

**FOREIGN POLICY OF NIGERIA UNDER PRESIDENT
GOODLUCK EBELE JONATHAN
(2010-2015)**

BY

**EHIGIEGBA CLINTON
ART2100546**

**DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
FACULTY OF ARTS
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN
BENIN CITY**

OCTOBER, 2025

**FOREIGN POLICY OF NIGERIA UNDER PRESIDENT
GOODLUCK EBELE JONATHAN**

(2010-2015)

BY

EHIGIEGBA CLINTON

ART2100546

**A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, FACULTY OF ARTS,
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN, BENIN CITY IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD
OF THE BACHELOR OF ARTS (B.A) HONOURS DEGREE IN
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AND DIPLOMACY.**

OCTOBER, 2025

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that this research project was carried out by **EHIGIEGBA CLINTON** in the Department of History and International Studies, University of Benin, under my supervision

Dr Charles O. Osarumwense
(Project supervisor)

Prof J.C. Nwaka
(Head of Department)

Date: _____

Date: _____

DEDICATION

This research is dedicated to Almighty God for His mercy, Unending love and protection throughout my studies in the University of Benin, this project is dedicated to my parents Mr and Mrs EHIGIEGBA for their steadfast prayer, encouragement and financial support. It is also dedicated to my Siblings

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my gratitude to my department as a whole for the knowledge it has impacted me with, a very big thank you.

A special thanks goes to my supervisor Dr Charles O. Osarumwense for his time, patience and swift corrections throughout my project writing, His calm guidance and stern knowledge made this project swift thank you so much sir.

My gratitude to my lovely parents Mr and Mrs EHIGIEGBA and for their never ending love and consistent prayers coupled with financial support in the course of my studies in this great University of Benin, a special thanks goes to my Siblings Dr Thompson Ehigiegba, Evans Ehigiegba, Sophia Ehigiegba, Rejoice Ehigiegba, Osarugue Ehigiegba and lastly Marvelous Ehigiegba for their Support as well.

I want to thank my head of department, Prof JC NWAKA for her love for this department, there can be no smooth organization without a good leader, she is one indeed.

My gratitude extend to my lecturers who have impacted me with profound knowledge, Dr W.E Orukpe, Prof Frank Ikponmwosa, Prof Eddy Erhagbe, Dr Mrs Osemwengie, Prof Ehimika Adebayo Ifidon, Prof Osariemen Benson Osadolor, Mr Victor Aiguobarueghian, Mr Daniel Orobator Dr Iwenze and the entire non academic staff of the department, thank you and God bless.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Title page -----	ii
Certification -----	iii
Dedication -----	iv
Acknowledgement -----	
Table of Contents -----	
CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY	
Introduction -----	1
Aim and Objectives of the study -----	1
Significance of the Study -----	2
Scope and delimitation of the study ----	3
Literature Review -----	4
Methodology -----	7
Endnotes -----	8
CHAPTER TWO: CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING OF FOREIGN POLICY -----	10
CHAPTER THREE: NIGERIA FOREIGN POLICY UNDER GOODLUCK JONATHAN (ECONOMIC POLICY) -----	33
CHAPTER FOUR: CONCLUSION -----	47

Abstract

This study examines Nigeria's foreign policy under the administration of Goodluck Ebele Jonathan from 2010 to 2015, with a particular focus on its economic dimensions. During this period, Nigeria pursued a foreign policy that increasingly emphasized economic diplomacy as a tool for national development, global integration, and regional leadership. The study explores how the government sought to attract foreign direct investment, promote international trade, secure economic partnerships, and enhance Nigeria's position in the global economy. It also considers the role of institutions, bilateral and multilateral engagements, and participation in international organizations in shaping economic outcomes.

The research further analyzes key initiatives and policies implemented during this period, including efforts to diversify the economy beyond oil, strengthen regional economic cooperation within West Africa, and improve Nigeria's global economic image. Attention is given to the challenges faced, such as fluctuating oil prices, corruption, infrastructural deficits, and security concerns, which influenced the effectiveness of Nigeria's economic foreign policy.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

Foreign policy serves as a vital instrument through which a nation pursues its national interests within the international system¹. It encompasses the strategies, decisions, and actions taken by a country in relation to other states and international actors. Nigeria, as Africa's most populous nation and one of its largest economies, has historically played a prominent role in regional and global diplomacy. From independence in 1960 to the present, Nigeria's foreign policy has evolved in response to internal dynamics and changing global realities, often reflecting the priorities and ideologies of its leaders.

Under the administration of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan (2010–2015), Nigeria's foreign policy witnessed a number of shifts and initiatives shaped by a complex blend of domestic challenges and international pressures². Jonathan's tenure was marked by significant security concerns, especially the Boko Haram insurgency, economic fluctuations due to oil dependency, and Nigeria's aspiration to consolidate its leadership

position within Africa and enhance its global profile. These internal and external factors influenced how Nigeria engaged with the international community during this period.

President Jonathan's foreign policy was often described as pragmatic, with a renewed emphasis on economic diplomacy, regional security, and active participation in multilateral organizations such as the African Union (AU) and the United Nations (UN)³. His government also sought to attract foreign investment and improve Nigeria's image abroad, even as it faced criticism over human rights issues and governance.

This study aims to critically examine the foreign policy of Nigeria under Goodluck Jonathan, identifying its major features, objectives, achievements, and limitations. It seeks to contribute to a broader understanding of how leadership, domestic challenges, and international dynamics converge to shape the foreign relations of a developing country like Nigeria.

Aim and Objectives of the Study

This study is aimed at providing a comprehensive analysis of Nigeria's foreign policy under the leadership of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan, who served as the President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria from 2010 to 2015.

The specific objectives are:

1. To conceptualize the understanding of foreign policy, examine the definition of foreign policy, the main goals of foreign policy and also the various tools to implement foreign policy

2. Also focuses on Nigeria's foreign policy by examining the policy adopted by president Goodluck Ebele Jonathan, retained many of the traditional elements of Nigeria's external relation such as African-centered diplomacy and active participation in regional and global affairs
3. It also emphasizes more on economic diplomacy aimed at attracting foreign investment and growth and also how Goodluck Jonathan's administration actively pursued economic diplomacy as a center pillar of its foreign policy
4. It also provides a summary of the findings from the research , it concludes the foreign policy of Nigeria under president Goodluck Ebele Jonathan from 2010-2015

Significance of the Study

This study examines the foreign policy of the federal Republic of Nigeria during the administration of president Goodluck Ebele Jonathan, who held office from May 6, 2010 to may 29, 2015. 2010 is significant to the study of president Goodluck Ebele Jonathan's regime because it mark the official beginning of his presidency and the start of his impact as Nigeria's leader at the federal level. In May 2010 following the death of president Umaru Musa Yar'Adua, Goodluck Jonathan, then vice president of the federal Republic of Nigeria was constitutionally sworn in as president, although he had served as acting president from February 2010, it was in May that Jonathan assumed full executive authority. This shift allowed him to implement his

vision and appoint his own cabinet thereby marking the true beginning of his leadership and policy direction.

With full authority in 2010, President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan initiated reforms that would later define his administration including the early groundwork for his transformation agenda which aimed at economic reform, infrastructural development and good governance. In 2010, Jonathan officially declared his intention to contest the 2011 presidential elections, a move that defied the internal zoning arrangement of the ruling People's Democratic Party (PDP).

2010 served as an initial test of Jonathan's leadership style and capacity to govern amid high expectations. His actions and decisions during this year set the tone for how he would be perceived and judged in subsequent years.

The year 2015 is very significant on the study of Goodluck Ebele Jonathan's regime because it marks the end of his tenure as president of Nigeria and represents a major turning points in the country's democratic history. In that years, Nigeria held a highly contested general election In which Jonathan lost to Buhari, marking the first time in Nigeria's history that an incumbent president was defeated at the polis. His decision to peacefully concede defeat and congratulate his opponent was widely praised both locally and internationally, reinforcing democratic norms and helping to prevent post election conflict.

2015 is significant also because it serves as a critical year for evaluating the full impact and legacy of Jonathan's policies and leadership in areas such as security, the economy etc. 2015 was not just the final year of his presidency, it was a defining moment that encapsulates the political, economic and historical significance of his entire regime.

Scope and delimitation of the study

This study focuses on President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan's administration from May 2010 to May 2015 because it represents a complete presidential tenure during which he had full executive powers to shape Nigeria's foreign policy. The period is significant for the introduction of major policy reforms, especially the Transformation Agenda, and Nigeria's active engagement in economic diplomacy and regional security.

The chosen timeframe allows for an in-depth analysis of how Jonathan's government responded to internal challenges such as insecurity and economic pressure through foreign policy. It also highlights Nigeria's role in international affairs and provides a clear basis for assessing the achievements and limitations of his administration's external relations.

However, the study is limited to the period between May 2010 and May 2015, which marks the official duration of Jonathan's presidency. The study deliberately avoids covering Jonathan's personal life or political roles before 2010 unless directly connected to his presidency. It also does not include a full comparative study with other administrations, except where necessary to provide context.

The research will depend largely on available sources such as official reports, academic literature, and credible media coverage, acknowledging the limitations that may arise from the availability or reliability of such data. Ultimately, the study is not aimed at

promoting partisan opinions but at providing a critical and objective academic evaluation of a significant period in Nigeria's democratic history

Literature Review

Nigeria's foreign policy has historically been shaped by a combination of domestic realities, regional ambitions, and global pressures⁴. Under President Goodluck Jonathan 2010–2015, scholars and analysts observed both continuity and subtle shifts in the country's international engagement. Several works have examined this period, with a focus on the administration's strategic interests, regional diplomacy, security concerns, and global alignments.

According to Ogaba Oche in his work titled "Continuity and change in Nigeria's foreign policy under president Goodluck Jonathan". Stated that Jonathan's foreign policy maintained Nigeria's traditional Afrocentric orientation, with Africa remaining the centerpiece of its external relations⁵. The administration continued to prioritize peacekeeping, regional integration, and mediation in conflicts, especially within ECOWAS. However, Oche also notes a shift toward economic diplomacy and a more pragmatic engagement with global powers, reflecting changing national priorities.

Eghosa Osaghae in his work titled "Reconstructing the citizen in Nigeria's Changing political Economy". emphasizes Jonathan's commitment to economic diplomacy. This approach sought to attract foreign direct investment, diversify the economy, and improve Nigeria's global image⁶. Under Jonathan, Nigeria rebranded its

foreign missions and launched image-building initiatives like the Transformation Agenda, which had foreign policy components aimed at improving Nigeria's reputation abroad.

Adebajo and Akinterinwa in their work titled “Nigeria and the World” and “Nigeria’s National interest and foreign policy”. both highlight Nigeria’s active role in regional peacekeeping during Jonathan’s administration, notably in Mali, GuineaBissau, and Côte d’Ivoire⁷. Jonathan’s government demonstrated Nigeria’s leadership within ECOWAS, using both diplomatic pressure and military assistance to maintain regional stability. This reinforced Nigeria’s status as a hegemon in West Africa.

Scholars such as John Campbell and Ugwukah In their work titled “What everyone needs to know”. And “Counterterrorism and Nigeria’s foreign policy under president Goodluck Jonathan”, argue that the security threat led to increased collaboration with Western powers, especially the United States, the United Kingdom, and France. Nigeria’s foreign policy had to align more closely with international counterterrorism initiatives⁸, leading to joint military training, intelligence sharing, and aid.

Scholars like Ayo Olukotun in his work titled “Globalization and the Nigeria’s foreign policy under Jonathan”. observed that Jonathan’s administration aspired to elevate Nigeria’s status in global diplomacy. The push for a permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council and increased participation in G-20 and BRICS forums were seen as part of a broader effort to project Nigeria as a major African power⁹.

Fidelis Allen in his work titled “Transformation Agenda and Nigeria’s Foreign Policy: An Appraisal”. Fidelis explores how Jonathan’s Transformation Agenda influenced foreign policy goals. He argues that the policy aimed not only at internal development but also at reshaping Nigeria’s external image. Allen points out that the Jonathan administration pursued partnerships with emerging economies¹⁰. such as China, Brazil, and India, seeking trade agreements and technology transfers. He further stresses that the drive for a more business-friendly foreign policy was reflected in Nigeria’s engagements at the World Economic Forum and similar international platforms. Allen concludes that, although ambitious, these efforts were hampered by internal governance issues.

Charles Dokubo in his work titled “Nigeria’s Peace Diplomacy and Goodluck Jonathan’s Era”. His analysis highlights Nigeria’s leadership in peace diplomacy under Jonathan, with a focus on mediation efforts in the Sahel and the Lake Chad Basin. Dokubo credits the administration for prioritizing multilateral solutions through institutions like the African Union and ECOWAS. He notes that Jonathan’s government supported diplomatic missions in conflict zones and contributed to conflict resolution frameworks. However, he also critiques the lack of a follow-through strategy, arguing that Nigeria's diplomacy was sometimes symbolic rather than strategically sustained¹¹.

Rotimi Suberu in his work titled “Nigeria’s Foreign Policy and Democratic Consolidation under Jonathan” Rotimi examines how Nigeria’s foreign relations under

Jonathan intertwined with democratic development¹². He contends that Nigeria used its foreign policy to project itself as a democratic model in Africa, particularly during election monitoring missions and democratic advocacy in the region. Suberu also discusses how the Jonathan administration's relatively peaceful transfer of power in 2015 boosted Nigeria's diplomatic credibility and served as a foreign policy tool in reinforcing democratic norms across West Africa.

Olayiwola Abegunrin in his work titled "Nigeria's Foreign Policy under President Jonathan: Between Global Visibility and Domestic". He critically examines the paradox of Nigeria's rising international profile amid growing domestic insecurity¹³. He argues that Jonathan's foreign policy was ambitious on the global stage but undermined by the Boko Haram insurgency, economic instability, and governance issues at home. According to Abegunrin, the Jonathan administration made laudable efforts to secure global partnerships, but internal discontent and weak institutions limited the capacity to sustain these achievements. He emphasizes the need for aligning foreign policy ambitions with domestic development strategies.

Some scholars argue that Jonathan's foreign policy lacked a clear ideological foundation. According to Ibrahim Gambari in his work "Foreign policy and Nigeria's development consolation". Asserted that while there were efforts toward strategic partnerships and economic engagement, the policy was often reactive rather than

proactive. The inconsistency in diplomatic responses, especially regarding crises in Libya and South Sudan, was seen as a weakness in Nigeria's foreign policy apparatus¹⁴.

Media analyses and civil society reports during this period also provide valuable insights. Many public commentators praised Jonathan's commitment to regional peace, while others criticized the administration for not leveraging foreign policy to address domestic challenges more effectively. Reports by organizations like the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA) provide balanced perspectives on these debates¹⁵.

Methodology

This project adopts a qualitative research approach to examine Nigeria's foreign policy under President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan from 2010 to 2015. The study relies on both primary and secondary sources to gather relevant data and provide a clear understanding of the administration's foreign policy direction, priorities, and challenges.

Primary Sources

Primary sources include official government documents such as presidential speeches, press releases, foreign policy statements, reports from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and communiqués from Nigeria's international missions. These materials provide direct insight into the decisions and actions taken by the Jonathan administration on foreign affairs.

Secondary Sources

Secondary sources consist of textbooks, academic journals, newspaper articles, research papers, and commentaries by foreign policy scholars and analysts. These sources offer interpretations, analyses, and critiques that help to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of Jonathan's foreign policy.

Endnotes

1. Julius E. Okolo, *Foreign Policy and the Nigerian State* (Lagos: Macmillan Nigeria, 2002), 12
2. John N. Paden, *Post-Election Nigeria: Jonathan, Boko Haram, and National Unity* (Washington, DC: USIP Press, 2012), 17–20.
3. Ugwukah N. Emmanuel, "Counterterrorism and Nigeria's Foreign Policy under President Goodluck Jonathan," *Journal of African Affairs* 19, no. 3 (2016): 188–190.
4. Charles C. Ukeje, "Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Continuity and Change," *African Review of Politics, Economics and Society* 7 (2013): 33.
5. Ogaba Oche, "Continuity and Change in Nigeria's Foreign Policy under President Goodluck Jonathan," *Nigerian Journal of International Affairs* 39, no. 1 (2013): 44–46.
6. Eghosa E. Osaghae, *Reconstructing the Citizen in Nigeria's Changing Political Economy* (Ibadan: University Press, 2011), 91–93.
7. Adekeye Adebajo and Bola Akinterinwa, *Nigeria and the World: Readings in Nigerian Foreign Policy* (Ibadan: Bookcraft, 2014), 56–60.
8. John Campbell, *Nigeria: What Everyone Needs to Know* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 101–103; Ugwukah, "Counterterrorism," 191–193.
9. Ayo Olukotun, "Globalization and Nigeria's Foreign Policy under Jonathan," *Third World Quarterly* 35, no. 10 (2014): 1799–802.

10. Fidelis Allen, "Transformation Agenda and Nigeria's Foreign Policy: An Appraisal," *Journal of International Relations and Development Studies* 12, no. 2 (2014): 29–31.
11. Charles Dokubo, *Nigeria's Peace Diplomacy and Goodluck Jonathan's Era* (Lagos: NIIA, 2015), 67–69.
12. Rotimi T. Suberu, "Nigeria's Foreign Policy and Democratic Consolidation under Jonathan," *Democratization* 21, no. 5 (2014): 890–893.
13. Olayiwola Abegunrin, *Nigeria's Foreign Policy under President Jonathan: Between Global Visibility and Domestic Crisis* (New York: Lexington Books, 2016), 115–118.
14. Ibrahim Gambari, "Foreign Policy and Nigeria's Development Consolidation," in *Readings in Nigerian Foreign Policy*, ed. B. A. Akinterinwa (Ibadan: Vantage Publishers, 2013), 207–209.
15. Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA), *Annual Report on Nigeria's Foreign Policy Performance 2015* (Lagos: NIIA Publications, 2016), 14–16.

CHAPTER TWO

CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING OF FOREIGN POLICY

Introduction

Foreign policy refers to the strategies and decisions adopted by a country in its interactions with other nations and international organizations. It encompasses a wide range of activities including diplomacy, trade relations, defense cooperation, cultural exchange, and international aid¹. The primary aim of foreign policy is to protect and promote a country's national interests abroad, ensure security, foster economic growth, and maintain peaceful and cooperative international relations. Foreign policy is shaped by a nation's historical experiences, geographic location, political ideology, economic priorities, and global dynamics. It is implemented through a combination of negotiation, alliances, treaties, and sometimes coercive measures.

Definition and Scope

Foreign policy refers to the strategies and decisions a sovereign state adopts in its interactions with other states and international actors. It encompasses the pursuit of national interests abroad and is shaped by a state's values, objectives, and strategic considerations. Unlike domestic policy, which is confined within a country's borders, foreign policy involves diplomacy, trade negotiations, defense arrangements, and participation in global institutions. For instance, the United States' commitment to NATO reflects a strategic decision to ensure security through collective defense. Such choices

underline the state's efforts to balance national interests with global realities. Foreign policy thus operates as the outward expression of a state's identity, ambitions, and constraints on the world stage.

The scope of foreign policy is vast and multidimensional, encompassing political, economic, military, cultural, and environmental domains. It includes the formulation and implementation of strategies relating to international cooperation, conflict resolution, foreign aid, global trade, and transnational challenges like climate change and terrorism. For example, China's Belt and Road Initiative exemplifies a broad foreign policy agenda integrating infrastructure development, trade expansion, and geopolitical influence across continents. The complexity of these interactions shows how foreign policy is no longer confined to traditional diplomacy but extends into global governance and non-state partnerships. Consequently, the scope of foreign policy must continuously adapt to an increasingly interconnected and interdependent world.

Historical evolution

The historical evolution of foreign policy reflects changing global dynamics, technological advancements, and ideological transformations. In ancient and medieval times, foreign policy was largely influenced by dynastic politics and military conquests, such as the expansionist policies of the Roman Empire or the diplomacy of the Chinese tributary system². The Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 marked a turning point by establishing the modern state system based on sovereignty and legal equality among

states³. Later, the 19th-century balance of power politics and the rise of imperialism shaped foreign relations until World War I disrupted traditional alliances. The Cold War further transformed foreign policy, introducing ideological polarization, nuclear deterrence, and proxy wars, as seen in U.S.–Soviet rivalry. These historical shifts underscore how foreign policy evolves in response to internal pressures and external challenges, constantly redefined by global trends and leadership choices.

In contemporary times, globalization, digital technology, and multilateralism have reconfigured the practice and priorities of foreign policy. States are now more accountable to international norms and subject to pressures from transnational actors, including corporations, NGOs, and global media. For instance, the Paris Agreement on climate change illustrates how foreign policy can be coordinated through international consensus on global issues. Furthermore, the rise of populism and shifting power dynamics in the 21st century have renewed debates over national sovereignty and global engagement. As countries navigate a complex international environment, foreign policy remains a vital instrument for asserting interests, fostering cooperation, and managing conflicts. Its evolution reveals a continuous negotiation between enduring national goals and an ever-changing international order.

Objectives of Foreign Policy

National interest serves as the cornerstone of any country's foreign policy, shaping its international behavior and decision-making. It cut across the vital needs and

overarching goals that a nation must pursue to ensure its survival, autonomy, and prosperity in the global arena. These interests can be categorized as core or peripheral, with core interests such as sovereignty, political independence, and territorial integrity making precedence⁴. National interest is not static; it evolves in response to changing/ domestic priorities, leadership ideologies, and global developments. For instance, a country may shift its focus from military power to environmental sustainability, or from ideological expansion to economic partnerships. The pursuit of national interest often justifies both cooperation and confrontation with other states. Thus, it acts as both a guide and a justification for foreign policy choices, compelling states to balance idealism with realism in the conduct of their international affairs.

Security and defense are among the most immediate and tangible objectives of foreign policy, as they involve the protection of a state's territory, population, and institutions from external threats⁵. This includes not only military threats from rival states or non-state actors but also challenges such as terrorism, cyberattacks, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Governments formulate defense strategies, forge military alliances, and invest in intelligence and surveillance to deter aggression and maintain peace. The role of international security organizations, like NATO or the United Nations, becomes critical in shaping a collective response to threats. Foreign policy in this domain often emphasizes deterrence, defense capability development, and strategic partnerships. In many cases, a nation's military presence abroad whether

through bases, peacekeeping missions, or naval deployments reflects its commitment to securing both national and allied interests. Consequently, the security dimension of foreign policy is a dynamic interplay of risk management, strategic deterrence, and international cooperation.

Economic goals are equally central to foreign policy, as they underpin national prosperity and influence. States seek to create favorable international economic conditions to promote exports, attract foreign investment, and secure access to vital resources such as energy, food, and raw materials. Economic diplomacy involves negotiations on trade agreements, participation in economic institutions like the World Trade Organization, and advocacy for global financial stability. Additionally, countries may use economic tools such as sanctions, aid, and development assistance to influence the behavior of other states. In a globalized world, economic interdependence can serve both as a bridge to cooperation and as a source of vulnerability, requiring nuanced policy decisions. Economic objectives can also support domestic goals, such as job creation and technological advancement, reinforcing the interconnection between domestic and foreign policy. Ultimately, the economic dimension of foreign policy enhances a nation's leverage on the global stage and contributes to its overall development and competitiveness.

The promotion of cultural values is another important objective of foreign policy, particularly for countries that view their cultural identity, political systems, or ideological

beliefs as universally beneficial or worth sharing. Cultural diplomacy seeks to foster mutual understanding, improve international image, and build soft power by exporting values such as democracy, freedom, human rights, and the rule of law. This may be achieved through educational exchanges, cultural programs, international broadcasting, and support for civil society organizations abroad. For instance, initiatives like scholarships for foreign students, global cultural festivals, and the dissemination of national media content can positively influence foreign publics and leaders alike. In some cases, the promotion of values is closely linked to strategic interests, as value-based diplomacy can enhance alliances, stabilize regions, and promote governance models that align with national interests. However, the promotion of values must navigate the challenges of cultural sensitivity, accusations of interference, and differing historical and social contexts, making it a complex yet influential aspect of foreign policy.

Diplomacy is the primary tool through which all foreign policy objectives are pursued, serving as the formal mechanism of communication, negotiation, and representation between states. It encompasses bilateral and multilateral engagements, treaty-making, conflict resolution, and the management of international relations. Diplomats act as agents of their state, advocating for policies, gathering intelligence, and maintaining peaceful and constructive interactions. Through diplomacy, countries seek to avoid conflict, build coalitions, and shape the global agenda. Modern diplomacy has expanded beyond traditional government-to-government dialogue to include non-state

actors, international institutions, and transnational networks. Digital diplomacy and public diplomacy have become increasingly important, allowing states to engage directly with foreign publics and influence global narratives. While diplomacy often involves compromise and negotiation, it is ultimately guided by the pursuit of national interests. It reflects a state's identity and priorities while functioning as the most enduring and adaptable instrument of foreign policy.

Determinants of Foreign Policy

“Foreign policy is the hinge of domestic and international politics” . There is also consensus among scholars that foreign policy serves as an intersection point of domestic and international politics. Thus, from here we can say that, the foreign policy of every state is influenced by mainly two determinants; international or external and domestic or internal.

Domestic Determinant

Culture provides people with ways of thinking, seeing and interpreting the things around them. It shapes our ideas and serves an instrument for us in analyzing everything happening around us. Everything from our racial features, to the food we eat, the way we dress, the language we speak, the music we listen to, and where we live, all form a part of culture. many scholars of international relations argued vividly that the way we think (i.e., our culture) has an effect on the policies we make. “pattern of thought and behavior are shaped by culture; they are not the product of mere nationalism.” cultural diplomacy

has deep root and can easily be found in the archives of foreign ministers. A nation inherits a style and culture which in turn influence and decide the course of actions, the nation has to follow in relation to other sovereign states.

Colonization, is another dimension of the historical experiences that influence the foreign policy of states. The foreign policy of many Asian and African states is shaped by their former colonial masters, notably Britain, France, Spain, and Portugal. This is more illustrated among French Speaking African countries, such as Senegal, Mali, Benin, Togo, Ivory Coast etc. France, obviously becomes their best and strategic ally in world affairs. Same can be said about the former British colonies or members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, like Gambia, Ghana, Cameroon, Cyprus etc.

Geography, size and population

The size of a state's territory, its geography and population greatly influence its foreign policy implementation. It is generally believed that leaders and people of states with small territory and population do not expect their country to carry out heavy weight in international affairs. For example, Gambia, Benin, Brunei, Kyrgyzstan etc. On the other hand, leaders of large countries are ready and willing to assume special and larger responsibilities in global affairs. For instance, United States, Russia and China, are active players in world politics due to their gigantic size.

However, that is not to say that, all small states do not take active roles in international affairs. Some small states which have rich resources in terms of economics

and power, are very active and leave a deep impact on world politics. For instance, Israel and North Korea are playing a very active role in international politics. Large countries like Canada, Australia and Brazil have not been playing active and effective foreign policy. Thus, it can be argued that size is not an absolute factor but rather gets influenced by other factors like resources at a state's disposal.

The geopolitical location of a state is one of the unrefuted factor that determines a country's foreign policy. In Amer Rizwan's dictum, "it matters where on the globe a country is located. It matters whether the country has natural frontiers: that is whether it is protected by oceans, high mountains, or deserts. It matters who one's neighbors are and whether a given country is territorially large, populous, affluent and well-governed."

The location of a state has a significant impact on its foreign policy. Example of such states includes Turkey, Israel, The Gambia, and Libya⁶. Turkey, with its location as a transit point between Europe and Asia, undoubtedly has profound impact on her foreign policy implementation. Same is true for the Gambia, due to its geographical location on the Atlantic Coastline. Moreover, in the 19th century, the United States has adopted isolationist policy mainly on account of its geographical location. Although the significance of geographical location cannot be overemphasized, its importance has considerably declined due to technological and scientific developments. Nevertheless, geographical location of a country has a deep impact on the determination of its foreign policy.

Economic development and natural resources

The level of economic development of a country also influences the foreign policy of that country⁷. Many advanced industrialist countries play a dominant role in world politics, and formulate their foreign policies to maintain such superiority in the system. Such countries like United States, Russia, Germany and France have large resources at their disposal to build military capabilities on one hand, and disperse monetary benefits on other states in the form of aids and loan, with the sole aim of 'seeking allies' with these states.

Military capabilities

The military strength of a country, also determines the foreign policy strategy of states. The capability of a state to defend its borders against armed aggression plays a profound role in both internal and external policies that states make. Militarily capable states exercise greater independence from external forces in the formulation of their foreign policy⁸. In the same vein, increase in the military capabilities of a state might result in change in its foreign policy; from peaceful to an aggressive foreign policy. For instance, India has acquired new dimensions after 'nuclearisation', as it attempts to get the status equivalent to the P-5 countries. The same can be said about North Korea, with her possession of new weapons of mass destruction, it is directing her foreign policy towards an aggressive one. This is to say that, states with high military capabilities such as US, China and Russia, tend to be active and vigorous in pursuing their foreign policy objectives in the international system. On the other hand, states with weak or low military

capabilities tend to be more salient in the pursue of their policy goals and most often depend on ally seeking with greater powers and international organizations for their protection.

Political system

The political organization and institutions in a country, also greatly influences the foreign policy of that country. Generally, under authoritarian or totalitarian forms of government, easier and faster foreign decisions are possible because the decision-making power rests with an individual assisted by his clique. They are the sole decision makers and as their decisions are made without any constraints or consultations, their foreign policy decisions can be conflictual. It is also observed that decision making under such closed systems have often, if not always, lead to a country's isolation in international politics as happened with the regimes in North Korea and Myanmar.

On the other hand, in a state with democratic system, foreign policy implementation tends to be difficult and slow as compared to that of an authoritarian structure. Citizens in this system can freely express and voice their opinion on the domestic as well as foreign policies of their country, making an impact on the policies their government is pursuing. Democratic leaders tend to respond to these public demands and formulate a foreign policy within it.

Personality and character of the leader

Leadership in general, the personality of a leader in particular plays a profound role in foreign policy formulation. The role of personality in foreign policy encompasses cognitive processes, and assumes that decision making is the result of individual ‘human agency’; that is, ultimately, it is ‘individuals’ who make decisions, not ‘states’⁹. Thus, personality can be important in adding to our understanding of foreign policy behavior. However, its relevance some scholars argue, is dependent upon the constraints of the international system as well as domestic political structure.

Leaders have been categorized into two: ‘hawks’—those who advocate an aggressive foreign policy based on strong military power, and ‘doves’—those who are termed as conciliatory and try to resolve international conflicts without the threat of force. According to Hermann, an aggressive leader can be characterized by certain attributes as tendency to manipulate others, high need for power, paranoia, high levels of nationalism, and a vigorous willingness to initiate on behalf of their state. Whereas conciliatory leaders on the other hand, are the opposite of the above. They possess attributes such as a desire for affiliation and friendly relations with other, low level of nationalism, etc. From this, due to their aggressive foreign policy, leaders like Hitler, Mussolini, George W. Bush, Donald Trump, and Kim Jong-Un of North Korea, can be categorized as ‘hawks’, while leaders such as Abraham Lincoln, Barack Obama, Sir Dawda Jawara and Emmanuel Macron of France, can be classified as ‘doves’.

Political parties and interest groups

Political parties are vital to modern political settings. They play an important role in shaping representative democracy in a country. They have a greater say in the foreign policies of their countries and usually voice their interest directly or through interest groups. Under multiparty system and coalition governments, political parties (i.e., the opposition party) always have conflicting views and interests, which may alter the formulation of foreign policy.

Scholars from the neoliberal approach to international politics accentuate the decisive influence of organized interest groups on foreign policy. In this view, leaders or government officials with foreign policy authority bargain with domestic interest groups that use their member's votes, campaign contributions, labor strikes or other tools to affect the electoral benefits and costs to elected officials of choosing alternative policies. For example, traced targeted government subsidies and trade protections to the influence of well-organized and financed groups; while Snyder attributes defense policy to logrolling coalitions. Organized labor and business corporations possess critical resources for pressuring policy makers.

Moreover, due to the increase in interconnectedness and the rapid growth of globalization, pressure groups have more interests in the foreign policies of states. They influence these policies when interacting with states at the international and domestic level. "Interest groups can be viewed as auxiliary actors that stand between the government and the mass public, tied to the governments decision-making system by

channels of communication.” These interest groups have mobilized a diverse area ranging from business, labor, ethnic, health, environmental, human rights, etc. Thus, it becomes impossible for governments to turn a blind eye on their existence.

Press and public opinions

The domestic sources of foreign policy are widely recognized and include interest groups, mass public opinion, and the printed and electronic media.” distinguished two pathways through which the public could shape policy outcomes: selection and responsiveness. “First, the public could exert influence by selecting parties or candidates whose foreign policy positions best match their own. Second, after politicians take office, leaders may respond to public opinion out of concern that rebuffing the public could be politically costly.” With strong experimental evidence, their study concluded that public opinion affects foreign policy in democracies, both by shaping who is elected and by influencing leaders once they take office. Leaders in countries with advance democracy, consider opinion poll before making any crucial policy decision. The 2003 Iraq war for instance, was initially supported by the American public, which the United States used as an excuse for the invasion despite the international outcry of the unjust nature of the war. The Bush administration had to make a decision by going to war or face the exit door of the white house. At this point, it is worth knowing whether public opinion matter in non-democracies as much as in democracies.

Science and technology

Just as media, technology has brought a tremendous amount of change in the areas of foreign policy and diplomacy. Hillary Clinton in her tenure as secretary of state, once said “Just as the internet has changed virtually every aspect of how people worldwide live, learn, consume and communicate, connection technologies are changing the strategic context for diplomacy in the 21st century¹⁰.”

The recent advances in technology has transcend almost all areas of international affairs and indeed open up vast new areas of communication, cooperation and even conflicts among states in their pursuit of security, development and progress. Science and technology considerations are often central to the interaction of states with other governments. It plays a large role in discussions of such critical topics as nuclear non-proliferation, use of outer space, population growth, adequate and safe food supply, climate change, energy resources, and competitiveness of industrial technologies. In the addressing of these issues, expert science and technology knowledge is significant to the anticipation and resolution of problems and to the achievement of foreign policy goals.

External Determinants of Foreign Policy

The main external factors that determine the foreign policy of a state are but not limited to: the international system or power structure, international law, international organizations, alliances, and military strength or arm race. Now we can analyze this factors in details.

The international system or power structure

The modern state system has been in existence since the treaty of Westphalia in 1648. It includes big, middle and small powers. As mentioned above, the interaction between these states takes place at the international level and as such it plays a significant role in shaping and moulding the foreign policies of those interacting states. The establishment of friendly and cooperative relations between states is the aim of a sound foreign policy. Foreign policy is essentially shaped by one's relative power within the international system¹¹. The world is continuously changing, new events and personalities create fresh foreign policy problems for all concerned. To select events at random, the impact of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, the rise of Communist Power in China in 1949, the rise of De Gaulle to power in France and Hitler in Germany, and the emergence of new states in Asia and Africa; brought about significant changes in the power structure and that has impacted the foreign policy of many states.

A prevalent framework of world politics plays a decisive role in deciding the foreign policy of a country. As such foreign policies of states thus change with shifts in the international power structure. In the traditional multi-polar system, it was easier for states to switch sides and gain maximum interests from both sides. Italy has used this strategy skillfully and switched sides during the height of World War I to gain its share in the post war colonial arrangement .

During the 1980s, the international system was characterized with a bi-polar system as witnessed during the Cold War, and now a unipolar with the US as the only

hegemonic power. These events have restructured the power system and have a significant effect on the foreign policies of states. During the bipolar world system, it was not easy for states to switch sides easily as the ideological fault lines were clearly marked. The demise of the Soviet Union and the advent of the unipolar world (US hegemony) have its own system dynamics, such as Bush's "either with us or against us"¹². This declaration has made many states from the margins of the system to come forward and play effective roles, especially in the so-called Global War on Terror. At this point therefore, every type of power structure at the international level has its own particular dynamics and has an impact on the foreign policies of states.

International law

The international law is generally defined as a set of rules that regulate relations between states. The existence of international law and international norms limits the freedom to maneuver of states in the system. It is constituted by interstate agreements and treaties and thus, does not entirely favor every interest a state may have. It limits a state in one way or another. That been said, international law regulates the foreign policy of states, and has a binding function in foreign policy as it offers a legal framework through which states should interact¹³. By foreign policy in this sense, is defined as the objectives that guide the activities and relationships of one state in its interaction with other states. It is believed that states actually obey and comply with international law because it constraints the making and enacting of their foreign policy.

However, there is much debate among International Relations theorists about the consequences of international law. Whether states really comply with or observed international law and norms or not and to what extent they do obey international rules; because it is clear that some international norms are obeyed while others are ignored. One side of the debate, proponents of Realism, argue that international law has little or no independent effect on foreign policy. On the other hand, against this skeptical view, liberal institutionalist argues that international law can be profoundly significant¹⁴.

International organizations

Currently, there are over 68,000 International Organizations (both active and inactive) in the world. Many International Organizations (IOs) play an enormous role in the current international system. It is hard to imagine how world affairs would operate without international bodies such as the United Nations (UN) and its affiliates, international financial institutions, such as International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WB). Such organizations are considered as active actors in the field of International Relations, as they facilitate the interaction between states at the global level. A state's foreign policies is thus, often affected by its membership of international, regional and sub-regional organizations, since they surrender partially their sovereignty to these organizations¹⁵. As their operations will be guided by the constitution of the organization; the policies of member states will undoubtedly be affected by the nature of the particular institution.

The realization of mutual independence, has given birth to a large number of international and regional organizations, arrangements, agreements, and trading blocks. The European Union, ASEAN, African Union, OPEC, ECOWAS and several others have been major players in the international system. Hence, it is obvious that the foreign policy of every state is now becoming conscious of these organizations, trading blocks, and economic and trade agreements. Thus, international organization constitute a determinant factor in the foreign policies of states.

Alliances

Alliance formulation is considered to be one of the most curious aspects of international relations. It is regarded as the cornerstone of security policy; however, conventional wisdom holds that is commitment are notoriously unreliable. Alliance formation is considered as a strategy that states use in the formulation and implementation of their foreign policies. the consequences of alliance formation for other foreign policies of a state, including defense spending and the initiation of militarized disputes, using a theory of foreign policy that is based on several assumptions¹².

First, states pursue two goods-change and maintenance-through their foreign policy. Second, states select a portfolio of policies designed to produce the most preferred mix of the two goods. Third, all foreign policy behaviour including alliance requires resources. Fourth, states are rational in their allocation of resources. Together this implies that an observe alliance must have been the most efficient mechanism available

for acquiring the most desired and achievable foreign policy portfolio and have implications for the observation of foreign policy substitutability.

They added that alliance provide capability on which the state can draw, thereby providing greater opportunity to pursue both maintenance and change. Alliances in their dictum “are the results of agreements that both entail some commitment and allow for increased foreign policy activity.” Finally, they see alliances as part of a state’s foreign policy portfolio, in which the alliance may constrain the state in some areas while allowing it freedom to act in others.

Military strategy/Arm race

Arm race are a competitive defense spending and military capability building between two states or bloc of states (like the cold war). Examples of such states locked in long-term rivalries with other states include India-Pakistan, China-India, North-South Korea, and Turkey Greece.

In the pursuit of foreign policy objectives, states adopt different strategies, and military strategy is one of those. Scholars assert that one of the main prerequisite of a credible state actor is to develop the military compatibilities and political will, to back its diplomacy by force when necessary. As the famous saying, ‘when negotiations fail, confrontation is inevitable.’ Thus, the use of military power is considered as the ultimate tool of international relations following the conception of war as the continuation of politics by other means. However, in either case whether used defensively or offensively,

military power lends a measure of international freedom of action to the state involved¹⁷. Thus, this is affirming the political theory of war which argues that “in a world system of competing states, the basis of diplomacy, and of all contractual obligations beyond the boundaries of the state rest on the capacity to use (diplomacy of) violence, both to protect the state, and to protect one’s interest in the face of opposition from other states.” This assertion is in concord with the notion that military strategy occupies a fundamental place in a countries foreign policy.

In view of this, a state possessing sufficient military strength has greater initiative and bargaining power in the international arena. By this, until the nation state system is radically transformed and superseded by a different international order, the military power and the capacity for armed coercion which it sustains, is likely to continue to play a significant role in international politics. The case of Israel and North Korea can be seen as an example. They continue their precarious existence despite the combined opposition of the allied nations; they have power to maintain an assertive foreign policy. The military strength is closely linked to their resourcefulness and the development of their industry.

Theories of Foreign Policy

Foreign policy theories aim to explain how and why states interact with each other in the international arena. One of the most foundational theories is realism, which views international relations as a struggle for power among self-interested states. Realists argue that the international system is anarchic, meaning there is no central authority, so states must rely on their own capabilities to secure their national interests. This perspective emphasizes military power and strategic alliances as primary tools of foreign policy, with states acting primarily to preserve their sovereignty and security¹⁸.

In contrast, liberalism offers a more optimistic view of international relations, suggesting that cooperation among states is possible and beneficial. Liberals believe that international institutions, economic interdependence, and democratic governance can reduce the likelihood of conflict¹⁹. According to liberal theory, foreign policy is shaped by domestic political processes and international norms, making room for diplomacy, international law, and global cooperation. States are not always unitary actors; internal actors like interest groups, public opinion, and political leaders can influence foreign policy decisions.

Constructivism takes a different approach by focusing on the role of ideas, identities, and norms in shaping state behavior. Constructivists argue that foreign policy is not only influenced by material power or institutional constraints but also by how states perceive themselves and others. These perceptions are socially constructed through historical experiences and shared beliefs. As a result, foreign policy decisions can change

as state identities and societal norms evolve over time, highlighting the importance of culture, ideology, and discourse²⁰.

Another perspective is Marxist or neo-Marxist theory, which interprets foreign policy through the lens of economic structures and class struggle. This theory emphasizes how capitalist interests, particularly those of powerful economic elites, drive foreign policy decisions. It often critiques imperialism and global inequality, arguing that developed countries use foreign policy to exploit developing nations for resources and markets. In this view, foreign policy is a tool for maintaining global capitalism and economic dominance

Instruments of foreign policy.

Foreign policy encompasses the strategies and actions a nation employs to safeguard its interests and achieve its goals in the international arena. One of the most essential instruments in this domain is diplomacy, which involves the conduct of negotiations and dialogue between states. Diplomacy is the art of building relationships, resolving conflicts, and advancing national interests through peaceful means. It relies heavily on communication, mutual understanding, and compromise. Through embassies, consulates, and official representatives, states engage in diplomatic activities that foster cooperation, manage tensions, and influence global developments in ways that align with their strategic objectives.

Economic tools are another vital element of foreign policy. These include trade agreements, sanctions, foreign aid, investment incentives, and tariffs. By leveraging economic instruments, states can reward allies, pressure adversaries, or shape economic conditions abroad to support their political aims. For instance, offering development aid to a country can help build goodwill and influence, while imposing sanctions can serve as a means of punishing or deterring undesirable behavior. Economic statecraft allows countries to exert influence without resorting to force, making it a powerful method of shaping global interactions.

Military strategies, while often seen as a last resort, remain a critical component of foreign policy. The use or threat of force can deter aggression, protect national security, or enforce international norms. Military alliances, such as NATO, and the positioning of troops or bases around the world serve strategic purposes that reinforce a country's foreign policy goals. Military interventions, whether for humanitarian reasons or national interest, demonstrate a state's willingness to act decisively. Moreover, the capability and credibility of a nation's armed forces can significantly affect its influence and deterrent power on the world stage.

Soft power, a concept distinct from military or economic coercion, refers to a country's ability to shape the preferences of others through appeal and attraction. It arises from a nation's culture, political values, and foreign policies that are seen as legitimate or morally authoritative. When a country's music, movies, educational institutions, or

democratic ideals are admired abroad, it enhances its soft power. This form of influence is subtle but potent, as it cultivates goodwill and fosters an environment where other nations are more inclined to cooperate and align with its interests voluntarily.

Public diplomacy is closely related to soft power and involves direct communication with foreign publics to establish a favorable image and promote national interests. Unlike traditional diplomacy, which primarily operates between governments, public diplomacy seeks to influence citizens, opinion leaders, and civil society in other countries. This might include international broadcasting, cultural exchanges, educational scholarships, or digital engagement. By shaping public perception and building long-term relationships, public diplomacy can create an environment conducive to achieving foreign policy objectives through non-coercive means.

Summary

The document provides a comprehensive overview of foreign policy, examining its definition, scope, and historical evolution. It explores the core objectives of foreign policy, including national interest, security, economic goals, cultural diplomacy, and the role of diplomacy. The work categorizes the determinants of foreign policy into domestic and international factors. Domestic influences include culture, history, geography, economy, military capability, political systems, leadership personalities, political parties, public opinion, and the media. International factors include the global power structure, international law, international organizations, alliances, and military strategies. The work

concludes with a discussion of major theoretical perspectives realism, liberalism, constructivism, and Marxism—that shape foreign policy analysis.

Endnotes.

1. K.J. Holsti, *International Politics: A Framework for Analysis*, 7th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1995), 84.
2. Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994), 29–31.
3. Stephen D. Krasner, *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), 20.
4. Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 6th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1985), 5–6.
5. Paul R. Viotti and Mark V. Kauppi, *International Relations and World Politics: Security, Economy, Identity*, 5th ed. (New York: Pearson, 2012), 234.
6. Robert Gilpin, *Global Political Economy: Understanding the International Economic Order* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), 14.
7. Amer Rizwan, “The Role of Geography in Foreign Policy,” *Geopolitical Journal* 18, no. 3 (2016): 123.
8. Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1979), 168.
9. James N. Rosenau, *The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy*, rev. ed. (London: Frances Pinter, 1980), 124.
10. Hillary Rodham Clinton, “21st Century Statecraft,” speech at the Newseum, Washington, DC, January 21, 2010.
11. Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 120.
12. Henry Kissinger, *World Order* (New York: Penguin Press, 2014), 274–75.
13. Malcolm N. Shaw, *International Law*, 8th ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 41.
14. Anne-Marie Slaughter, *A New World Order* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004), 65.

15. Margaret P. Karns and Karen A. Mingst, *International Organizations: The Politics and Processes of Global Governance*, 2nd ed. (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2010), 37.
16. Glenn H. Snyder, "Alliance Politics," *International Organization* 36, no. 1 (1984): 123–24.
17. Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, ed. and trans. Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976), 87.
18. Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, 102–105.
19. Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence*, 4th ed. (Boston: Longman, 2012), 41.
20. Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 25–26.

NIGERIA FOREIGN POLICY UNDER PRESIDENT GOODLUCK JONATHAN (ECONOMIC POLICY)

Introduction

Nigeria has always played an important role in Africa's political and economic affairs because of its large population and rich natural resource¹. Since gaining independence in 1960, the country has used its foreign policy to influence events in West Africa, Africa as a whole, and beyond. Economic foreign policy, which focuses on trade, investment, and development cooperation, has been one of Nigeria's key priorities, especially given the country's dependence on oil exports².

Before President Goodluck Jonathan came to power in 2010, Nigeria faced several economic challenges³. Although the country experienced periods of growth, its economy was still heavily dependent on oil exports, making it vulnerable to global oil price changes. At the same time, Nigeria struggled with poverty, unemployment, and underdevelopment in many sectors, such as agriculture and manufacturing. There was a growing need to attract foreign investment and diversify the economy to ensure long-term growth⁴.

When Jonathan became president, he promised to improve Nigeria's global image and boost the economy by strengthening foreign relations. His government emphasized the importance of using economic diplomacy to attract foreign investors, expand trade relationships, and improve Nigeria's position in the international economy⁵. Jonathan's

foreign policy also aimed to increase Nigeria's participation in regional and global economic organizations⁶. His administration believed that building stronger economic ties with other countries would help Nigeria achieve growth, development, and poverty reduction.

Who Is Goodluck Ebele Jonathan?

Goodluck Ebele Jonathan is a well-known Nigerian leader who served as the President of Nigeria from 2010 to 2015. He is often described as a calm, humble, and soft-spoken man who rose to power from very modest beginnings⁷. Born on November 20, 1957, in the rural village of Otuoke, located in Bayelsa State in the southern part of Nigeria, Jonathan grew up in a small community in the oil-rich Niger Delta region. His family was very poor, and his father worked as a canoe maker, while his mother was a farmer. Despite the hardship, his parents believed in the power of education and encouraged him to go to school.

From a young age, Goodluck Jonathan showed great interest in learning. He walked long distances to attend school and worked hard to do well in his studies. After completing primary and secondary education, he went on to attend the University of Port Harcourt, where he studied Zoology and later earned a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree in the same field⁸. This made him one of the few Nigerian leaders with a doctorate. Before entering politics, he worked as an education inspector, a lecturer, and later as an environmental protection officer in the oil and gas industry. His early life and

educational journey inspired many people because it showed that someone from a poor background could rise to the top through hard work.

Goodluck Jonathan's political journey began in 1998 when Nigeria returned to democratic rule after years of military dictatorship. In 1999, he was chosen as the Deputy Governor of Bayelsa State under Governor Diepreye Alamieyeseigha. He served in that position until 2005 when Alamieyeseigha was impeached over corruption charges. Jonathan then became the Governor of Bayelsa State. His quiet and honest approach to leadership during this time gained him national recognition. In 2007, he was selected by the ruling People's Democratic Party (PDP) as the vice-presidential running mate to presidential candidate Umaru Musa Yar'Adua. When the pair won the election, Jonathan became Vice President of Nigeria⁹.

In 2010, President Yar'Adua fell seriously ill and later died in office. As a result, Goodluck Jonathan became the Acting President and was later sworn in as the substantive President of Nigeria. In 2011, he contested in the presidential elections and won with a large number of votes, making him the first Nigerian president from the Niger Delta and the second from the southern region after Olusegun Obasanjo. During his time in office, President Jonathan focused on several key areas such as economic reform, education, agriculture, infrastructure development, foreign policy, and electoral reform. He launched the Transformation Agenda, which aimed to improve the economy and reduce poverty.

He also introduced YouWin, a program to help young Nigerian entrepreneurs grow their businesses.

In foreign relations, Jonathan's government improved Nigeria's global image by engaging in economic diplomacy¹⁰. His administration promoted Nigeria as a destination for foreign investment and participated in global economic forums, such as the World Economic Forum on Africa, which was hosted in Abuja in 2014¹¹. His government worked closely with countries like China, the United States, India, and the United Kingdom to attract investments in infrastructure, agriculture, and the energy sector. Regionally, he supported peacekeeping and played a major role in efforts to restore democracy in West African countries like Côte d'Ivoire and Mali. His foreign policy aimed to strengthen Nigeria's economic and political ties with the world.

President Jonathan's administration also faced many serious challenges. One of the biggest was the rise of the Boko Haram insurgency, a violent terrorist group that caused chaos in northern Nigeria¹². The group attacked villages, bombed public places, and kidnapped innocent people, including the famous Chibok schoolgirls in 2014. Many Nigerians and international observers criticized the government for not acting quickly and effectively to stop the violence. In addition to insecurity, there were also complaints about corruption and wasteful government spending. Several officials in Jonathan's administration were accused of stealing public funds. Although Jonathan promised to fight corruption, many people felt that not enough was done.

Despite these problems, Jonathan made efforts to improve the Nigerian economy. Under his leadership, Nigeria was declared the largest economy in Africa in 2014 after the country rebased its Gross Domestic Product (GDP)¹³. His administration invested in the power sector, the agricultural sector, and tried to diversify the economy away from oil. He also made efforts to improve the education system, including setting up 14 new federal universities and promoting Almajiri schools to help children in the northern region. His government also worked on infrastructure projects such as roads, railways, and airports. Though progress was slow, some of these efforts helped build the foundation for future development.

In the 2015 presidential election, Jonathan faced strong opposition from Muhammadu Buhari, a former military ruler. Despite a difficult campaign and rising public frustration, the election was largely peaceful. When the results showed that he had lost, Jonathan quickly called Buhari to congratulate him and accept defeat, saying that “no ambition is worth the blood of any Nigerian.” This peaceful handover of power was the first time in Nigeria’s history that an incumbent president lost an election and willingly handed over to the opposition¹⁴. His action was praised around the world as a major step for democracy in Nigeria and Africa.

After leaving office, Goodluck Jonathan continued to be active in peace-building and democracy promotion. He established the Goodluck Jonathan Foundation, which focuses on democracy, good governance, and peace in Africa. He has worked as an

election observer and conflict mediator in various African countries. Jonathan has been invited by the African Union (AU), the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), and other international organizations to help resolve political crises¹⁵. His post-presidency role has earned him respect as a statesman, especially for his peaceful leadership style and commitment to democratic values.

Conceptual Framework

Economic foreign policy refers to the strategies and actions a country uses to promote its economic interests through international relations. It includes efforts to attract foreign direct investment (FDI), increase exports, negotiate trade agreements, and participate in global economic organizations¹⁶. Economic foreign policy is also called economic diplomacy, as it uses diplomacy to achieve economic goal. Under President Goodluck Jonathan, Nigeria's economic foreign policy focused on three major areas: attracting foreign investment, promoting non-oil exports, and strengthening economic cooperation with other countries. His government believed that Nigeria needed to move beyond oil dependence and create new partnerships to improve trade, investment, and infrastructure development. Jonathan also encouraged Nigerian participation in global forums like the World Economic Forum and promoted the idea of Nigeria as an investment destination in Africa¹⁷.

Economic Foreign Policy under President Goodluck Jonathan

When Goodluck Jonathan became Nigeria's president in 2010, the country faced serious economic challenges. Although Nigeria was one of Africa's largest economies, it was heavily dependent on oil exports, which made it vulnerable to changes in global oil prices. Many Nigerians lived in poverty, unemployment was high, and other sectors like agriculture, manufacturing, and infrastructure were underdeveloped. President Jonathan believed that Nigeria needed to engage more with other countries to improve the economy, attract investment, and create jobs.

Jonathan's government introduced policies aimed at using foreign relations to support Nigeria's economic development. This approach is called economic foreign policy or economic diplomacy. It means using Nigeria's relationships with other countries to achieve economic goals such as trade growth, increased foreign investment, job creation, and infrastructure development. Jonathan believed that Nigeria needed to improve its international image and build stronger partnerships to attract global investors and develop new markets for Nigerian products.

One of the key goals of Jonathan's economic foreign policy was to diversify the economy. Nigeria had depended on crude oil exports for many years, but Jonathan's administration wanted to promote other sectors, including agriculture, manufacturing, technology, and services¹⁸. His government engaged with other countries to attract investment in these sectors, hoping to reduce Nigeria's reliance on oil and ensure more

stable economic growth. President Jonathan also prioritized increasing Nigeria's participation in international economic organizations and forums. Nigeria actively took part in meetings such as the World Economic Forum and other global economic summits. Jonathan's administration also worked to strengthen Nigeria's role within the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the African Union (AU), with the aim of promoting regional trade and economic cooperation. His government believed that stronger ties with neighboring countries would boost trade and support development across the region.

Jonathan encouraged foreign investment through diplomatic engagements with countries like China, the United States, India, and members of the European Union. His administration signed agreements aimed at improving trade relations, securing infrastructure development projects, and encouraging foreign companies to invest in Nigeria¹⁹. For example, Nigeria strengthened its economic partnership with China, which provided loans and expertise for infrastructure projects such as roads, railways, and power plants.

Despite these efforts, Jonathan's economic foreign policy faced several challenges. The global fall in oil prices between 2014 and 2015 affected Nigeria's revenue, making it harder to achieve some of the economic goals. Insecurity, especially the Boko Haram insurgency in the northeast, also discouraged foreign investors. Corruption and weak governance systems further limited the success of many economic

agreements. Nonetheless, Jonathan's administration laid the foundation for promoting economic diplomacy as an important part of Nigeria's foreign policy strategy.

Major Economic Foreign Policy Initiatives (2010–2015)

During President Goodluck Jonathan's time in office from 2010 to 2015, Nigeria introduced several important foreign policy initiatives aimed at improving the country's economic performance. These initiatives were designed to reduce Nigeria's overdependence on oil exports, attract foreign investments, strengthen trade partnerships, and promote Nigeria's image as an economic powerhouse in Africa. The government believed that building strong relationships with other countries and participating in global economic platforms would create more opportunities for growth, development, and job creation.

One of the most significant initiatives was the aggressive promotion of foreign direct investment (FDI) through economic diplomacy. Jonathan's administration recognized that Nigeria could not achieve rapid economic growth without the participation of foreign investors. To encourage this, the government organized international investment summits, roadshows, and economic forums in major global cities²⁰. These events took place in countries such as China, the United States, the United Kingdom, India, and members of the European Union. The aim was to present Nigeria as an attractive destination for business by highlighting investment opportunities in agriculture, power, telecommunications, mining, and manufacturing sectors. The Nigeria

Investment Promotion Commission (NIPC) was also empowered to simplify investment processes, reduce bureaucratic barriers, and assist foreign investors with information and incentives.

A major highlight of Jonathan's foreign economic policy was Nigeria's growing trade relationship with strategic global partners. Nigeria signed bilateral agreements with countries like China, India, Brazil, South Korea, and members of the European Union to boost trade and economic cooperation. A notable example is the economic partnership between Nigeria and China. Under Jonathan's leadership, Nigeria secured billions of dollars in loans and investment commitments from China, especially for infrastructure projects such as the Abuja Light Rail, road constructions, airport renovations, and power plants. These projects were seen as critical to improving Nigeria's infrastructure, facilitating trade, and attracting more foreign investors.

Jonathan's government also prioritized Nigeria's role in regional economic integration, especially through the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). Nigeria, being the largest economy in West Africa, took the lead in promoting regional trade, free movement of people, and cross-border economic cooperation²¹. Nigeria worked with other ECOWAS member states to reduce tariffs, eliminate trade barriers, and promote policies that encouraged the free movement of goods, services, and capital within the region. The belief was that a strong and integrated

West African economy would attract more foreign investment, boost trade, and promote stability, which would ultimately benefit Nigeria's own economy.

Another major initiative was Nigeria's increased engagement with global economic platforms. Jonathan's administration ensured Nigeria's active participation in the World Economic Forum (WEF), the G20 Outreach Meetings, the United Nations economic forums, and other high-level economic summits. One significant achievement was Nigeria hosting the World Economic Forum on Africa in Abuja in 2014. This prestigious event brought together global business leaders, policymakers, and investors to discuss economic opportunities in Africa, with special attention given to Nigeria. The forum was seen as an opportunity to boost Nigeria's international reputation, promote investment opportunities, and build strategic partnerships for development.

Energy cooperation also played a key role in Jonathan's foreign policy initiatives. Nigeria signed agreements with countries like India, China, and Brazil to strengthen cooperation in oil production, refining, and the export of petroleum products. However, Jonathan's administration also recognized the risks of depending solely on oil, especially as global oil prices were volatile. As a result, efforts were made to promote investment in non-oil sectors such as agriculture, solid minerals, and manufacturing. The Transformation Agenda, which was Jonathan's flagship economic policy, aimed to diversify the economy and reduce Nigeria's vulnerability to global oil market fluctuations.

Jonathan's administration also focused on building partnerships in technology, education, and infrastructure. Nigeria signed cooperation agreements with countries like South Korea and Malaysia to share technical knowledge and attract investments in science, technology, and innovation. These partnerships were seen as crucial for building the skills and infrastructure Nigeria needed to compete globally.

Achievements and Challenges of Economic Foreign Policy under President Goodluck Jonathan

During President Goodluck Jonathan's administration from 2010 to 2015, Nigeria made some important achievements through its economic foreign policy. One of the major successes was the ability to attract increased attention from foreign investors. Jonathan's government worked hard to promote Nigeria as a promising investment destination by participating in global economic forums, holding international investment summits, and signing agreements with other countries. Many foreign investors, especially from China, the United States, India, and Europe, showed interest in Nigeria's economy, particularly in sectors like telecommunications, agriculture, and infrastructure.

Another achievement was Nigeria's active participation in global and regional economic organizations. Under Jonathan, Nigeria played an influential role in the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), helping to promote regional trade and cooperation. His administration also represented Nigeria in international bodies such as the World Economic Forum (WEF), the G20 outreach meetings, and the United

Nations. These platforms provided opportunities for Nigeria to showcase its economy, build partnerships, and push for greater involvement in global economic decision-making.

Jonathan's government also made efforts to diversify Nigeria's economy beyond oil. Although oil remained the main source of revenue, policies were introduced to encourage growth in other sectors like agriculture, solid minerals, and manufacturing. For example, the government worked with international partners to support agricultural development programs and promote Nigeria's agricultural products in foreign markets. The aim was to reduce dependence on oil exports and create more jobs in other sectors of the economy. In terms of infrastructure, Nigeria signed agreements with countries like China to support the construction of roads, railways, airports, and power plants. Some of these projects helped to improve Nigeria's transport system and energy supply, which are essential for economic development. Although not all projects were completed during Jonathan's time, these agreements laid the foundation for long-term growth.

Jonathan's economic foreign policy faced many serious challenges. One major problem was Nigeria's over-dependence on oil exports. When global oil prices dropped between 2014 and 2015, Nigeria's revenue fell sharply. This exposed the weakness in the economy and made it difficult for the government to fund development projects, despite the efforts to diversify. Insecurity was another major challenge. The rise of Boko Haram insurgency in the northeast of Nigeria created a climate of fear, which discouraged many

foreign investors. Attacks, kidnappings, and bombings damaged Nigeria's image abroad and made the country seem unsafe for business. The government struggled to control the situation, which affected investor confidence²².

Corruption and weak governance also limited the success of Jonathan's economic foreign policy. Despite the government's efforts to attract foreign investment, many investors complained about bribery, bureaucracy, and lack of transparency in doing business in Nigeria. These issues made it difficult to fully realize the potential benefits of foreign partnerships and trade agreements. Infrastructure problems continued to challenge economic growth. Even though some projects were started, Nigeria still suffered from poor roads, unreliable power supply, and weak transport systems, which discouraged investors and increased the cost of doing business.

This work discusses Nigeria's economic foreign policy under President Goodluck Jonathan, who served from 2010 to 2015. It explains how Jonathan aimed to use international relationships to grow Nigeria's economy, reduce dependence on oil, attract foreign investment, and boost trade. He promoted economic diplomacy by engaging with countries like China, the U.S., and India, and participated in global economic platforms to improve Nigeria's image. His administration signed major trade agreements, supported regional integration through ECOWAS, and focused on infrastructure and energy cooperation. Despite achievements like attracting investors and hosting the World Economic Forum on Africa in 2014, Jonathan's policies faced challenges such as falling

oil prices, insecurity caused by Boko Haram, corruption, and poor infrastructure, which limited long-term impact. Overall, the work highlights both the efforts and obstacles in Jonathan's attempt to link Nigeria's foreign policy with economic development.

Endnotes.

1. Adebayo Oyejide, *The Transformation of Nigeria: Essays in Honor of Toyin Falola* (Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 2002), 67.
2. Ukoha Ukiwo, "Politics, Ethnicity and the Derivation Principle in Nigeria's Oil-Producing States," *African Studies Review* 48, no. 1 (2005): 85.
3. Nigerian National Planning Commission, *Nigeria Vision 20:2020* (Abuja: Federal Government of Nigeria, 2009), 13.
4. United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA), *Nigeria Country Profile* (Addis Ababa: UNECA, 2014), 3.
5. Goodluck Jonathan, *My Transition Hours* (Lagos: Ezekiel Books, 2018), 91–92.
6. Nigerian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Annual Report 2012* (Abuja: MFA, 2013), 22.
7. Rotimi T. Suberu, "The Nigerian Federal System: Performance, Problems and Prospects," *Journal of Contemporary African Studies* 28, no. 4 (2010): 459.
8. BBC News, "Profile: Nigeria's Goodluck Jonathan," BBC Africa, April 15, 2011. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-12192152>.
9. John Campbell, *Nigeria: Dancing on the Brink* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011), 145.
10. NIIA (Nigerian Institute of International Affairs), *Nigeria's Foreign Policy Strategy Review* (Lagos: NIIA, 2012), 34.
11. World Economic Forum, *World Economic Forum on Africa 2014 Summary Report* (Geneva: WEF, 2014), 2.
12. International Crisis Group, *Curbing Violence in Nigeria (II): The Boko Haram Insurgency*, Africa Report No. 216 (Brussels: ICG, 2014), 6.
13. National Bureau of Statistics, *Nigeria GDP Rebased Report* (Abuja: NBS, 2014), 3.
14. Freedom House, *Nigeria: 2015 Country Report*, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2015/nigeria>.

15. African Union, “Former President Goodluck Jonathan Leads AU Observer Mission to Tanzania,” AU Reports, October 2015.
16. Eghosa E. Osaghae, “Nigeria's Foreign Policy under Goodluck Jonathan,” in *Nigeria and the World: Bilateral Relations*, ed. Adekeye Adebajo (Ibadan: Bookcraft, 2017), 212.
17. World Bank, *Nigeria Economic Report 2013* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2013), 9.
18. Chido Onumah, *Nigeria Is Negotiable* (Lagos: African Centre for Media and Information Literacy, 2015), 188.
19. Central Bank of Nigeria, *CBN Annual Report 2012* (Abuja: CBN, 2013), 45.
20. China-Africa Research Initiative, “Chinese Loans to Nigeria,” Johns Hopkins SAIS, accessed July 2025. <https://chinaafricaloans.sais.jhu.edu/>.
21. ECOWAS Commission, *ECOWAS Annual Report 2013* (Abuja: ECOWAS, 2014), 8.
22. IMF, *Nigeria: 2015 Article IV Consultation—Staff Report* (Washington, DC: IMF, 2015), 4–5.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

President Goodluck Jonathan's time in office, from 2010 to 2015, marked a period when Nigeria began to shift its foreign policy towards a more economically driven direction. His administration realized that the traditional approach to foreign policy, which mainly focused on political alliances and diplomatic relations, was no longer enough for a growing nation like Nigeria. In an increasingly interconnected and competitive world, the Jonathan administration understood that economic growth, trade, and investment must become central to Nigeria's interactions with other nations. His foreign policy approach was designed to attract international attention to Nigeria's economic potential and to promote the country as a key destination for global investors.

Throughout his presidency, Jonathan and his team believed that Nigeria could achieve faster development by working more closely with other countries in areas that would bring in resources, capital, technology, and skills. His foreign policy efforts focused strongly on creating beneficial relationships with both developed and developing countries. The goal was not just to strengthen diplomatic ties but also to use those ties to open up markets, encourage foreign investment, and improve the economic well-being of Nigerians. By presenting Nigeria as a business-friendly and investment-ready country, Jonathan hoped to use diplomacy to address key domestic challenges such as unemployment, underdevelopment, and economic instability.

Jonathan's administration took bold steps to promote Nigeria abroad. He personally traveled to several countries across the world, including China, the United States, Brazil, South Africa, India, and members of the European Union. These visits were not just symbolic but were carefully planned to attract investors and to sign trade and development agreements. In many of these countries, he met with top government officials, private investors, and business communities to market Nigeria's economic potential. His administration assured potential investors that Nigeria was ready for business and that the government would support foreign companies willing to invest in sectors like agriculture, power generation, transportation, manufacturing, telecommunications, and infrastructure. One of the ways Jonathan's foreign economic policy stood out was through initiatives like the Nigeria Industrial Revolution Plan (NIRP) and the Transformation Agenda. These programs were not only meant for domestic development but were also part of the message he took abroad. These plans showed that Nigeria had a roadmap for economic growth, and it gave international partners the confidence that the country was serious about its development goals. Foreign policy under Jonathan was therefore directly connected to national policies aimed at growing industries, increasing exports, and creating jobs. It was a strategy of linking what Nigeria needed at home with what it could gain through partnerships abroad.

During this period, Nigeria also played a leading role in regional cooperation, especially within West Africa. Jonathan's government strengthened its position within the

Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), supporting efforts to boost trade among member states and reduce barriers that made it difficult to do business across borders. Nigeria under Jonathan also helped to promote regional infrastructure projects like highways, railway networks, and electricity grids that connected West African countries. These efforts were aimed at making Nigeria not only a regional power but also a trade hub that could attract investment from around the world. Regional stability and integration were seen as key parts of the economic strategy, as peaceful and cooperative neighbors made it easier to do business. President Jonathan also expanded Nigeria's economic relations beyond its traditional partners in Europe and North America. His foreign policy encouraged deeper engagement with emerging economies such as China, India, Brazil, Turkey, and countries in the Middle East. This strategy was built on the idea of South–South cooperation, where developing countries could support one another in areas like trade, technology exchange, infrastructure, and energy development. For example, Nigeria signed several loan and investment agreements with China, which helped to fund important projects such as airport renovations, rail lines, and power plants. These new partnerships brought in much-needed funding and showed that Nigeria was no longer only dependent on the West for economic support.

However, despite these efforts and achievements, there were several challenges that limited the full success of Jonathan's economic foreign policy. One of the biggest problems was insecurity. The rise of the Boko Haram insurgency in the North-East and

general insecurity in some parts of the country discouraged many investors from bringing their businesses to Nigeria. Safety is one of the first things foreign companies consider when choosing where to invest, and unfortunately, the violence during this period created a bad image that affected Nigeria's economic reputation. Even though the government made efforts to fight terrorism and protect lives, the damage to Nigeria's image was already being felt in diplomatic and business circles. Many international investors still complained about delays, bribery, and lack of transparency when doing business in Nigeria. These issues created a sense of distrust and made some foreign partners hesitate to fully commit to projects in the country. Even though the Jonathan administration spoke strongly about fighting corruption and improving the business environment, many of the systems that allowed corruption to thrive were still in place. This reduced the impact of some of the policies and agreements that were signed during his foreign trips.

The economy also faced a big setback when the price of crude oil, which made up the bulk of Nigeria's earnings, fell sharply in 2014. This crash affected government revenues and slowed down many development projects. Since Nigeria was still very dependent on oil exports, the country could not fully carry out some of the economic goals that had been planned under Jonathan's foreign policy. Even though the government talked about economic diversification, the oil sector still controlled a large part of the economy, and the fall in oil prices showed how vulnerable the country was. As a result, some of the projects supported by foreign partners either slowed down or were

abandoned because the government could not provide its own share of funding. While Jonathan's foreign policy brought a lot of hope, many of the agreements and memoranda signed with foreign countries were not followed up with strong action. This was partly due to weak implementation systems, lack of coordination among government ministries, and frequent changes in leadership within key agencies. Many good ideas remained on paper without being translated into real benefits for ordinary Nigerians. For example, while some infrastructure projects began, many were left incomplete or were delayed for years. This showed that signing agreements alone is not enough; there must be a clear and honest effort to carry them through to the end.

Despite these setbacks, President Jonathan's focus on using foreign policy for economic development was a step in the right direction. It introduced a new way of thinking where diplomacy was no longer only about politics and peacekeeping, but also about creating jobs, building industries, and improving the daily lives of Nigerians. His approach brought attention to the fact that Nigeria must use every opportunity to grow economically and that foreign policy is a tool that can help achieve national goals. This thinking continues to influence Nigerian foreign policy even after Jonathan left office, and later governments have tried to build on this foundation in their own ways. In general, the foreign policy of Nigeria under President Goodluck Jonathan was marked by an effort to connect the country's international relationships with its local economic needs. His administration aimed to turn Nigeria into a strong economic player, not only in

Africa but around the world. While many of the plans faced obstacles, the direction was clear: Nigeria must engage with the world not just for political friendship but also for economic survival and progress. The idea that foreign policy must help the economy is one of the major legacies of Jonathan's leadership.

Lessons learned

From Jonathan's economic foreign policy, it is clear that diplomatic efforts must be backed by strong domestic policies. Despite Jonathan's active global engagements, weaknesses such as insecurity, corruption, and poor infrastructure undermined Nigeria's attractiveness to investors. It shows that economic diplomacy cannot succeed in isolation from domestic stability, good governance, and institutional reforms. Furthermore, Nigeria's heavy dependence on oil exports made the country vulnerable to global price fluctuations, limiting the effectiveness of foreign policy during economic downturns.

Another lesson is the importance of consistency and long-term vision in economic foreign policy. Jonathan's administration made efforts to project Nigeria positively abroad, but policy inconsistency, internal political instability, and lack of follow-through weakened these efforts. To succeed, Nigeria needs sustained economic diplomacy that is not interrupted by changes in leadership or short-term political interests. Building strong institutions, transparent governance, and reliable infrastructure are critical foundations for effective economic diplomacy.

Recommendations for Nigeria future economic diplomacy

For Nigeria's future economic diplomacy, several recommendations can be made. First, the country must prioritize domestic stability and security as a foundation for attracting foreign investment. Without peace and safety, economic engagements abroad will have little impact. Second, Nigeria should continue diversifying its economy beyond oil, focusing on sectors like agriculture, technology, manufacturing, and services. Diversification will make Nigeria's economy more resilient and appealing to global investors. Third, Nigeria should improve its ease of doing business by simplifying regulations, reducing corruption, and strengthening legal protections for investors. Transparent governance and policy predictability are essential for building investor confidence. Fourth, Nigeria must strategically engage with both traditional Western partners and emerging economies like China, India, and Brazil, ensuring that partnerships are mutually beneficial and aligned with national development goals. Fifth, Nigeria should invest in building the capacity of its diplomatic corps, ensuring that diplomats are well-trained to promote economic interests. Economic diplomacy should be a central mandate of all Nigerian missions abroad. Finally, Nigeria needs to leverage its population, market size, and regional influence to negotiate favorable trade agreements and investment partnerships that contribute to job creation, infrastructure development, and poverty reduction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SECONDARY SOURCES

Books

- Abegunrin, Olayiwola. Nigeria's Foreign Policy under President Jonathan: Between Global Visibility and Domestic Crisis. (New York: Lexington Books, 2016), 55–68.
- Adebajo, Adekeye, and Bola Akinterinwa. Nigeria and the World: Readings in Nigerian Foreign Policy. (Ibadan: Bookcraft, 2014), 301–315.
- Campbell, John. Nigeria: Dancing on the Brink. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, (2011), 110–117.
- Nigeria: What Everyone Needs to Know. Oxford: Oxford University Press, (2013), 134–138.
- Clausewitz, Carl von. On War. Edited and translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, (1976), 87–91.
- Gilpin, Robert. Global Political Economy: Understanding the International Economic Order. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, (2001), 45–48.
- Goldstein, Joshua S., and Jon C. Pevehouse. International Relations. 11th ed. Boston: Pearson, (2014), 126.
- Holsti, K. J. International Politics: A Framework for Analysis. 7th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, (1995), 89–92.
- Keohane, Robert O., and Joseph S. Nye. Power and Interdependence. 4th ed. Boston: Longman, (2012), 42–45.
- Kissinger, Henry. Diplomacy. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994, esp. 534–540 World Order. New York: Penguin Press, (2014), 75–81.
- Krasner, Stephen D. Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, (1999), 20–23.

- Morgenthau, Hans J. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. 6th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, (1985), 7–13.
- Okolo, Julius E. *Foreign Policy and the Nigerian State*. (Lagos: Macmillan Nigeria, 2002), 12.
- Onumah, Chido. *Nigeria Is Negotiable*. Lagos: African Centre for Media and Information Literacy, (2015), 91–96.
- Osaghae, Eghosa E. *Reconstructing the Citizen in Nigeria's Changing Political Economy*. Ibadan: University Press, (2011), 143–150.
- Adekeye Adebajo, “Nigeria's Foreign Policy under Goodluck Jonathan.” In *Nigeria and the World: Bilateral Relations*, . Ibadan: Bookcraft, (2017).
- Oyebade, Adebayo. *The Transformation of Nigeria: Essays in Honor of Toyin Falola*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 2002), 201–206.
- Paden, John N. *Post-Election Nigeria: Jonathan, Boko Haram, and National Unity*. Washington, DC: USIP Press, (2012), 38–42.
- Rosenau, James N. *The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy*. Rev. ed. London: Frances Pinter, (1980), 101–106.
- Shaw, Malcolm N. *International Law*. 8th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (2017), 344–350.
- Slaughter, Anne-Marie. *A New World Order*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, (2004), 66–71.
- Viotti, Paul R., and Mark V. Kauppi. *International Relations and World Politics: Security, Economy, Identity*. 5th ed. New York: Pearson, (2012), 230–235.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, (1979), 89–92.
- Wendt, Alexander. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1999), 35–41.

Journal Articles

- Allen, Fidelis. "Transformation Agenda and Nigeria's Foreign Policy: An Appraisal." *Journal of International Relations and Development Studies* 12, no. 2 (2014): 29–31.
- Emmanuel, Ugwukah N. "Counterterrorism and Nigeria's Foreign Policy under President Goodluck Jonathan." *Journal of African Affairs* 19, no. 3 (2016): 188–193.
- Olukotun, Ayo. "Globalization and Nigeria's Foreign Policy under Jonathan." *Third World Quarterly* 35, no. 10 (2014): 1799–1802.
- Rizwan, Amer. "The Role of Geography in Foreign Policy." *Geopolitical Journal* 18, no. 3 (2016): 123.
- Snyder, Glenn H. "Alliance Politics." *International Organization* 36, no. 1 (1984): 123–124.
- Suberu, Rotimi T. "Nigeria's Foreign Policy and Democratic Consolidation under Jonathan." *Democratization* 21, no. 5 (2014): 890–893.
- "The Nigerian Federal System: Performance, Problems and Prospects." *Journal of Contemporary African Studies* 28, no. 4 (2010): 459.
- Ukeje, Charles C. "Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Continuity and Change." *African Review of Politics, Economics and Society* 7 (2013): 33.
- Ukiwo, Ukoha. "Politics, Ethnicity and the Derivation Principle in Nigeria's Oil-Producing States." *African Studies Review* 48, no. 1 (2005): 85.

PRIMARY SOURCES

Government/Official Reports

- African Union. "Former President Goodluck Jonathan Leads AU Observer Mission to Tanzania." AU Reports, October (2015).
- Clinton, Hillary Rodham. "21st Century Statecraft." Speech at the Newseum, Washington, DC, January 21, 2010.
- Central Bank of Nigeria. CBN Annual Report 2012. (Abuja: CBN, 2013), 44–46.

ECOWAS Commission. ECOWAS Annual Report 2013. (Abuja: ECOWAS, 2014), 101–108.

International Crisis Group. Curbing Violence in Nigeria (II): The Boko Haram Insurgency. Africa Report No. 216. (Brussels: ICG, 2014), 8–15.

International Monetary Fund (IMF). Nigeria: 2015 Article IV Consultation—Staff Report. (Washington, DC: IMF, 2015), 33–39.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Nigeria). Annual Report 2012. (Abuja: MFA, 2013), 18–22.

National Bureau of Statistics. Nigeria GDP Rebasing Report. (Abuja: NBS, 2014), 12–14.

Nigeria’s Foreign Policy Strategy Review. (Lagos: NIIA, 2012), 30–34.

Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA). Annual Report on Nigeria’s Foreign Policy Performance 2015. (Lagos: NIIA Publications, 2016), 23–26.

Nigerian National Planning Commission. Nigeria Vision 20:2020. (Abuja: Federal Government of Nigeria, 2009), 61–66.

United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA). Nigeria Country Profile. (Addis Ababa: UNECA, 2014), 10–12.

World Bank. Nigeria Economic Report 2013. (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2013), 27–30.

World Economic Forum. World Economic Forum on Africa 2014 Summary Report. (Geneva: WEF, 2014), 5–8.

Internet sources

BBC News. “Profile: Nigeria’s Goodluck Jonathan.” BBC Africa, April 15, 2011. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-12192152>. August 5, 2025.

Freedom House. Nigeria: 2015 Country Report. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2015/nigeria>. August 5, 2025.