iraq even though Iraq was in no way involved in it” (Hinnebusch, 2007:10). On March 20, 2003, the U.S without the authorisation of the UNSC, unilaterally invaded Iraq with the help of its ally, Britain, and a ‘coalition of the willing’ based on a false intelligence gathered that, the Iraqi leader, Saddam Hussein, possessed WMD. The goal of the invasion codenamed ‘Operation Iraqi Freedom’ was to use a small military force to swiftly ouster Saddam Hussein, neutralise his stockpile of WMD when found and lastly, to rebuild a new and democratic Iraqi State. Unfortunately, the WMD was never found. Having taking out Saddam Hussein, the Iraqi Army was dissolved, the small military force without receiving reinforcement in the post-Saddam Hussein era faced resistance from insurgents – some of which were soldiers in the Iraqi Army that was dissolved. The Iraqi invasion turned occupation became one of the most costly military operation of the U.S in terms of finance and the life of foot soldiers that was lost.

Several justifications (*jus ad bellum*) and motives for the U.S invasion of Iraq in 2003 have been given by the U.S and analysts alike. The first justification was the potential threat Iraq as a rogue state posed to U.S security. The dictator, Saddam Hussein already had a bad record of using chemical weapon on the Kurds at Halabja, Northern Iraq on March 16, 1988, and on Iranians during the Iran-Iraq War (1980-1988). The fear of America was that Saddam Hussein, believed to be seeking or possessed WMD, could team up with like minded anti-American terrorist groups such as al-Qaeda by either sponsoring or supporting them with WMD against the U.S. Hence, the U.S invaded and dislodged Saddam Hussein before such WMD fall into the hands of al-Qaeda that would not hesitate to make it a weapon of choice in their next attack.

Secondly, the invasion was to enforce international law. Saddam Hussein of Iraq in the month of August, 1990, annexed Kuwait which led to the Gulf War (1990-1991). Responding to his unlawful act, the UNSC authorised the U.S-led international coalition to use force to end Iraq’s annexation of Kuwait. The coalition in their operation codenamed ‘Operation Desert Storm’, successfully restored the status quo and the Gulf War ended with a ceasefire agreement in 1991. Stated in the ceasefire agreement and subsequent UNSC resolutions were the conditions that Iraq destroy its stockpile of WMD, not fly its warplanes in the no-fly zones, subject itself to the U.N inspection among others. But repeatedly, there were material breaches to the ceasefire agreement and the UNSC resolutions by Iraq despite the economic sanctions placed on the country. Thus, the UN inspectors in Iraq left Iraq prior to the four days of America and Britain’s airstrikes on major Iraqi facilities that can be used by Saddam Hussein to develop WMD in an operation codenamed ‘Operation Desert Fox’ which started on December 16, 1998. On November 8, 2002, the UNSC passed resolution 1441, giving Iraq a ‘final opportunity’ which, failure on its part to comply, would lead to ‘serious consequences’. Iraq accepted that the U.N inspectors return to the country. But again, Saddam Hussein failed to stick to Iraq’s obligation let alone did he cooperate with the U.N

inspectors as Hans Blix, Head of the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) stated (cited in Bradley, 2009:69; Castro Santos and Teixeira, 2013). Thus, the U.S unilaterally resorted to the use of force.

Thirdly, the invasion was meant to free the Iraqi people from the oppression of Saddam Hussein's Ba'athist government by exporting liberal democracy to the country. The Bush administration like previous administrations, had this conviction that freedom as a liberal value is a universal birthright of every living being. To liberate the Iraqi people from the dictator, Saddam Hussein, only meant that his government had to be overthrown by the use of force and replaced with a liberal democratic government. This regime change plan and the birth a new and democratic Iraq was not without some benefits. To Bush Jr., a democratic Iraq was a right step towards the democratisation of the Middle East which would make the volatile region more peaceful, stable and prosperous. Also, Bush Jr. saw a link between democracy promotion in the Middle East and the U.S national security. While preemption and preventive war were short-term solutions to defeating al-Qaeda, democracy was the ultimate panacea on the long-run (Castro Santos and Teixeira, 2013). As expected, promoting democracy in the Iraqi State that has no history of democracy has in the last few years not been without some domestic opposition and challenges.

Closely linked to the aforementioned justification for the 2003 invasion of Iraq is the fourth which is, for the security of Israel. "Israeli politicians have long stressed that they live in a 'tough neighbourhood' and frequently stake their claim to be the only truly democratic nation in a sea of dictatorships and corrupt regimes. Both the domestic Israel lobby and the Bush administration believed toppling Saddam Hussein would lead to a domino effect of democratisation that would simultaneously fulfil the aims of increasing Israel's security and the wider aims of the Bush doctrine" (McGlinchey, 2010:28).

Lastly, some scholars are of the opinion that the ulterior motive behind the U.S invasion of Iraq was to guarantee unfettered supply of Iraqi oil at a favourable price. The economy of the U.S before and during the Bush administration was dependent on foreign oil, especially crude oil from the Persian Gulf. This made the U.S vulnerable should there be a disruption of energy supply by Saddam Hussein or any terrorist group.

### 3.3 The U.S Multilateral Approach to North Korea and Iran's Nuclear Programme

On the 29<sup>th</sup> of January, 2002, George W. Bush Jr. in his State of Union address, demonised the rogue states – Iran, Iraq and North Korea, calling them an “Axis of Evil” owing to their respective pursuit of the development of WMD, nuclear weapons precisely (Pauly, 2009). In his words:

*“States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. They could provide these arms to terrorists, giving them the means to match their hatred. They could attack our allies or attempt to blackmail the United States. In any of these cases, the price of indifference would be catastrophic”* (CNN.com, 2002).

Despite Bush Jr. rhetoric on how the ‘Axis of Evil’ pursuit of WMD posed a threat to U.S security and that of its allies – Japan, South Korea, Israel etc, he did not adopt an offensive military strategy against Iran and North Korea, like he did for Afghanistan and Iraq. Rather, Bush Jr. adopted multilateral diplomacy.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) or North Korea's nuclear programme started fully roughly three decades after the Korean War (1950-1953) ended. During the Cold War, the Soviet Union assisted the Communist leader of North Korea, Kim Il Sung to build the country's nuclear facility at Yongbyon, which became operational in 1986 with a 5 megawatt (MW) nuclear reactor. On October 21, 1994, Clinton's administration signed the Agreed Framework with Kim Jung Il's government which on its part would freeze its nuclear weapon programme in exchange for the shipments of heavy fuel oil and two light-water reactors (LWRs) to be built at Kumho by the Korea Energy Development Organisation (KEDO) – an international consortium made up of the U.S, Japan and South Korea (Wit, 2001; Liou, 2004; Poneman, 2007; Matray, 2013).

On January 10, 2003, North Korea announced that it was withdrawing from the 1968 Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) which it ratified on December 12, 1985. Prior to the North Korea's withdrawal from the NPT, the Bush administration in October, 2002, claimed that North Korea admitted to have been secretly running a Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) programme (Matray, 2013). However, for the purpose of negotiating the denuclearisation of North Korea, the U.S joined Russia, China, Britain, South Korea and, Japan to form the Six-Party Talks which had its first round of negotiations in Beijing, China, from August 27-29, 2003.

On October 9, 2006, North Korea tested its first nuclear weapon underground. On February 13, 2007, North Korea reached an agreement on its disarmament with the U.S-led Six-Party Talks. Same year, it shut down the Yongbyon nuclear reactor. On June 27, 2008, Pyongyang symbolically destroyed the 60 foot cooling tower of the Yongbyon nuclear reactor (a major nuclear facility for the production of weapon-grade plutonium) which is 60 miles North of Pyongyang, as part of its commitment to the said 2007 agreement. It also disabled the

Yongbyon nuclear facility and, submitted the inventory of its nuclear programme. In return, the Bush administration removed North Korea from the U.S list of state sponsors of terrorism which North Korea has been on since 1988. In addition to this, Washington lifted some trade sanctions on North Korea (Choe, 2008).

In comparison to North Korea's nuclear programme, that of the Islamic Republic of Iran is much older. Iran's nuclear programme dates back to the 60s when the U.S supplied Iran a 5 megawatt (MW) light water research reactor and highly enriched uranium (HEU) to fuel the reactor. This research reactor became operational in 1967. In 1970, Iran's parliament ratified the NPT. Four years later, Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi created the Atomic Energy Organisation of Iran (AEOI) and announced his plan to build over 23 nuclear power plants in the next 20 years that would generate 23 megawatts of electricity for the country (Cirincione, 2006; cited in Iran Watch, 2016). He started by building the Bushehr nuclear power plant which was contracted to the German company, Kraftwerk (now Siemens) in 1974. But during the Iranian Revolution (1978-1979) Shah Pahlavi was overthrown. The following year, on September 22 precisely, the Iran-Iraq War broke out which lasted till August 20, 1988. These radical and violent events from the late 70s to the late 80s led to the suspension of the Iran's nuclear programme (though, in 1984, Iran opened its Nuclear Research Centre at Isfahan). In the 1990s, Iran's nuclear programme was revived with the help of Russia, China and Pakistan (cited in Iran Watch, 2016).

Iran has consistently stated that its nuclear programme is for civilian purposes which are allowed under international law, and not to develop weapon-grade uranium and plutonium. But contrary to what Iran wants the whole world to believe, are its activities at different nuclear facilities – Natanz Uranium Enrichment Plant, Arak heavy-water reactor, the underground Fordo Fuel Enrichment Plant, and the secret nuclear facility at the Parchin Military Base.

In 2002, two of the aforementioned nuclear facilities– Natanz and Fordo were revealed by the terrorist group, Mujahideen-e-Khalq (MEK). In 2003, the EU-3 (Britain, France and Germany) began negotiations with Iran vis-a-vis its activities at the Isfahan uranium conversion facility. On the 15<sup>th</sup> of November, 2004, Iran concluded the Paris Agreement with the EU-3. But in October, 2005, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad made the worrisome call for Israel to be “wipe off the map” (Smyth, 2005) which many feared would be carried out with nukes. In April, 2006, Iran announced that it had resumed uranium enrichment at Natanz. Same year, the U.S, Russia and China joined the EU-3 (now EU-3+3) in negotiating with Iran to halt its uranium enrichment. The Bush administration also backed the UNSC resolutions imposing economic sanctions on persons and organisations connected to Iran's nuclear and missile program from 2006 to 2008 – resolution 1737, 1747 and 1803. Despite the 2007 National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) report that stated that though, Iran had a clandestine nuclear weapons programme, it stopped the programme in 2003, President George W. Bush Jr., till the end of his second term in office in 2009, remained steadfast in his foreign policy on Iran's nuclear programme, using both multilateral diplomacy and economic sanction to get Iran to curtail its uranium enrichment.

### **3.4 The U.S and Israeli-Palestinian Peace Process**

The Bush administration, like the previous administration, was involved in the Israeli-Palestinian peace process hopefully to end the protracted conflict between Israel and Palestine. The history of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can be traced back to the secret accord between Britain and France during the First World War (1914-1918). Named after the representative of Britain and France, the Sykes-Picot Agreement (1916) that carved out their country's sphere of influence over the declining Ottoman Empire territories in the Middle East, was seen by the Arabs as contradicting the October 24, 1915, McMahon-Hussein Correspondence from the British High Commissioner in Egypt, Sir Henry McMahon to Sherif Hussein of Mecca. In the Correspondence, Britain promised Sherif Hussein that it would recognise and support the independence of Arabs if he assisted Britain in the fight against the Ottoman Turks. This promise was interpreted by Sherif Hussein to include Palestine which Britain denied (Spooner, 2015).

On November 02, 1917, Britain's Foreign Secretary, Arthur Balfour wrote a letter to a stalwart Zionist in Britain, Lord Rothschild, informing him of the British government support for the "establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people". This letter became known as the Balfour Declaration (Tahhan, 2017). After the First World War ended in 1918, Palestine became a Mandate territory of Britain based on the newly formed League of Nations' Mandate System. In 1939, the Second World War broke out and during the war, over 6,000 Jews were killed under the Führer of Nazi Germany, Adolf Hitler. In 1945, the war came to a close and thereafter, there was a global sympathy for the Jews in the diaspora, especially for those that survived the 'holocaust'. On November 29, 1947, the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) adopted resolution 181 for the partitioning of Palestine into two states – the Israeli State and the Palestinian State. The UNGA plan did not go down well with the Palestinians. Thus, a war broke out between the Jews the Palestinians same year. In 1948, approximately 750,000 Palestinians became refugees after they were forced to leave their homeland by Jewish paramilitary forces in what the Palestinians call al-Nakbar (the Catastrophe).

On the 14<sup>th</sup> of May, 1948, the independence of the Jewish State was declared by Israel's first Prime Minister, David Ben-Gurion. But ever since then, Israel has fought several wars with its neighbours – the Arab-Israeli War (1948), Six-Day War (1967), Yom Kippur War (1973), First Israel-Lebanon War (1982) and, Second Israel-Lebanon War (2006). It was during the Six-Day War (1967) that Israel captured and occupied the Palestinian territories – Gaza Strip, West Bank and East Jerusalem as well as seized the Sinai Peninsula from Egypt and the Golan Heights from Syria. Besides fighting wars with Arab countries, Israel has faced two Palestinian uprisings – First Intifada (1987) and, Second Intifada (2000).

To resolve once and for all the intermittent Israeli-Palestinian conflict, a peace process was initiated, involving concerned world powers and international organisations. On September 13, 1993, President Bill Clinton witnessed alongside the Prime Minister of Israel, Yitzhak Rabin and the Chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) Yasser Arafat, the signing of the Oslo I Accord that was secretly negotiated in Oslo, Norway. This accord was

signed by Mahmoud Abbas of the PLO and the Foreign Minister of Israel, Shimon Peres in Washington D.C. After the Oslo II Accord was signed in Taba, Egypt on September 24, 1995, Clinton witnessed the second signing of the Interim Agreement by Yasser Arafat and Yitzhak Rabin on September 28 in Washington D.C. Between July 11-24, 2000, President Clinton met with PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat and Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak at Camp David to negotiate an agreement but, no agreement was concluded when the Camp David Summit ended. Under George W. Bush Jr., the U.S played a more active role in the peace process after it joined Russia, the U.N and E.U to form 'the Quartet' in Madrid, Spain, in 2002. The primary role of 'the Quartet' is to act as a mediator in the Israeli-Palestinian peace process.

### **3.5 The U.S Global Fight against HIV/AIDS: PEPFAR**

From his first term in office, President George W. Bush Jr. was passionate about offering assistance to low-income countries with a high rate of persons living with HIV/AIDS. On January 28, 2003, Bush Jr., in his State of the Union Address, made mention of his plan to fight the pandemic HIV/AIDS in a total of 14 'focus' countries (later 15 countries after Vietnam was added) in Africa, South America and the Caribbean. Accordingly, the U.S Congress passed the United States Leadership against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act which Bush Jr. signed on May 27, 2003. This Act led to the creation of the President's Emergency Plan for Aids Relief (PEPFAR), one of the largest if not the largest global health initiative in the world (Adeola and Ogunnoiki, 2016; Fancui and Eisinger, 2018).

\$15 billion was appropriated for the first phase of the global health initiative which was for a five-year period. \$9 billion was earmarked for the new program (PEPFAR), \$5 billion for existing bilateral programs around the world and, \$1 billion for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria (Radelet, 2003; Dietrich 2007; Lancaster, 2008). Almost as astonishing as the level of funding was Bush's embrace of a comprehensive approach to fighting the disease, encompassing prevention, care, and treatment by providing the life saving antiretroviral drugs to those infected with the disease (Radelet, 2003). In 2008, PEPFAR five- year period expired. But same year, PEPFAR was reauthorised.

### **3.6 The U.S Trade with Sub-Saharan African Countries: AGOA**

Enacted during Bill Clinton's administration on the 18<sup>th</sup> of May, 2000, the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), is a trade law that promotes free market between the U.S and Sub-Saharan African (SSA) countries. Initially meant to last for 8 years (October 2000-September 2008), it was extended to 2015 following the amendment of the Act by the U.S Congress which President George W. Bush Jr. gave his assent on July 12, 2004. In the year 2015, before the policy expired on the 30<sup>th</sup> of September, a legislative amendment was again made to the Act extending the termination year to 2025. On June 29, 2015, the AGOA Extension and Enhancement Act was signed into law by President Barack Obama

AGOA simply put, states that there shall be duty and quota-free preferential treatment for over 6,400 products (e.g. apparels and agricultural products) exported by eligible SSA

countries to the U.S market. This however is not without conditions. The SSA countries are to satisfy certain conditions such as promoting and protecting of human rights, the rule of law and the respect for core labour standards. Presently, there are 40 qualified SSA countries for this trade opportunity. But only a few are benefiting from their access to the U.S market (AGOA.info).

During and after George W. Bush Jr. administration, Nigeria for example has not been benefiting as they should from AGOA because, according to some experts, Nigeria failed to diversify her mono-economy. Secondly, some Nigerian manufacturers, despite their effort at boosting the country's non-oil export to the U.S market, do not always meet international standard specifications vis-à-vis the quality and packaging of their products. Thus, their products are often rejected by the U.S. (Okereocha, 2015).

### **3.7 The U.S and Africa's Security: AFRICOM**

Following the 9/11 terrorist attacks on America, the U.S beefed up its security operation around the world, including Africa. "[R]ecognizing the potential of the poorly governed spaces of the continent to provide facilitating environments, recruits, and eventual targets for Islamist extremists who threaten Western interests in general and those of the United States in particular" (Pham 2007 cited in Pham, 2007:1), President George W. Bush Jr. on February 6, 2007, announced the creation of the U.S Africa Command (AFRICOM). African countries (except Liberia) rejected America's offer to host the headquarters of AFRICOM on their soil. Hence, AFRICOM headquarters was stationed outside the continent, in Stuttgart, Germany.

## **4. Nigeria's Foreign Policy under Olusegun Obasanjo (1999-2007)**

Following the sudden death of the dictator, General Sani Abacha on the 8<sup>th</sup> of June, 1998, General Abdulsalami Abubakar became the Head of State of Nigeria for a very short period. During his regime, which lasted for 11 months and 19 days, General Abdulsalami Abubakar freed the political prisoners incarcerated by General Sani Abacha (one of which was Chief Olusegun Obasanjo, a retired General of the Nigerian Army and, former military Head of State of Nigeria in the mid 70s). He initiated a transitional programme born out of his willingness to hand over the mantle of leadership to a democratically elected president. Having lifted the ban on political parties, political parties were registered and accordingly, a presidential election took place in 1999 which Chief Olusegun Obasanjo, the presidential candidate of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) won (Ajetunmobi, *et al.*, 2011; Ashaver, 2014; Adeola and Ogunnoiki, 2015; Okeke, 2017). On the 29<sup>th</sup> of May, 1999, Chief Olusegun Obasanjo was sworn-in as the President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria with his Vice, Alhaji Atiku Abubakar.

On assuming the office of the president, Chief Olusegun Obasanjo met the Nigerian economy in a bad shape, a ballooning external debt, a worrisome statistic of 70% of the population living below the poverty line of \$1 per day and, chronic corruption in the public sector. He started by setting up the Independent Corrupt Practices and other related Offences Commission (ICPC) in September, 2000, and the Economic and Financial Crimes

Commission (EFCC) in April, 2003, with the primary goal of prosecuting corrupt individuals. These commissions few years after they were created played a major role in the dropping of Nigeria in the Transparency International (TI) ranking of the most corrupt countries in the world (Enweremadu, 2010; Adeola and Ogunnoiki, 2015).

That he reinvigorate the ailing economy and set it back on the part of sustainable economic growth and development, President Olusegun Obasanjo embarked on the reform of different sectors in Nigeria's economy. One of such reforms worthy of mentioning is the deregulation of the telecommunication industry in 2001 in what used to be dominated by the state-owned NITEL. This attracted foreign service providers of Global System for Mobile communications (GSM) into the country who were issued license to operate in the lucrative Nigerian telecommunication industry (Adeola and Ogunnoiki, 2015; Sanubi and Oke, 2017). Still on the economy, President Olusegun Obasanjo as part of his efforts at repositioning Nigeria's economy, came up with the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) in 2003 in order to reduce abject poverty and create jobs in the land. For Nigeria's power sector, he changed what used to be the National Electricity Power Authority (NEPA) to the Power Holding Company of Nigeria (PHCN) on July 1, 2005. Still in the year 2005, on December 31<sup>st</sup> precisely, the Governor of the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN), Professor Charles C. Soludo, reformed the Nigerian financial system having overseen the recapitalisation of commercial banks to 25 billion naira and their consolidation through merger and acquisition from 89 to 25 banks.

On the international scene, President Olusegun Obasanjo's foreign policy objectives were to reverse Nigeria's pariah status by rebuilding its image abroad; to see to the readmission of the country into the fold of civilised states; to free resources for improving the material condition of the people by negotiating a debt relief with the Paris Club; to repatriate stolen public funds stashed in foreign banks by wholesale looters of the Nigerian treasury and, to scout for and woo prospective foreign investors into Nigeria's economy (Abdul and Ibrahim, 2013; Durotoye, 2014; Adeola and Ogunnoiki, 2015; Kai, *et al.*, 2017). Despite achieving most of his foreign policy objectives, there were acerbic criticisms of President Olusegun Obasanjo for his excessive and expensive travelling abroad, his failure to improve the state of public infrastructures and utilities in Nigeria – roads, electricity generation/supply etc which could have gone a long way in attracting foreign direct investment into the country (Ojameruaye 2007 cited in Abdul and Ibrahim, 2013:46-47, Ngara *et al.*, 2013, Adebajo, 2008 cited in Olorunyomi, 2014:63).

#### **4.1 Nigeria's relations with Immediate Neighbours**

The Federal Republic of Nigeria with a landmass of 938,768 square kilometres, is geographically located in the West African sub-region on 4°N and 14°N latitude of the equator and 3°E and 15°E longitude of the Greenwich Meridian. Bordering Nigeria to the North is Niger, Cameroon to the East and Benin Republic to the West. Worth mentioning at this juncture is the fact that these countries surrounding Nigeria were formerly part of France massive empire in Africa during the colonial era.



In the post-colonial era, Nigeria being an Anglophone country has maintained cordial relations with its Francophone neighbours. During the Obasanjo administration the resolution of the longstanding dispute between Nigeria and the Central African country, Cameroon over the Bakassi Peninsula made headlines.

#### **4.1.1 Nigeria and Cameroon Peaceful Settlement of the Bakassi Peninsula Dispute**

The Bakassi Peninsula, a 1,600 kilometres long peninsula, is endowed with crude oil and minerals. It is inhabited mainly by the Efik people from Cross River State and Akwa Ibom State as well as the Efut, Ibibio and Annang people from Nigeria (Gbemre, 2016). Historically, the Bakassi was part of the ancient kingdom of Calabar before the 19<sup>th</sup> century scramble for African territories. During the scramble for African territories, the peninsula became part of the British Protectorate based on the September 10, 1884, Treaty of Protection between Britain and Old Calabar. On the 11<sup>th</sup> of March, 1913, Britain ceded the peninsula to Germany after signing the 1913 Anglo-German Treaty. The following year, the First World War broke out and Germany, being one of the Central Powers, was vanquished by the Allied Powers. Hence, German colonies, after the war came to an end on the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of November, 1918, were placed under the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations. The Bakassi Peninsula and the entire Southern Cameroons that was part of German territories in Africa was administered by the British Colonial Government of Nigeria. From February 11-12, 1961, the people of Bakassi Peninsula and Southern Cameroons voted in a plebiscite to join the French-speaking Northern Cameroons (Baye, 2010; Babatola, 2012; Etekpe, 2013).

In the post-colonial era, President Ahmadu Ahidjo of Cameroon and the Head of State of Nigeria, General Yakubu Gowon had a meeting at Yaoundé on April 04, 1971, to determine the maritime boundary of both countries. In June, 1971, the Joint Boundary Commission led by Chief Coker for Nigeria and Mr. Ngo for Cameroon met in Lagos and came up with what became known as the 'Coker-Ngo Line'. On the 1<sup>st</sup> of June, 1975, the 'Maroua Declaration' on the delimitation of the maritime boundary of Nigeria and Cameroon was signed by President Ahmadu Ahidjo and General Yakubu Gowon (Baye, 2010; Babatola, 2012; Etekpe, 2013). In 1981, a military clash between Nigeria and Cameroon took place over the Bakassi Peninsula. Again, there was military hostility between both countries in 1993 and 1994 respectively. Thus, on the 29<sup>th</sup> of March and the 6<sup>th</sup> of June, 1994, Cameroon, supported by the French government instituted legal action against Nigeria at the International Court of Justice (ICJ) which Nigeria objected to and filed its first preliminary objection on December 17, 1995 (Baye, 2010; Etekpe, 2013).

On October 10, 2002, the ICJ, based on the 1913 Anglo-German Treaty, gave its verdict on the delineation of the land and maritime boundary of Nigeria and Cameroon. The Court affirmed that Cameroon had sovereignty over the Bakassi Peninsula. On June 12, 2006, the then Secretary-General of the U.N in person of Kofi Annan witnessed the historical signing of the Green Tree Agreement (GTA) in New York, United States, by President Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria and his counterpart President Paul Biya of Cameroon. This agreement

led to the setting up of the UN Nigeria-Cameroon Mixed Commission headed by the Secretary-General's Special Representative for West Africa, Mr. Ahmedou Ould-Abdallah. The Commission's mission was to see to the implementation of the 2002 ruling of the ICJ. On August, 2006, the Nigerian Army pulled out of the peninsula. Finally on August 14, 2008, the Nigerian administration and police force pulled out of Bakassi. Their official exist was marked with a ceremonial hand over of the peninsula to Cameroon in Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria (Baye, 2010; Daily Trust, 2012; Unachukwu, 2012; Adeola and Ogunnoiki, 2015).

## **4.2 Nigeria and the West African Sub-region**

“At the inception of Nigeria's Fourth Republic in 1999, the West African political-military environments were volatile, with pockets of armed conflict and political violence in neighboring countries such as Liberia, Sierra Leone, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, and Côte d'Ivoire to mention but a few. This situation, together with the adverse socio-economic conditions of the sub-region, provided the new civilian Obasanjo administration in Nigeria the opportunities to launch itself, prove to the world that Nigeria was still relevant in the scheme of things in West Africa, and also to showcase Nigeria's African foreign policy” (Badmus and Ogunmola, 2017:66-67).

### **4.2.1 Nigeria's Role in the Peace and Stability of the West African Sub-region**

In pursuance of her Afrocentric foreign policy, Nigeria has been committed to the defense and protection of the political independence, territorial integrity and stability of every state in the West African sub-region. Nigeria as the most populous country in the sub-region and indeed on the continent has always played the role of a 'Big Brother' that ensures the peace and stability of the sub-region. In the second Liberia Civil War (1999-2003) between the government of President Charles Taylor and the rebel groups, the Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy (LURD) and the Movement for Democracy in Liberia (MODEL), Nigeria was a major player, military wise, as it led the ECOWAS Mission in Liberia (ECOMIL) during the Obasanjo administration.

Furthermore, Obasanjo's administration “...sponsored Nigeria's former leader Gen. Abdulsalami Abubakar through ECOWAS to lead the peace process that got Charles Taylor to relinquish power...” (Garuba, 2008:16). Hence, on August 11, 2003, having been granted asylum by President Olusegun Obasanjo, Charles Taylor stepped down, and was flown into Nigeria where he lived in a rented mansion at Diamond Hill, Cross River State. No sooner had he been granted asylum than world leaders started mounting pressure on President Olusegun Obasanjo to repatriate him. Bowing to international pressure, Obasanjo handed him over to Liberia after he was caught trying to cross into Cameroon on March 29, 2006. He was later moved to Freetown, Sierra Leone, to face 17-count indictment (later reduced to 11) at the Special Court for Sierra Leone (SCSL) for aiding and abetting war crimes in the bloody Sierra Leone Civil War (1991-2002). Charles Taylor made his first appearance at the SCSL on April 03, 2006. But for security reasons, he was moved to The Hague, Netherlands on

June 30, 2006 based on the UNSC resolution 1688 authorising the transfer of his trial to The Hague on June 16, 2006 (Nweke, 2010; Adeola and Ogunnoiki, 2015).

Conflict management and resolution were not all that Nigeria did as regional power in the West African sub-region. During the Obasanjo administration, Nigeria also ensured that West African countries were politically stable and under a constitutional and democratically elected government. In Togo, Obasanjo's administration played a major role in resolving the constitutional crisis in the country. On February 05, 2005, the President of Togo, President Gnassingbé Eyadema died. But what followed after his death was the installment of his son, Mr. Faure Eyadema, as Acting President by the Togolese Army. This act of the Togolese military contravened the 1992 Constitution of Togo. Thus, President Olusegun Obasanjo joined the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in calling for constitutional procedure to be followed in filling the vacant seat. On the 25<sup>th</sup> of February, 2005, Mr. Faure Eyadema stepped down only to contest as the presidential candidate of the *Rassemblement du Peuple Togolais* (RPT) in the April 24, 2005, presidential election which he won (Ebuku, 2005 cited in Badmus and Ogunmola, 2017:69).

### **4.3 Nigeria and the Economic Development of Africa: NEPAD**

During his first term in office, President Olusegun Obasanjo was one of the brains behind the setting up of the Organisation of African Unity's New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) in 2001 and, the African Union's African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) in 2003 (Akinboye, 2013; Adeola and Ogunnoiki, 2015; Sanubi and Oke, 2017). He was also NEPAD's pioneer chairperson of the Head of State and Government Implementation Committee (HSGIC) (Nweke, 2010; Ajetunmobi, *et al.*, 2011; Alo, 2013).

Prior to 2001, the Heads of State of Nigeria, Algeria, Egypt, Senegal, and South Africa were given the mandate to develop a socio-economic development framework for the continent (Nweke, 2010; cited in Okajare, 2012). Swinging into action, President Thabo Mbeki of South Africa came up with the Millennium Africa Recovery Plan (MAP) while President Abdoulaye Wade of Senegal, the Omega Plan. These two plans were merged on July 03, 2001, at the 37<sup>th</sup> Heads of State and Government Summit of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) in Lusaka, Zambia, to form the New African Initiative (NAI) which later became the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). On July 11, 2001, the continental body, OAU, adopted NEPAD. The following year, the A.U did likewise (Okajare 2012; Alo, 2013; Adeola and Ogunnoiki, 2015).

“The primary objective of NEPAD is to eradicate poverty in Africa, to place African countries both individually and collectively on a path of sustainable growth and development, and ensure Africa's integration and halt the marginalization of the continent in the global economy” (Alo, 2013:295). This objective would be achieved in partnership with the G8 countries who would finance the development of African countries on the condition of democracy and good governance (Adeola and Ogunnoiki, 2015; Badmus and Ogunmola; 2017).

#### **4.4 Nigeria and Regime Security, Conflict Management and Resolution in other African sub-region**

On the 16<sup>th</sup> of July, 2003, Major Fernando Pereira led a coup d'état in São Tomé e Príncipe that ousted President Fradique de Menzes while he was away, attending the 6<sup>th</sup> Reverend Leon Sullivan Summit in Abuja, Nigeria. As expected, the international community was against the military junta. But the Nigerian government seized the opportunity to showcase its capability to secure the regime of an elected political leader in Africa. Few days after Fradique de Menzes was overthrown, he was restored as the President of São Tomé e Príncipe with the help of President Olusegun Obasanjo and other African countries on July 23, 2003 (Porto 2003 cited in Badmus and Ogunmola, 2017:70; Kai, *et al.*, 2017).

Under President Olusegun Obasanjo, Nigeria recorded remarkable achievements in the area of peace and security in Africa (Garuba, 2008). During his administration, Nigeria was a major Troop Contributing Country (TCC) for the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS). Created in 2004, AMIS was to carry out peacekeeping operation in Sudan's Darfur region. On December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2007, the African Union–United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID) took over from AMIS.

As the President of Nigeria and Chairperson of the A.U, Obasanjo was instrumental in the Darfur peace talks which began on August 23, 2004. President Olusegun Obasanjo “played host to a fresh round of peace talks in Abuja between the Sudanese government and the two rebel movements in Darfur as part of efforts to ensure that peace returns to Darfur district and Sudan as a nation” (Nweke, 2010:40).

#### **4.5 Nigeria and the Wider World: Shuttle Diplomacy**

Following his inauguration on May 29, 1999, President Olusegun Obasanjo reached out to Nigeria's old friends, trade partners, multilateral creditors as well as traditional and emerging global powers in the international community. Between the months of May, 1999, and mid-August, 2002, Obasanjo embarked on 113 foreign trips, spending 340 days out of the country (Akindele, 2003). Attesting to his months of globetrotting, he said:

*[A]s many of you may be aware, I have devoted much time and energy journeying virtually all corners of the globe in my personal effort to positively reintegrate our country into the international community and attract investment. We are happy to report that the results from these trips have been encouraging enough to confirm my personal belief and the advice of marketing experts namely that personal contact is the best way to market your product. And my product is Nigeria (Oyedoyin, 2002).*

In his several trips abroad with his Ministers of Foreign Affairs Alhaji Sule Lamido (1999-2003) and Ambassador Oluyemi Adenji (2003-2006), President Obasanjo attended/addressed

sessions of the U.N, G77, G8, OPEC, Commonwealth of Nations, A.U, ECOWAS and many other Organisations (Ajayi, 2005; Ajayi 2006 cited in Abdul and Ibrahim, 2013:42; Kai, *et al.*, 2017; Sanubi and Oke, 2017). The international community responded positively to Obasanjo's months of shuttle diplomacy and charm offensive by welcoming back the country into the global community of civilised states. From August 26-28, 2000, President Bill Clinton of the United States was in Nigeria and addressed the joint session of the National Assembly. On April 14, 2002, the Chinese President Jiang Zemin, who on a state visit, arrived the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja. From July 11-12, 2003, President George W. Bush Jr. of the United States was Nigeria. Between the 5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> of December, 2003, Nigeria played host to the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) at Abuja with the Queen of England, Queen Elizabeth II in attendance as the Head of the Commonwealth of Nations. From the 26<sup>th</sup> - 27<sup>th</sup> of April, 2006, it was the turn of the President of the People's Republic of China (PRC), in person of President Hu Jintao who on a state visit strengthened his country's economic ties with Nigeria (Adeola and Ogunnoiki, 2015).

#### **4.6 Nigeria and the Paris Club: Debt Forgiveness**

Prior to the return of the country to civilian rule in 1999, Nigeria's economy was weighed down by a huge external debt owed the Paris Club of creditors. Thus, the Obasanjo administration, with the help of his Finance Minister, Dr. Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala began the debt relief negotiation process with the Paris Club. "Nigeria was able to reach an important agreement with the Paris Club in June 2005, at which time it owed the club \$31 billion. This involved Nigeria making an upfront payment of \$6 billion in existing arrears, thereby reducing its debt to \$25 billion. In return, the club would write off 67% of the remaining debt, amounting to \$17-18 billion" (Alao, 2011:21). The debt pardon gave President Olusegun Obasanjo the breathing space to grow Nigeria's foreign reserves which as at 1999 was \$2 billion to \$43 billion on leaving office in 2007 (Ajetunmobi *et al.*, 2011; Abdul and Ibrahim, 2013).

#### **4.7 Nigeria-U.S Military Cooperation**

Nigeria, since it attained 'political flag' independence in 1960, has been committed to the peacekeeping missions in the West African sub-region, in Africa as a whole and, the wider world. As part of President Olusegun Obasanjo's effort in ensuring that Nigerian soldiers remain professional at what they know how to do best, his administration sought a military assistance from the U.S in restructuring the Nigerian Army. In the year 2000, Nigeria signed an agreement with the U.S. Based on the agreement both parties appended their signature on, the U.S via the Military Professional Resources Incorporated (MPRI), would help the Nigerian State in her procurement of military aid. Also, they would assist Nigeria in training her Army to perform effectively and efficiently in their peacekeeping operations. On the part of Nigeria, the Obasanjo administration would contribute \$3.5 million for the implementation of the defense plan (Ajayi, 2006 cited in Isyaku, 2011:84; Garuba 2008; Alao, 2011; Ajetunmobi, *et al.*, 2011; Berkers, 2011 cited in Abdul and Ibrahim, 2013:43).

#### **4.8 Nigeria's Relations with Traditional and Emerging Powers: Space Technology Development**

Another milestone achievement of the Obasanjo administration that can be attributed to his foreign policy is Nigeria's space technology development. In 2001, the National Space Research and Development Agency (NASDA) was established to spearhead Nigeria's space programme. Since its inception, NASDA has successfully launched five satellites into the orbit – 3 Earth observation satellites and 2 communication satellites (Vanguard, 2017).

On September 27, 2003, Obasanjo's administration launched Nigeria's maiden Earth observation satellite, NigeriaSat-1, into orbit from the spaceport in Plesetsk Kosmodrome, Russia. Being a micro-satellite, NigSat-1 was built to the tune of \$13 million by Surrey Satellite Technology Limited (SSTL) in the United Kingdom. Equipped with high resolution cameras, data gotten from NigeriaSat-1 was to benefit Nigeria in natural disaster monitoring and management, boundary/demographic/geological mapping, agriculture, deforestation monitoring, urban and rural planning etc. The satellite was one of the five satellites of the Disaster Monitoring Constellation (DMC), a network set up by the SSTL which brought together seven countries namely: Nigeria, China, Algeria, U.K, Thailand, Turkey and Vietnam for the purpose of sharing information for disaster management. The NigeriaSat-1 had a five year life span. But, it remained functional in space beyond five years. It was later replaced during Jonathan's administration with two new satellites – NigeriaSat-2 which was built by the SSTL and NigeriaSat-X, built solely by Nigerian engineers. Both satellites flew upward into space from the launch pad in Yasny, Russia, on August 17, 2011. These satellites like NigeriaSat-1 are for observation purposes (Akinboade, 2011; Global Security, 2011; Johnkingsley, 2011; Aron, 2013; Vanguard, 2017).

On the 13<sup>th</sup> of May, 2007, the Obasanjo administration launched the very first communication satellite in Nigeria and indeed in Africa – NigComSat-1, built by Chinese which cost his government \$340 million. NigComSat-1 was launched into orbit in Xichang Space Centre, China. This satellite was to improve telecommunication, broadcasting and broadband internet services in the country. But in the year 2008, during Yar'Adua's administration, NigComSat-1 solar-powered battery could not be recharged. It was replaced under the Jonathan administration with NigComSat-1R which took off from Xichang Space Centre in China on December 19, 2011. NigComSat-1R, like the previous satellite was to deliver better telecommunication, broadcasting and internet services to Nigerians (Onuah, 2008; Vanguard, 2017)

#### **5. United States and Nigeria's Foreign Policy under George W. Bush Jr. and Olusegun Obasanjo: A Comparison**

“Comparison is a fundamental tool of analysis. It sharpens our power of description, and plays a central role in concept-formation by bringing into focus suggestive similarities and contrasts among cases” (Collier, 1993). Taking into consideration the theme of this paper, the “Across-System Method” is the most befitting comparative method to adopt. But before the juxtaposition of the foreign policy of the U.S and Nigeria is carried out, it is imperative to

point out what actually makes the U.S and Nigeria's foreign policy under George W. Bush Jr. and Olusegun Obasanjo suitable for comparison.

First and foremost, the foreign policy of the United States and Nigeria are worth comparing, considering the power status of both countries in the international system. The U.S in the post-Cold War era is well recognised as the world's sole superpower while Nigeria, from the early 60s has been an active regional power on the African continent. The last reason is the close duration of the administration of both the presidents. President George W. Bush Jr. became the president-elect of America for eight years (two terms) from 2001 to 2009 while Olusegun Obasanjo was the president of Nigeria for eight years (two terms) from 1999 to 2007.

### **5.1 The Similarities between the United States and Nigeria's Foreign Policy under George W. Bush Jr. and Olusegun Obasanjo**

Firstly, President George W. Bush Jr. and Olusegun Obasanjo had one foreign policy focus in common, and that is Africa. While Bush Jr. was more passionate about fighting HIV/AIDS in Africa, Obasanjo focused on safeguarding the peace and stability of the region.

Last but not the least is President George W. Bush Jr. and Olusegun Obasanjo unilateral action without the approval of appropriate institutions. President George W. Bush Jr. circumvented the UNSC and invaded Iraq in 2003 based on a wrong intelligence gathered that Saddam Hussein's possessed WMD. Similarly, the National Assembly (comprising the Lower House – House of Representatives and the Upper House – Senate) was bypassed by President Olusegun Obasanjo when he single handedly ceded the Bakassi Peninsula to Cameroon in 2006. His unilateral action angered the law-makers, as the Green Tree Agreement had not been ratified by the Legislature. This clearly contravened section 12(1) of the 1999 Constitution (Ngara *et al.*, 2013; Olorunyomi, 2014; Badmus and Ogunmola, 2017).

### **5.2 The Differences between the United States and Nigeria's Foreign Policy under George W. Bush Jr. and Olusegun Obasanjo**

For the difference, the first is the foreign policy instrument(s) used by President George W. Bush Jr. and Olusegun Obasanjo. While the instruments – warfare, propaganda, diplomacy and, economic sanction were utilised by Bush Jr. in the implementation of his foreign policy, Obasanjo used the foreign policy tool – diplomacy.

Lastly, the difference between President George W. Bush Jr. and Olusegun Obasanjo's foreign policy is evident in their foreign policy objectives. Top on the priority list of Bush Jr.'s foreign policy objectives was counterterrorism, while for Obasanjo administration, it was the reintegration of the ostracised Nigerian State into the fold of civilised countries.

### **Concluding Remarks**

Under President George W. Bush Jr., the foreign policy of the United States was tailored majorly towards combating terrorism, the nonproliferation of WMD, promoting democracy

and, the fight against HIV/AIDS in Africa and around the world. For Nigeria, rebuilding the country's battered image abroad, the reintegration of the country into the international community, debt relief negotiations, disputes resolution, regional peace and security and lastly, the economic development of Africa were on President Olusegun Obasanjo foreign policy priority list. Having juxtaposed the U.S and Nigeria's foreign policy, only two major similarities and differences were identified. Conclusively, it can be said that the foreign policy of the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Nigeria under George W. Bush Jr. and Olusegun Obasanjo was similar vis-à-vis their foreign policy focus on Africa and unilateralism in foreign policy implementation. However, the foreign policy of both presidents' was different with respect to the choice of foreign policy instrument(s) and, foreign policy objectives.



## References

- [1] Abdul, S. U. & Ibrahim, M. B. (2013). Interrogating Nigeria's Foreign Policy in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Reflections on the Gains and Challenges of Obasanjo's Administration 1999-2007. *Bassey Andah Journal*, Vol. 6, pp. 34-50.
- [2] Adelusi, O. (2013). Concentric Circles Approach to Foreign Policy Making and Analysis: An Exploratory Essay. Retrieved October 18, 2017 from [olufemiadelusi.blogspot.com/2013/10/concentric-circles-approach-to-foreign.html](http://olufemiadelusi.blogspot.com/2013/10/concentric-circles-approach-to-foreign.html)
- [3] Adeniran, T. (1983). *Introduction to International Relations*. Lagos: Macmillan Nigeria Ltd.
- [4] Adeola, G. L. & Ogunnoiki, A. O. (2015). The Pursuance of Nigeria's Domestic and Foreign Policy in the Fourth Republic: Complementarity or Contradiction. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 434-444.
- [5] Adeola, G. L. & Ogunnoiki, A. O. (2016). The Securitisation of Communicable Viral Diseases in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: A Growing Human Security Danger in a Globalized World. *Ideal Journal of Art and Humanities (IJAH)*, 2(2), pp. 71-82.
- [6] AGOA.info: About – Agoa.info – Africa Growth and Opportunity Act. Retrieved August 10, 2018 from <https://agoa.info/about-agoa.html>
- [7] Ajayi, K. (2005). Nigeria's Foreign Policy and Image Crisis. *AJPAM*, Vol. XVI, No. 2, pp. 50-63.
- [8] Ajetunmobi, R. O., Osunkoya, O. A., Omotere, T. F. (2011). Impact of President Obasanjo's Personality on Nigerian Foreign Policy, 1999-2007. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences* 8(6), pp. 308-315.
- [9] Akinboade, L. (2011). How do NigComSat-2 and NigComSat-X benefit Nigeria?. Retrieved August 08, 2018 from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2011/.../how-do-nigcomsat-2-and-nigcomsat-x-benefit...>
- [10] Akinboye, S. O. (2013). Beautiful Abroad but Ugly at Home: Issues and Contradictions in Nigeria's Foreign Policy. A paper delivered at the 9<sup>th</sup> Inaugural Lecture 2012/2013 Session, University of Lagos, July 17.
- [11] Akinboye, S. O. & Ottoh, F. O. (2005). *A Systematic Approach to International Relations*. Lagos: Concept Publications.
- [12] Akinterewa, B. A. (2004). "Concentricism in Nigeria's Foreign Policy" in Akinterewa, B. A. (ed.). *Nigeria's New Foreign Policy Thrust. Essays in Honour of Ambassador Oluyemi Adeniji*. Ibadan: Vantage Publishers Limited.

- [13] Alao, A. (2011). Nigeria and the Global Power: Continuity and Change in Policy and Perceptions. SAIIA Occasional Paper 96.
- [14] Alo, E. N. (2013). Obasanjo's Leadership Role as Chairman of NEPAD's HSGIC. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, Vol. 7(7), 295-303.
- [15] Aluko, O. (1981). *Essays in Nigerian Foreign Policy*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- [16] Anderson, J. E. (1975). *Public Policy-Making*. New York: Praeger.
- [17] Aron, J. (2008). How Nigeria has been using its Satellites. *NewScientist*. Retrieved August 08, 2018 from <https://www.newscientist.com/.../dn24025>
- [18] Ashaver, T. B. (2014). Continuities and Discontinuities in Nigerian Foreign Policy. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 286-305.
- [19] Babatola, J. E. T. (2012). Nigeria-Boundary Dispute: The Quest for the Bakassi Peninsular. *International Affairs and Global Strategy*, Vol. 4, pp. 81-95.
- [20] Badmus, I. A. & Ogunmola, D. (2017). Re-Engineering Nigeria's Foreign Policy in the Post-Military Era: Olusegun Obasanjo's Presidency and Nigeria's African Foreign Policy. *Journal of International and Global Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 56-76.
- [21] Baye, F. M. (2010). The Implications of the Bakassi Conflict Resolution for Cameroon. *African Journal on Conflict Resolution* 10(1), 9-34.
- [22] Bradley, C. A. (2009). The Bush Administration and International Law: Too much Lawyering and too Little Diplomacy. *Duke Journal of Constitutional Law & Public Policy*, Vol. 4:57, 57-75.
- [23] Castro Santos, M. H. & Teixeira, U. T. (2013). The essential role of democracy in the Bush Doctrine: the invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan. *Revista Brasileira De Política Internacional*. 56(2): 131-156.
- [24] Cheo, S. (2008). North Korea Destroys Cooling Tower at Nuclear Plant. *The New York Times*. Retrieved September 30, 2018 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/27/world/asia/27iht-korea.1.14044540.html>
- [25] Cirincione, J. (2006). Stop the Fuel Cycle, I Want to Get Off. *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs*, Vol. 30:3.
- [26] CNN.com – Bush State of the Union Address – January 29, 2002. Retrieved September 28, 2018 from [edition.cnn.com/2002/ALLPOLITICS/01/29/bush.speech.txt/](http://edition.cnn.com/2002/ALLPOLITICS/01/29/bush.speech.txt/)

- [27] Collier, D. (1993) "Comparative Method" in Finifter, A. W. (ed.). *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*. American Political Science Association (APSA).
- [28] Collier, M. M. (2003). The Bush Administration's Reaction to September 11: A Multilateral Voice or a Multilateral Veil?. *Berkeley Journal of International Law*, Vol. 21, Iss. 3, pp. 715-730.
- [29] Daalder, I. H. & Lindsay, J. M. (2003). The Bush Revolution: The Remaking of America's Foreign Policy. *The Brookings Institution*, pp. 1-60.
- [30] Daily Trust (2012). FG Ignored our Advice on Bakassi – Prof. Asiwaju. Retrieved August 09, 2018 from <https://www.dailytrust.com.ng/fg-ignored-our-advice-on-bakassi-prof-asiwaju.html>
- [31] Dalby, S. (2005). Geopolitics, Grand Strategy and the Bush Doctrine. *Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS)*, Discussion Paper, No. 90, pp. 1-20.
- [32] Dietrich, J. W. (2007). The Politics of PEPFAR: The President's Emerging Plan for AIDS Relief [Full Text]. *Ethics & International Affairs*, Vol. 21.3. Retrieved September 28, 2018 from <https://www.carnegiecouncil.org/.../Essay>
- [33] Dominguez, J. I. (2005). Bush Administration Policy: A View Towards Latin America. *Revista*.
- [34] Dresner, A. (2009). Policy of Preemption or the Bush Doctrine. *School of Doctoral Studies (European Union) Journal*, No. 1, pp. 281-285.
- [35] Durotoye, A. (2014). One Personality, Two Regimes: A Comparative Analysis of Nigeria's Foreign Policies under Olusegun Obasanjo. *International Affairs and Global Strategy*, Vol. 24, pp. 22-32.
- [36] Dye, T. D. (1978). *Understanding Public Policy*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- [37] Enweremadu, D. U. (2010). Anti-Corruption Policies in Nigeria under Obasanjo and Yar'Adua: What to do after 2011?. *Friedrich Ebert Stiftung*. Discussion Paper No. 1, pp. 1-29.
- [38] Etekpe, A., (2013). ICJ Judgment on Bakassi Peninsula and Lake Chad: Litmus Test for Peace and Integration in Africa. *African Journal for Political Science and International Relations*, Vol. 7(6), 286-294.

- [39] Facui, A. S. & Eisinger, R.W. (2018). PEPFAR – 15 years and Counting the lives Saved. *The New England Journal of Medicine*. Retrieved September 28, 2018 from <https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMp1714773>
- [40] Falcone, E. (2015). USA Foreign Policy in Latin America: The Challengers. Libera Università Internazionale Degli Studi Sociali
- [41] Frankel, J. (1963). *The Making of Foreign Policy*. London: Oxford University Press.
- [42] Friedrich, C. J. (1963). *Man and His Government*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [43] Gambari, I. A. (1989). *Theory and Reality in Foreign Policy Making: Nigeria after the Second Republic*. Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Humanities Press International.
- [44] Garuba, D. (2008). Keys to Facilitate the Monitoring of the Spanish Foreign Policy and the International Relations in 2007 – Country Profile: Nigeria and its Regional Context Annex Foreign Policy. *CIDOB International Yearbook*. Barcelona: Spain.
- [45] Gbemre, Z. (2016). The Need for UN to Review the Bakassi Peninsular Land Dispute and the Need for the Conduct of a Referendum to Decide the Fate if Nigerians in Bakassi. Retrieved August 09, 2018 from [reformeronline.com/the-need-for-un-to-...](http://reformeronline.com/the-need-for-un-to-...)
- [46] Global Security (2011). NigeriSat-1- Global Security.org. Retrieved August 08, 2018 from <https://www.globalsecurity.org/space/world/nigeria/nigeriasat-1.htm>
- [47] Greenstein, F. I. (2005). Presidents, Their Styles and Their Leadership. *Center for Public Leadership*, Work Papers, pp. 219-232.
- [48] Hinnebusch, R. (2007). The American Invasion of Iraq: Causes and Consequences. *Perceptions*, pp. 9-27.
- [49] Iran Watch (2016). A History of Iran’s Nuclear Program. Retrieved September 30, 2018 from [https://www.iranwatch.org/Weapon\\_Programs/1\\_Landing\\_Page\\_Panel](https://www.iranwatch.org/Weapon_Programs/1_Landing_Page_Panel)
- [50] Isyaku, A. (2011). Obasanjo Administration and the Restoration of Nigeria’s International Image (1999-2007). Unpublished M.Sc Thesis, Department of Political Science, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.
- [51] Jarratt, S. C. (2006). George W. Bush, “Graduation Speech at West Point” (1 June 2002). *Voices of Democracy* 1, pp. 83-103.

- [52] Johnkingsley, E. (2011). Nigeria Launches First Satellite Built in Africa. SciDev.Net. Retrieved on August, 08, 2018 from <https://www.scidev.net/global/.../nigeria-launches-first-satellite-built-by-africans.html>
- [53] Kai, B., Nwigbo, T. S. & Ojei, P. A. (2017). Foreign Policy Strategy of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1960-2012: The Missing Link. *International Journal of International Relations, Media and Mass Communication Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 2 pp. 10-27.
- [54] Kelly, M. J. (2003). The Bush Foreign Policy 2001-2003: Unilateralist Theory in a Multilateral World, and the Opportunity for Change Offered by Iraq. *Washington University Global Studies Law Review*, Vol. 2, Iss. 1, pp. 221-229.
- [55] Lancaster, C. (2008). George Bush's Foreign Aid: Transformation or Chaos?. *Washington D.C Centre for Global Development*.
- [56] Liou, T. (2004). U.S-South Korea Relations under Kim Dae-jung and beyond. *Tamkang Journal of International Affairs*, pp. 51-88.
- [57] Matray, J. I. (2013). The Failure of the Bush Administration's North Korea Policy: A Critical Analysis. *International Journal of Korean Studies*, Vol. XVII, No. 1, pp. 140-177.
- [58] McGlinchey, S. (2010). Neoconservatism and American Foreign Policy. *Politikon (IAPSS)* 16(1), 21-33.
- [59] Miroff, N. (2006). How President Bush has unified Latin America. *SFGATA*. Retrieved October 08, 2018 from <https://www.sfgate.com/.../How-President-Bush-has-unified-Latin-America-2501215.p...>
- [60] Modelski, G. (1962). *A Theory of Foreign Policy*. London: Pall Mall Press.
- [61] NATO – Topic: NATO and Afghanistan (2018). Retrieved September 03, 2018 from [https://www.nato.int/cps/em/natohq/topics\\_8189.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/em/natohq/topics_8189.htm)
- [62] NATO-ISAF's Mission in Afghanistan (2001-2014) (2015). Retrieved September 03, 2018 from [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics\\_69366.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_69366.htm)
- [63] Ngara, C. O., Esebonu, E. N. & Ayabam, A. T. (2013). Personality and Nigeria's Foreign Policy: A Comparative Analysis of Obasanjo's Foreign Policy as Military Head of State and Civilian President. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, Vol. 3 No. 19, pp. 74-83.
- [64] Northedge, F. S. (1968). *The Foreign Policies of the Powers*. London: Faber & Faber.
- [65] Nweke, R. C. (2010). The Role of Nigeria in Restoring Peace in West Africa. Unpublished Master Thesis, University of Malta.

- [66] Ojo, O. & Sesay, A. (2002). *Concepts in International Relations*. Ile-Ife: Cleanprint Publisher.
- [67] Okajare, S. T. (2012). Between Principle and Practice: NEPAD as an Indicator of Afrocentrism in Nigerian Foreign Policy. *European Scientific Journal*, Vol. 8, No.14, pp. 210-222.
- [68] Okeke, V. O. S. (2017). Nigerian Foreign Policy and Engagements under President Olusegun Obasanjo's Democratic Administration. *African Journal of Basic & Applied Sciences* 9 (6), 338-349.
- [69] Okereocha, C. (2015). How Nigeria can Leverage on AGOA to boost non-oil export – The Nations. Retrieved August 10, 2018 from [thenationonline.net/how-nigeria-can-leverage-on-agoa-to-boost-non-oil-export/](http://thenationonline.net/how-nigeria-can-leverage-on-agoa-to-boost-non-oil-export/)
- [70] Olorunyomi, B. R. (2014). Nigeria's Foreign Relations under Olusegun Obasanjo's Civilian Administration. *Covenant University Journal of Politics and international Affairs (CUJPIA)*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 53-64
- [71] Onuah, F. (2008). Nigeria Satellite Battery Dead not Lost in Space. Retrieved August 08, 2018 from <https://www.reuters.com/.../nigeria-satellite/nigerian-satellite-battery-dead-not-lost-in-spa...>
- [72] Oyedoyin, T. (2012). 'Obasanjo Woos Foreign Investors to Nigeria', *NigeriaWorld News Headline*, 18 July, Retrieved October 10, 2018 from [nigeriaworld.com/feature/publication/oyedoyin/0718-202.html](http://nigeriaworld.com/feature/publication/oyedoyin/0718-202.html)
- [73] Padgett, T. (2005). Why Latin America bashes Bush. *Time*. Retrieved from October 7, 2018 from [content.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1126425,00.html](http://content.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1126425,00.html)
- [74] Pauly, R. J. (2009). "Identifying and Confronting the "Axis of Evil": A Critical Retrospective" in Lansford, T., Watson, R. P. & Covarrubias, J. (eds). *America's War on Terror*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- [75] Pham, P. J. (2007). Nigeria's Foreign Policy: An Inquiry in Sources and Prospects. *Instituto Português de Relações Internacionais (IPRI)*, Work Paper 35, pp. 1-18.
- [76] Poneman, D. (2007). The History of the 1994 Agreed Framework. *History News Network*. Retrieved September 30, 2018 from <https://historynewsnetwork.org/article/31633>
- [77] Prins, B. C. & Wilford, A. (2013). U.S. Leadership in a Post 9/11 World: Comparing World Views and Foreign Policy Decisions of George W. Bush and Barack Obama. *Baker Center for Public Policy*, Policy Brief, pp. 1-7.

[78] Radelet, S. (2003). Bush and Foreign Aid. *Foreign Affairs*, September/October, pp. 104-117.

[79] Record, J. (2003). The Bush Doctrine and War with Iraq. *Parameters*, pp. 1-21.

[80] Sanubi, F. A. & Oke, C. I. A. (2017). Diplomatic Shuttles in Foreign Policy: Were Obasanjo Trips during his Tenure of any Benefits to Nigeria?. *Journal of Social and Management Sciences*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 139-152.

[81] Shareef, M, J. M. (2010). President George W. Bush's Policy Towards Iraq: Change or Continuity?, Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/501/>

[82] Smyth, G. (2005). Israel should be 'wiped off the map' says Iran. *Financial Times*. Retrieved October 2, 2018 from <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=3&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwit6MmKvKLeAhVBqYsKHVaTCG0QFjACegQIBxAB&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ft.com%2Fcontent%2F14ee1ccc-465b-11da-8880-00000e2511c8&usg=AOvVaw3EOxy1WVPj-Bqw6tV-WqmE>

[83] Spooner, R. (2015). The McMahon Promise to Hussein. *The Balfour Project*. Retrieved September 28, 2018 from [www.balfourproject.org/the-mcmahon-promise/](http://www.balfourproject.org/the-mcmahon-promise/)

[84] Tahhan, Z. (2017). 100 years on: The Balfour Declaration explained. Retrieved September 27, 2018 from <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwic353avKLeAhVqh4sKHZFkAOYQFjAAegQICRAB&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.aljazeera.com%2Fdepth%2Ffeatures%2F2017%2F10%2F100-years-balfour-declaration-explained-171028055805843.html&usg=AOvVaw0crwh7GDJBIwpN5VUE2Zr4>

[85] The New York Times (2006). Bush's Speech on Immigration. Retrieved October 23, 2018 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2006/05/15/washington/15text-bush.html>

[86] Tian, J. (2003). The Bush Administration's Nuclear Strategy and Its Implications for China's Security. Work Paper, pp. 1-20.

[87] Unachukwu, J. A. (2012). ICJ Judgment on Bakassi: The 'fresh facts' – the Nation Nigeria. Retrieved August 09, 2018 from [thenationonlineng.net/icj-judgment-on-bakassi-the-fresh-facts/](http://thenationonlineng.net/icj-judgment-on-bakassi-the-fresh-facts/)

[88] Vanguard (2017). Nigeria to Launch Africa's 1<sup>st</sup> Nanosatellite. Retrieved August 08, 2018 from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2017/05/nigeria-launch-africas-1st-nanosatellite/>

[89] Wit, J. S. (2001). What Should We Do with the U.S.-North Korea Agreed Framework?. *Brookings*. Retrieved September 17, 2018 from <https://www.brookings.edu/.../what-should-we-do-with-the-u-s-north-korea-agreed-fr...>