

## **Public Diplomacy and Bilateral Relations Building: Options for National Economic Development in Nigeria**

By

**Oluranti Afowowe**

Department of History and International Studies

Osun State University, Ikire Campus, Nigeria

rantiafowowe@gmail.com

### **Abstract**

The dynamics of globalization in the 21<sup>st</sup> century created inter-dependencies of nation-states that define the character, essence and relational complexities of the international community. Technological and scientific advancements, particularly in the last five decades, have redefined human existence and context of inter-states and inter-personal relations in a way that make the world, a global village. Inter-dependency of states had become phenomenal in the age of globalization. Action(s) and even inaction(s) of states have far reaching implications not only on socio-economic development, but more significantly the security and continued corporate existence of Nation states. Understandably, therefore, states seek to sustain, advance, promote, defend and protect their self-defined interests (cultural, social, economic, political and security) within the context of the international community through the instrumentalities of violent (wars) and peaceful (diplomacy) mechanisms. Human history succinctly demonstrates that ultimate interests of states are better achieved through diplomacy that is cost effective and efficient rather than wars, particularly in modern age of sophisticated weapons (nuclear, biological and chemical) of mass destructions with capability of putting an end to human existence. The focal point of this study is to examine the different ramifications of public diplomacy as a veritable tool of achieving states' objectives and interests, especially within the context of bilateral relations among comity of nations.

**Key words:** Bilateral Relations, Economic Development, National Interest, Nigeria, Public Diplomacy

### **Introduction**

The history of interdependency of nation-states is necessarily a study that is as old as history of state formations (Meredith, 2006:141-260). However, the technological and scientific discoveries, innovations and developments (computers, internet facilities, satellite communication, global banking, etc.), particularly in the last five decades, have redefined human existence and context of inter-states and inter-personal relations in a way that the world has become a global village (Bylis, 2011:235-242). Human values and ethical standards have been globalized to the extent that extant human rights of nation-states enshrined in different constitutions are derivatives of universal declarations of human rights. In essence, no single country can redefine human rights outside the purview of universal human rights without been reprimanded by the international community. Even the concept of sovereignty is continually being redefined by inter-dependency of states (Sabine and Thorson, 1973:372-381).

To be sure, states inter-dependency elicits competitions for economic resources, political power, influence, and status (Shively, 2014:407-413). Wars, imperial dominations, colonialism and even neo-colonialism have been engendered by inter-dependency of states. For instance, Africa was colonized by Europeans for three generic reasons: first, as source of raw materials for European industries; second, as source of market for European manufactured goods; and lastly as a field of investment of European surplus values (Nkrumah, 1960:1-5). In a nutshell, colonialism became an attractive option for Europeans as a result of the inability of the European economy to be self sustaining.

In modern age and times, inter-dependency of states has become phenomenal, characterized by far reaching implications not only for socio-economic development, but also for the security and continued corporate existence of states (Watson, 2011:450-452). This is well illustrated in the debt crisis that bedeviled Euro currency zone in 2015, which was one of the factors that influenced the British referendum to opt out of European Union. Understandably, therefore, while states seek to sustain their interests within the international community they are better achieved through diplomacy that is cost effective and efficient rather than wars (Mingst, 2004:113-116). It is against this background that this study examines the different approaches of public diplomacy in achieving the objectives of Nation states.

### **Conceptual Framework**

Diplomacy, like every other concept in behavioural sciences, has elicited considerable literature according to the perceptions, ideological orientation and authors' idiosyncrasies. For some, diplomacy is simply 'doing the nastiest thing in the nicest way'. Indeed, a notable Professor of International Relations, Northedge (1975:49), while conceptualizing Russia-USA relations in the 1970s opined that: "The American and Russian images of diplomacy were those of a sort of professional football match in which the aim was to deceive, outwit or otherwise defeat and frustrate the other side". Diplomacy can be conceptualized from a more academically rigorous perspective as: the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations between the governments of independent states. It is essentially the techniques often adopted by nation-states in order to achieve their foreign policy objectives (Akinboye and Ottoh, 2005:19).

In other words, diplomacy (within the context of states' relations) is a mechanism for achieving state(s) defined objectives and enlightened self interests within the competitive international environment through methods and means that establishes, sustain and advance social harmony and the collective security. Every effort of states' that is geared towards obtaining favourable policy outcomes from interactions with other states that does not include the deployment and dispensation of violence (wars (physical or psychological)) falls within the purview of diplomacy. The history of diplomacy is as old as the history of the formation of states. States have had to protect, sustain and advance their interests with active supports and collaborations of other states. Diplomacy therefore evolved in the process of states having to accommodate interests of other states as a prelude for advancement of the states perceived interests. However, it is important to note that modern diplomacy was an outcome and by-product of the post-Renaissance

European state system. A perusal of European history will provide a good illumination of this fact (Thompson, 1966).

Suffice it to say, diplomacy predated Nigeria's corporate existence. As far back as 1483, the Oba of Benin appointed one Chief Ugwato as the ambassador to Portugal between 1483 and 1486 (Fajana and Biggs, 1964:185-187). It is therefore safe to infer that states (empires) that existed in the territory known as Nigeria today, must have had a very rich diplomatic history. It is perhaps apposite to mention here that diplomacy has different ramifications, aptly depicted in various typologies. Briefly identified, types of diplomacy includes: *Cultural Diplomacy; Gunboat Diplomacy; Dollar Diplomacy; Public Diplomacy; and Economic Diplomacy*. Time and space will not permit us to give conceptual definitions of these broad ranges of diplomacies except, Public Diplomacy, the subject matter of this study.

### **Public Diplomacy**

Historically, one of the earliest documented account of the usage of Public Diplomacy to achieve political ends occurred during the reign of King Hezekiah of Judah (715 BC to about 686 BC). There was an interesting account of an effort by King of Assyria to influence public opinion of the people of Judah to attain Assyria's pre-determined national interest. This incident is documented in The Holy Bible, 2King Chapter 18; Verse 17- 37.

- 17 And the king of Assyria sent Tartan and Rabсарis and Rabshakeh from Lachish to king Hezekiah with a great host against Jerusalem. And they went up and came to Jerusalem. And when they were come up, they came and stood by the conduit of the upper pool, which is in the highway of the fuller's field.
- 18 And when they had called to the king, there came out to them Eliakim the son of Hilkiyah, which was over the household, and Shebna the scribe, and Joah the son of Asaph the recorder.
- 19 And Rabshakeh said unto them, Speak ye now to Hezekiah, Thus saith the great king, the king of Assyria, What confidence is this wherein thou trustest?
- 20 Thou sayest, (but they are but vain words,) I have counsel and strength for the war. Now on whom dost thou trust, that thou rebellest against me?
- 21 Now, behold, thou trustest upon the staff of this bruised reed, even upon Egypt, on which if a man lean, it will go into his hand, and pierce it: so is Pharaoh king of Egypt unto all that trust on him.
- 22 But if ye say unto me, We trust in the LORD our God: is not that he, whose high places and whose altars Hezekiah hath taken away, and hath said to Judah and Jerusalem, Ye shall worship before this altar in Jerusalem?

- 23 Now therefore, I pray thee, give pledges to my lord the king of Assyria, and I will deliver thee two thousand horses, if thou be able on thy part to set riders upon them.
- 24 How then wilt thou turn away the face of one captain of the least of my master's servants, and put thy trust on Egypt for chariots and for horsemen?
- 25 Am I now come up without the LORD against this place to destroy it? The LORD said to me, Go up against this land, and destroy it.
- 26 Then said Eliakim the son of Hilkiah, and Shebna, and Joah, unto Rabshakeh, Speak, I pray thee, to thy servants in the Syrian language; for we understand it: and talk not with us in the Jews' language in the ears of the people that are on the wall.
- 27 But Rabshakeh said unto them, Hath my master sent me to thy master, and to thee, to speak these words? Hath he not sent me to the men which sit on the wall, that they may eat their own dung, and drink their own piss with you?
- 28 Then Rabshakeh stood and cried with a loud voice in the Jews' language, and spake, saying, Hear the word of the great king, the king of Assyria:
- 29 Thus saith the king, Let not Hezekiah deceive you: for he shall not be able to deliver you out of his hand:
- 30 Neither let Hezekiah make you trust in the LORD, saying, The LORD will surely deliver us, and this city shall not be delivered into the hand of the king of Assyria.
- 31 Hearken not to Hezekiah: for thus saith the king of Assyria, Make an agreement with me by a present, and come out to me, and then eat ye every man of his own vine, and every one of his fig tree, and drink ye every one the waters of his cistern:
- 32 Until I come and take you away to a land like your own land, a land of corn and wine, a land of bread and vineyards, a land of oil olive and of honey, that ye may live, and not die: and hearken not unto Hezekiah, when he persuadeth you, saying, The LORD will deliver us.
- 33 Hath any of the gods of the nations delivered at all his land out of the hand of the king of Assyria?
- 34 Where are the gods of Hamath, and of Arpad? Where are the gods of Sepharvaim, Hena, and Ivah? Have they delivered Samaria out of mine hand?

- 35 Who are they among all the gods of the countries, that have delivered their country out of mine hand, that the LORD should deliver Jerusalem out of mine hand?
- 36 But the people held their peace, and answered him not a word: for the king's commandment was, saying, Answer him not.
- 37 Then came Eliakim the son of Hilkiah, which was over the household, and Shebna the scribe, and Joah the son of Asaph the recorder, to Hezekiah with their clothes rent, and told him the words of Rabshakeh (KJV VERSION).

The usage of Public Diplomacy within the context of modern history in public discourse is dated back to The Times of London publications in 1856. Public Diplomacy as diplomatic categorization was conceptualized in 1965 by Edmund Gullion. Ever since then, Public Diplomacy has deservedly attracted scholarly attentions.

To provide a wider perspective for this study, four different, but related definitions of Public Diplomacy shall be examined. According to Edward R. Murrow Center of Public Diplomacy, USA:

Public diplomacy... deals with the influence of public attitudes on the formation and execution of foreign policies. It encompasses dimensions of international relations beyond traditional diplomacy; the cultivation by governments of public opinion in other countries; the interaction of private groups and interests in one country with another; the reporting of foreign affairs and its impact on policy; communication between those whose job is communication, as diplomats and foreign correspondents; and the process of intercultural communications (Wikipedia, 2017).

For Jill A. Schuker, Public Diplomacy within the context of USA International Relations is ...effectively communicating with publics around the globe - to understand, value and even emulate America's vision and ideas; historically one of America's most effective weapons of outreach, persuasion and policy (Wikipedia, 2017).

Alan K. Henrikson, Professor of Diplomatic History construed Public diplomacy as:

the conduct of international relations by governments through public communications media and through dealings with a wide range of nongovernmental entities (political parties, corporations, trade associations, labor unions, educational institutions, religious

organizations, ethnic groups, and so on including influential individuals) for the purpose of influencing the politics and actions of other governments (Wikipedia, 2017).

U.S. Department of State defined Public Diplomacy as "...government-sponsored programs intended to inform or influence public opinion in other countries; its chief instruments are publications, motion pictures, cultural exchanges, radio and television" (Wikipedia, 2017). Important extrapolations can be made on Public Diplomacy.

- First, Public Diplomacy is people (public) centred. The focus of Public Diplomacy policy thrust is to influence the general public to have favourable dispositions to interests and policy measures and initiatives of the states involved in Public Diplomacy advocacy.
- Second, Public Diplomacy is intended to stimulate the general public to concretely influence their home government(s) to take actions that are in tandem with the interest(s) of the proponent of Public Diplomacy.
- Third, there is a nexus between democratic governance and Public Diplomacy. In democratic societies where public opinion has considerable influence on government(s) policy outcomes, Public Diplomacy has greater relevance and efficacy.
- Fourth, the revolution in social media (Facebook, twitter, you-tube, etc) has introduced new dimensions and complexities to the conduct and exercise of Public Diplomacy.
- Fifth, there is a symbiotic relationship and co-operation between governmental and non-governmental organizations in execution of Public Diplomacy.

#### **Public Diplomacy Methodology**

Public Diplomacy requires multidimensional approaches in execution. According to Nicholas Cull, the principal strategies and methods of Public Diplomacy involve:

- a. Listening to the views of the people for which Public Diplomacy is intended. This will enable Public Diplomacy advocates to develop proactive policy initiatives that will appeal to the sensibilities of the targeted population.
- b. Advocacy. This is a direct initiative where packaged programmes are implemented to elicit desired outcomes from the targeted population.
- c. Cultural Diplomacy. Here, the primary intention is to use culture as a form of enculturation programme through which values, norms and invariably interests of Public Diplomacy advocates are projected to a level that the targeted population began to accept such values and interests as essential.
- d. Exchange Diplomacy. This method falls within the purview of the various exchange programmes for students, journalists, trade unionists,

industrialists, etc facilitated by government agencies and sometimes by non-governmental bodies.

- e. International Broadcasting. BBC, VOA, CNN, etc broadcasts.

Public Diplomacy methodology also includes; personal contacts with influential personalities and organizations within the targeted state(s); Media interviews; and the internet interactions (social media). It is very important for me to mention categorically that Public Diplomacy and propaganda has a very blur line of division.

### **Bilateralism**

It is the oldest form of relationship in international relations. It is a legal relationship between two sovereign states that defines the context, character, type and essence of social, economic, political, cultural (and sometimes religious) co-operations between the two sovereign states. It is a principal method through which states uses to protect itself from external aggression and internal subversion, especially during the early stages of state formations. All multi-lateral international organizations such as Treaty of Westphalia (1648), Concert of Europe, The League of Nations, The United Nations, have roots in bilateralism. Bilateralism remains a cogent means of international relations between nation-states because of its responsiveness to the dynamics of individual states' interests and needs. It is also time and cost effective in policy decision making and execution.

The basic functions of bilateralism in international relations include:

1. Creating platform for articulation and defence of mutual interests of the two states e.g. defence of democratic governance, human rights, etc;
2. Trade Agreement negotiations;
3. Development and Promotion of investments for the optimization of commercial relations;
4. Developing common positions on international issues and events;
5. Sports co-operation;
6. Trans border crime control such terrorism, drug trafficking and corruption (money laundering);
7. Immigration agreement e.g. Turkey and Germany in post 2<sup>nd</sup> world war;
8. Cultural and educational exchanges,
9. Transfer of technology (N. Korea and Iran Nuclear development Programme.)

### **Nigeria and Bilateral Relations Building**

The pre-colonial states in Nigeria had robust bilateral relations that were responsive to their immediate social, economic and security needs (Akinjogbin, 2002:52-61). However, colonialism redefined bilateral relations of Nigeria as countries like Germany and France that had modicum of relationships with societies in Nigeria were compelled to forsake their interests in consonance with the agreements reached at the Berlin Conference of 1884-1885 on Africa partitioning among some

European countries. Prior to the Berlin conference, Germans developed extensive contacts with the indigenous population of North-Eastern Nigeria before British eventual colonization. In fact, a former first lady of Nigeria, Mrs Mariam Abacha was said to have been a product of inter-marriage between one of such Germans who married an indigenous woman.

At independence, Nigeria Bilateral relations' building lacked focus and was unnecessarily Anglo-centric. Ghana that had similar colonial exposures as Nigeria had a more robust and dynamic bilateral relations that made her pride of the black race. Peter Enahoro aptly captured the nature of Nigeria's diplomatic relations thus:

(In Nigeria)...Diplomats are trained to believe that diplomacy is a compromise between a given policy and organized contradictions. Thus, at international conferences, the Nigerian diplomat has a lot to say, but refrains from saying a lot which is most intriguing. This is how it works. When a Nigerian diplomat rises to make a speech, he only intends to make a brief clarification and not to make a speech. Later, a statement will be issued briefly clarifying the brief clarification which had been briefly stated earlier by the diplomat. This is solid diplomacy. Nigeria's entire diplomatic strategy will fall flat on its face if a Nigerian official were to be so undiplomatic as to try to be heard first at an international gathering.

In the first republic, our diplomats went to great lengths to see that they spoke when everyone else had finished speaking and half the conference were in the tea room. This was in the great tradition of that technique of diplomacy highly favoured by the political leaders of the period. It was called the doctrine of self-effacement, or the overseas policy of self-concealment. In practice, it meant that if there was a slim chance to cancel ourselves out at any international affair, we had to snatch it. Most diplomats approved of this and would often tell journalist proudly that Nigeria's successful policy was to hide from exposure (Enahoro, 2009:19).

The result was that Nigeria diplomatic relations were mainly symbolic, without adding quality to the economic and social well-being of Nigerians.

The reality of prosecuting civil war drastically effected a change in policy thrust of Nigeria bilateral relations. The Nigerian government developed a fruitful bilateral relationship with the defunct Soviet Union that decisively affected the outcome of the Nigerian civil war (Uwechue, 1971:85-100). The Soviet Union–Nigeria bilateral relationship equally facilitated the design and construction of Ajaokuta Steel factory. The diplomatic history of Nigeria during the military regimes was dominated by military leadership idiosyncrasies and myopic considerations rather than enlightened national interests.

Nigeria's involvements and deployments of troops in Chadian civil war in the late 1970s, Liberian and Sierra Leone civil wars of the 1990s where thousands of Nigerian soldiers lost their lives and billions of dollars squandered, were without the pursuit of national interests. True, Africa was said to be the centre of Nigerian foreign policy then. But this was a very nebulous concept that had no forward and backward linkages with Nigeria's national interests. The civil rule regimes (1979-1983 and since 1999), in spite of rhetoric, only differ in name and not in substance with what happened under the various military regimes as far as the country's foreign policies are concerned. Nigeria diplomatic relations' building remained largely unfocused and at the whims and caprices of leaders who are not nationalistic in the genre of the Meiji Japan. This informed the routine and uncoordinated financial and crude-oil donations to some African countries by Nigerian leaders, without concerted effort to get something in return (even if it is only goodwill) for the country.

### **Public Diplomacy in Nigeria and Bilateral Relations Building**

#### **A. Clear Definition of National Interests**

Nigeria's constitution stipulates state objectives as been primarily to build a united and prosperous society that thrives on principles of egalitarianism, social justice and fairness (The 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria Chapter II; Sections 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18). Beyond these blanket declarations, there is a need for specific definition of our national interests. For me, the national interests must be defined within the context of the immediate challenges of nation-building that confront Nigeria.

The genesis of Nigeria, nay Africa's challenges was well encapsulated in a profound submission of Chief Obafemi Awolowo thus: Economic under-development in Africa arise not from any deficiency in natural resources in any African country, but from

- (1) under-development of the subjective mind, typified by ignorance, illiteracy and deficiency in techniques and organization
- (2) under-development of body, typified by diseases, calorie deficiency, bad water, bad housing, and filthy environment;
- (3) under-development of agriculture and excessive underemployment of the rural population, typified by lack of savings and of capital formation. (Awolowo;1978;67)

Any attempt to define Nigeria's national interest(s) must be situated within the context of the fundamental challenges of economic under-development. Perennial crises in Nigeria such as Boko-Haram, Niger Delta Militancy, corruption, armed robbery have their roots in economic under-development (Opara, 2013:227-238; Anifowose, 2006:31-71). The focal point of Nigeria's national interests should be economic rather than romanticizing with nebulous concepts of African brotherhood and solidarity. In practical terms, Public Diplomacy should be geared towards building bilateral relations with countries that can concretely contribute to Nigeria's quest for economic development.

### **B. Leadership By Example**

Arguably, the character and integrity of national leadership determines the esteem accorded a nation-state by other people who are not her citizen. Tanzania under Julius Nyerere attracted one of the best patronages in Africa as a result of the quality of Nyerere's leadership. Let us see Prof Chinua Achebe's perception of Nyerere is eloquently captured thus:

I saw such a phenomenon on two occasions in Tanzania in the 1960s. The first was when news got around (not from the ministry of information, but on street corners) the President Nyerere after paying his children school fees had begged his bank to give him a few months grace on the repayment of the mortgage on his personal house. The other occasion was when he insisted that anyone in his cabinet or party hierarchy who had any kind of business interests must either relinquish them or leave his official or party position. This was no mere technicality of putting the business interest in escrow, but giving it up entirely. And many powerful ministers including the formidable leader of TANU women were forced to leave the cabinet. On these occasions, ordinary Tanzanian seemed to walk around, six feet tall (Achebe, 1983:20).

Quality of Nigeria's leadership (especially national) must improve significantly in moral uprightness, vision and sense of mission. Nigeria leaders must stop 'living for now' syndrome and go beyond ethno-religious bigotry that tended to portray Nigerians as less human species. Public Diplomacy requires robust, focused and energetic leadership that through conducts and actions exhibits characters that the world will be willing not only to accommodate, but to emulate.

### **C. Focused and Interest(s) Based Diplomatic Policy Initiatives**

The era of blind alliances based on primordial or colonial ties is almost extinct in international relations. Nation-states allowed their enlightened self interest(s) to

define the context, extent and depth of their diplomatic relations. For instance, Liberia was a creation of the USA, yet, the USA did not commit her resources (financial and military) to 'protect' Liberians at the peak of Liberian civil war where their citizens were murdered in tens of thousands. The same USA readily committed billion dollars military hardware to 'defend' Libyans from the purported intention of Col. Gaddafi to massacre them. The lesson was obvious, Libya had oil wealth resources that can make a difference to the USA economy, whereas Liberia offered no strategic economic benefit to the USA. Nigeria therefore needs to streamline her diplomatic initiatives in a manner that they will be strategic to the development of the country. It may be wasteful to have diplomatic representations in all countries of the world for reasons of pure national pride and prestige that does not add value to national development. There is need to identify countries that can meaningfully contribute to Nigeria's quest for economic development and subsequently Nigeria's resources should be diverted to build and sustain robust Public Diplomacy in such countries.

#### **D. Diplomatic Initiatives of other States**

Nigeria's leadership needs to benefit from experiences of other countries with similar backgrounds. Egypt and South African diplomatic initiatives, particularly during crisis epoch in the two countries provided durable lessons on how to predicate diplomatic relations on enlightened national self interests. At different times, Egypt developed in-depth bilateral relations with the Soviet Union and the USA to an extent that extracted the best possible generous economic, technical and military assistances from the two superpowers (Heikal, 1978:35-275). South Africa's industrialization during the obnoxious apartheid regime was achieved by diplomatic offensive of the unpopular racist regime. The regime succeeded in persuading the western world that it was a bulwark against communist threats represented by Nelson Mandela's ANC, Sam Njuoma's SWAPO and Augusto Neto's Cuban sponsored guerilla fighters in Angola (Seidman, 1977:56-126). Blind traditional alliance that does not elicit positive and mutually beneficial exchanges should be jettisoned. Nigeria supports for the USA and Britain should be based on enlightened self interests of Nigeria. Era of 'something for nothing' diplomacy should cease in Nigeria.

#### **E. Bilateral Relations' through Proactive Public Diplomacy**

For Nigeria's national security and economic development needs, there is a need for Nigeria to pursue a more dynamic and robust Public Diplomacy with three classes of countries:

1. Nigeria immediate neighbouring states, i.e. Benin Republic, Togo, Chad, Niger and Cameroon. Diplomatic offensive should be targeted at the population. Policies to encourage citizens of these countries to attend Nigeria educational institutions should be encouraged. Bilateral military relations should be developed, especially in the areas of military training and intelligence gathering.
2. Countries that attracts high patronage of Nigerians either for religious or economic reasons. Here, Britain, USA, France, Germany, Italy, Brazil, China, Saudi Arabia and Israel should be the focus of

Public Diplomatic initiatives that seek to exploit the potentials of the economies of these countries for Nigeria's economic development. For instance, there are Nigerians who have established profound relations with governmental and non-governmental institutions and personalities in these countries. Such Nigerians should be mobilized to encourage direct investments in Nigeria. For example, Saudi Arabia owns several refineries outside its territory. It could be encouraged to own refineries in Nigeria.

3. Countries where Nigerians already own considerable investments such as Ghana, Cote D'ivoire and South Africa. Nigeria through Public Diplomacy must actively seek to protect her citizens' investments from the unpalatable experience of arbitrary nationalization policy such as the Ghana expulsion of Nigerians in the late 1960s and the Idi Amin's regime confiscation of Asian assets in the 1970s.

### **Conclusion**

In the age of globalization of democratic governance and ethics engendered by increasing technological innovations that enables citizens to make more inputs to policy formulation and implementation processes, foreign policy initiatives cannot afford to ignore the general public of other states. It is imperative to note that major global power players (USA, Britain, Russia, China, etc) have long appreciated this fact. Each of these states already developed templates and institutions for aggressive public diplomacy initiatives.

Nigeria's quest for economic development necessitates active cooperation of other states. Public Diplomacy that creatively uses governmental institutions and resources as well as private initiatives (e.g. Nollywood Actors, Nobel Prize awardees, outstanding scholars and inventors, Music and Soccer Stars, etc.) has unique role in 'marketing' Nigeria to the outside world. True, Public Diplomacy may be expensive, but its long time impacts and economic returns if implemented with a purposive and focused national leadership will be worth every kobo invested in it. This is a lesson clearly discernible from the USA foreign policy initiatives.

**References**

- Achebe, Chinua, (1983), *The Trouble with Nigeria*, Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers
- Akinboye, O. Solomon and Ottoh, O. Ferdinand, (2005), *A Systematic Approach to International Relations*, Lagos: Concept Publications Limited
- Akinjogbin, I. A. (2002), *Milestones and Social Systems in Yoruba History*, Ibadan: Olu-Akin Publishers,
- Anderson, Rodee, C.C., T.J., Christol, C.Q., and Greene, T.H. (1976), *Introduction to Political Science*, Tokyo: McGraw-Hill Kogakusha, Ltd.,
- Anifowose, Remi, (2006), *Violence and Politics in Nigeria: The Tiv and Yoruba Experience*, Lagos: First Academic Publishers.
- Awolowo, Obafemi, (1978), *The Problems of Africa: The Need for Ideological Reappraisal*/London: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Baylis, John (2011) "International and Global Security" in J. Baylis, S. Smith and P. Owens (Eds.)
- The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Enahoro, P., (2009), *How to be A Nigerian*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- Fajana A. and Biggs B.J. (1964), *Nigeria in History*, Ikeja, Longman Nig. Ltd.
- Heikal, M. (1978), *Sphinx and Commissar: The Rise and Fall of Soviet Influence in the Arab World* London: William Collins Sons and Co Ltd.  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Public\\_diplomacy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Public_diplomacy) accessed on May 26, 2017
- Meredith, M. (2006), *The State of Africa: A History of Fifty Years of Independence*, London: Simon and Schuster UK Ltd.
- Mingst, K.A. (2004), *Essentials of International Relations*, New York: W.W. North and Company Incorporated,
- Nkrumah, K. (1960), *Towards Colonial Freedom*, Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Northedge, F.S.R., (1975), *East-West Relations: Détente and After*, Ile Ife: University of Ife PresS.
- Okpara, E. (2013), "Militancy, Terrorism and the Nigerian State" in Ozoemenam M. and Umar M.
- B. (eds.), *Internal Security Management in Nigeria*, Kaduna: Medusa Academic Publishers Limited.
- Sabine, G.H. and Thorson, T., (1973), *A History of Political Theory*, New Delhi: Oxford and IBH Publishing Co. PVT. LTD.
- Seidman, N. and Ann, (1977), *US Multinationals in Southern Africa Dar es Salaam*: Tanzania Publishing House

Shively, W. P. (2014), *Power and Choice: An Introduction to Political Science*, New-York: McGraw-Hill Education

The *1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria Chapter II*; Sections 14, 15, 16, 17 & 18.

Thomson, D. (1966), *Europe since Napoleon*, Middlesex: Penguin Books,

Uwechue, R. (1971), *Reflections on the Nigerian Civil War: Facing the Future* New York: African Publishing Corporation,

Watson, M. (2011), "Global Trade and Finance" in Baylis J., Smith S. and Owens, P. (eds.), *The*

*Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, Oxford: University Press