

# The Impacts of Globalization on the Military Instrument of Nigerian Foreign Policy (2012-2018).

**OTU OFFIONG DUKE**

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION,  
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES,  
UNIVERSITY OF CALABAR, CALABAR – NIGERIA.  
08035492186  
otuduke76@yahoo.com

**DICKSON DAVID AGBAJI**

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE,  
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES,  
UNIVERSITY OF CALABAR, CALABAR – NIGERIA.  
07069452417  
dicksonagbaji@gmail.com

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.9.04.2019.p88102

<http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.9.04.2019.p88102>

**Abstract:** *Many of us still think of the world vis-à-vis parts: different countries and peoples. However, the different parts of the world are now intermeshed across spatial and temporal trajectories into a synchronic order; a whole which has many commonalities and connections that cut across political borders, national identities and cultural differences. Little wonder the world is now called a “global village” because of the interconnectedness of economic, technological, religious, communications and transportation, military and political activities among people of the distinct states and societies on earth. Therefore, it is the purpose of this paper to investigate the impacts of globalization on the military aspect of Nigeria’s foreign policy tool. The study’s design is descriptive and it undertakes a content analysis of secondary data sources. Likewise, the study adopts the Behavioralist theory. The paper argues that the success achieved by implementing a carefully planned policy, hence, depends on the skillful utilization of tactical instruments, tools and globalization has great impacts on the shaping and usage of these tools for the formulation of well-grounded foreign policies in a rapidly changing world of complex interconnectedness.*

**Keywords:** *Globalization, foreign policy, foreign policy instruments.*

## INTRODUCTION

Rourke (2009) was precise in noting that when Rudyard Kipling predicted in 1889 that “East is East and West is West and never the twain shall meet”, he would not have foreseen the degree to which globalization would prove him wrong. Just like Kipling, many of us still think of the world vis-à-vis parts: different countries and peoples. However, the different parts of the world are now intermeshed across spatial and temporal trajectories into a synchronic order; a whole which has many commonalities and connections that cut across political borders, national identities and cultural differences. Little wonder the world is now called a “global village” because of the interconnectedness of economic, technological, religious, communications and transportation, military and political activities among people of the distinct states and societies on earth.

Globalization which spawned a new international system is not a novelty. It must be noted that the Westphalia Treaty of 1648 presented an era of sovereign nation-states interactions. The purpose and logic of the interactions among states have increased and are gaining grounds; every state, no matter how small, endowed or powerful must relate with other states. These transborder links of interdependence have cracked the capability of states to pursue security, economic and political goals via the traditional uses of power and in the course of these rapports, state set foreign policies, principles objectives vis-à-vis national interest, that guide their interaction with their external environment. The success achieved by implementing a carefully planned policy, hence, depends on the skillful utilization of tactical instruments, tools and globalization has great impacts on the shaping and usage of these tools for the formulation of well-grounded foreign policies in a rapidly changing world of complex interconnectedness.

## STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Since the last two decades, globalization has taken center stage to become one of the greatest themes in foreign policy. Nations are constantly impacted by the increasingly evolving nature of global events. Global events transcend borders to the point that an issue happening in nations thousands of miles away may have direct impacts on the security, peace, development, lifestyle or health of other nations within or outside the continental location of the issue. These affect States' international relations and reduces their capability to pursue strict military or economic policies without recourse to the wellbeing of others – state and non-state actors. Generally, scholars of globalization differ on what areas of social life is most impacted by globalization. Over the years, a lot of emphases have been placed on the economy, communications technology and the spread of cultures with the relegated importance of globalization's impact on politics. More so, there exists in globalization literature arguments on the declining relevance of territorial boundaries. They is the belief that globalization blurs the distinctions between the domestic and the foreign or what scholars like Hill (2003) call the 'inside' and 'outside.' This notwithstanding, the question then is: when this distinction is blur, how can we determine what is *foreign* in foreign policy?

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Imperatively, this essay is geared at explicating on the impacts of globalization on the military aspect of Nigeria's foreign policy tool. More specifically, it serves:

- i. To identify the meanings of foreign policy and globalization;
- ii. To determine the multidimensional nature of globalization;
- iii. To identify the distinct foreign policy tools as used by states; and
- iv. To discover the effects and consequences of globalization for the nation-state system.

## CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

It is difficult to reduce foreign policy to a single definition as there are myriad of them. For instance, Frankel (1969) saw foreign policy as consisting a decisive action which involves to some appreciable extent relations between states. However, some states are seen not to have taken any action in response to a situation e.g. the US and Russia's refusal to intervene in Syria (2011) and Iraq (2003) respectively. This inaction is an action in itself (as one cannot be politically neutral) (Duke, Agbaji, Charles, Akhabue & Elemi, 2018). To Light (1999) foreign policy is the official relations that take place between the units of the international system. Light focusing only on those official relations makes the definition laden as there are a plethora of relations between states which are unofficial. More so, Holsti (1992) defined foreign policy as the action of a state toward the external environment and recognition,

usually domestic under which these actions are formulated. Holsti looking at the domestic level is oblivious of the fact that a nation's politics and economy and its interactions cannot be construed without preference to the world system (external) of which it is a part. To that extent, therefore, we can describe foreign policy as comprising all (official and unofficial) relations and/or objectives, principles, values vis-à-vis national interest which guide and direct states' intercourse with other units/actors of the international system.

More so, globalization is a slippery and elusive concept. Despite intensifying interest in the phenomenon since the 1980s, it is still used to refer variously to a process, a policy, a marketing strategy or even an ideology (Heywood, 2007), it is thus difficult to reduce globalization to a single theme or definition as there are myriad available. For instance, McGrew cited in Randall and Theobald (1998) saw globalization as the multiplicity of linkages and interconnections that transcends the nation-states which make up the modern world system. According to Ohmae (1989), globalization is a borderless world, i.e. it not only refers to the tendency of traditional political borders, based on national boundaries to become permeable, it also implies that division between people previously separated by time and space have become less significant and are sometimes entirely irrelevant.

According to Robertson (1992:8), globalization refers to the "compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole." This definition raises three (3) issues: (1) globalization is a (long term) process, thus, today's mass communications satellites and tourism represent an acceleration and deepening; (2) it should not be read as creating a uniform response as people, conscious or unconscious of it, may respond differently; (3) what is been compressed is space, thus, leading towards homogenization or supraterritoriality (Brown, 1995; Scholte, 2005).

Globalization is multidimensional. In particular we need to recognize its economic, cultural and political dimensions. Economic globalization is a shift from a world of distinct national economies to an integrated global economy in which production (and exchange) is internationalized and trade, financial capital, technology and information etc, flow freely and instantly between nations (Heywood, 2009, Obadan, 2004, Randall & Theobald, 1998). Cultural globalization is a process whereby people, information, language, clothes, food, religions, diseases, movies etc, from one culture spread globally. Migration patterns, global tourism which brings jobs offer, foreign exchange and shape mental images of people and places fall under this (Heywood, 2007, Kaarbo & Ray, 2011, Legraine, 2003). Political globalization is evident in the growing number and significance of international organizations such as the European Union (EU), the United Nations (UN), World Trade Organization (WTO), North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), among others, and non-states transnational actors which compose a new system of global governance (Legrain, 2003, Archer, 1992, Heywood, 2007). For instance the UN has taken more roles, peacemaking and humanitarian intervention without the consent of states and provides forum for debate (Kaarbo & Ray, 2011).

Added to the foregoing analysis, Castells cited in Keukeleire and Schunz (2008) explained a fourth dimension they call 'the fourth main catalyst of globalization: technological development.' According to them, "... globalization has been enabled by the rapid evolution of communication, information and transport technology, which allow together for a decrease in importance of distances and, thus, the compression of space and time" (Keukeleire & Schunz, 2008:7). To that extent, therefore, globalization can be described as meaning that our lives are increasingly shaped by events that occur and decisions that are made at a great distance from us, thus, the declining relevance of territorial boundaries.

It can be deciphered from the foregoing that its multidimensional nature, nevertheless, globalization not only has severe effects but also has great consequences. So, it can be said to be like a coin possessing opposite sides: one side creates numerous

opportunities for some; and the other presents grave threats to the sustenance of others. In fact, we cannot but agree with McGrew (2005) that the area of social life which is most affected by the effects of globalization is politics. In fact, Keukeleire and Schunz (2008:7) explained this position in this way: “Not only are all levels of policy-making – from the local to the global – in one way or the other affected, but the predominantly territorial organization of politics itself is being put to the test.” So, political matters are affected by globalization, irrespective of which dimension, and nations are increasingly pressured to make decisions and severe, maintain or form alliances based on the world’s swift and ‘progressive’ changes. Added to this is the fact that the declining relevance of territorial boundaries blurs the distinctions between the domestic and the foreign or what scholars like Hill (2003) call the ‘inside’ and ‘outside.’ When this distinction is blur, how can we determine what is *foreign* in foreign policy? Consequently, globalization challenges how foreign policies are made. Though different arguments exist regarding the validity of the claims of the slow but progressive erosion of the nation-state borders system, nations and their policy makers consistently seek solutions – sometimes alone, other times through collaboration with other state or non-state actors – to novel challenges, thus, increasing the value of the idea of foreign policy.

The instrument with which nations pursue their foreign policies (a subject we will discuss later on in the study) are also largely affected by globalization. The closer the world get the more redundant the traditional focus on solely military and/or material capabilities to steer the instruments required to conduct foreign policy. So, states’ power structure in the international system is not entirely determined by the existing strength of the nations’ military or economy but by the networks or alliances they create and maintain. What is important and emphasized here, as Webber & Smith (2002) wrote, is influence and communications and structural power while coercion becomes less prominent and only sought for when all other options are exhausted by nations acting within a governing structure. As such, the tool to be used here is widely determined by the governing body of the mutually established structure. To sum it all up, Keukeleire and Schunz (2008:9) observed that:

*If globalization restructures the world as we know it, dealing with these transformative processes – through (foreign) policy – amounts in essence to “globalizing structures” ... i.e. adapting the political frameworks in which actors interact to the realities of a de-territorializing world.*

We must mention here that foreign policies are pursued through different means. These instruments for conducting foreign policy generally refer to the mechanisms used by States in conducting their relationships with other States (Akinboye, 1998). These tools comprise: Diplomacy; Propaganda; Economic measures; Cultural dimensions; and Military persuasions.

## **Diplomacy**

It is by far, (usually) the first, most peaceful and most important tool by which States mutually attempt to adjust their respective national interests. Crudely put, it is the conduct of inter-state relations by means of negotiations (Akinboye, 1998). G. Kennan saw it as the business of communicating between governments (Okoro, 2006). A more comprehensive definition is that diplomacy is the official state-to-state conduct of communications by means of negotiations usually by States’ officials: presidents, ambassadors, high commissioners, and so on, who use tact, intelligence, conciliation, arbitration, and commonsense to reach agreements, compromises, and settlements peacefully rather than by war (Holsti, 1992). It is commonly bilateral but the growing importance of international and regional conferences and organizations have shown its multilateral aspects (Palmer & Perkins, 2007; Akinboye, 2008; Akinboye & Ottoh, 2014). In most cases the purpose of diplomacy between States is to change or sustain each

other's objectives and policies to reach an agreement over some contentious issue, e.g. the Nigeria-Cameroon Bakassi Peninsula dispute (Okoro, 2002).

The machinery of diplomacy in a modern State consists of two major parts. First, there is the home establishment; the governmental department, referred to in Nigeria as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and in the United States of America as the Department of States, under the Chief Executive, entrusted with the basic responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs. Second, there is the diplomatic mission abroad, the embassies and legations, and their respective staff. Protected by international law from civil and criminal laws of the host States, through three sets of rules concerning protocol, immunities, and non-interference (Holsti, 1992), the diplomatic mission gathers information that affects relations between the two States, handles complaints and requests that might threaten the existing routine, administers foreign policy objectives, symbolically represents the home country (through social contacts at ceremonies), expands commercial interests, protects nationals, and so on (Okoro, 2002; 2006; Holsti, 1992).

### **Propaganda**

Propaganda generally refers to "any systematic attempt to affect the minds, emotions, and actions of given groups for a specific purpose" (Frankel, 1969 in Okoro, 2006). It can also be seen as the deliberate attempt by governments to influence the attitudes and behaviors of foreign populations, or of specific ethnic, class, religious, economic or language groups within these populations, with the hope that the foreign group will influence their government's actions (Holsti, 1992). It involves the extensive use of the mass media (Akinboye, 1998).

Propaganda differs from diplomacy, as Holsti (1992) aptly captured, because first, propaganda is addressed to the people in other States rather than to their government, and it is selfish, governed exclusively by the national advantage of the propagandist. Hence, since propaganda is used by States to create favorable attitudes abroad and decrease other States' ability to oppose their policies, it is, thus, believed to serve negative purposes (see Holsti, 1992).

Politically motivated propaganda program involves four essential components: a communicator or propagandist with a view to changing attitudes and opinions of others; the symbol – written, spoken, or behavioral – used by the communicator; the media of communication; and the audience or the target. Therefore, the first task in developing a propaganda is to identify the target; catch the target's attention; after these, the propagandist may use a variety of techniques in delivering the message(s) – name calling, fear, testimonial, bandwagon, frustration scapegoat, and so on (Holsti, 1992; Okoro, 2006).

### **Economic Measure**

The conduct of modern policy requires much more than just traditional contact between States and their officials. Therefore, owing to the complexities of commercial transactions and the structure of economic relations between societies, governments, in seeking to change or sustain the behavior of others, have a broad range of economic instrumentalities, which can lead to, as Holsti (1992) wrote, "the manipulation of economic opportunities and transactions to create vulnerabilities which can then be organized for all sort of political purposes."

These economic instruments include: tariffs; quotas; boycotts; embargoes; international trades; loans, credits and currency manipulations, freezing assets; blockades; blacklisting; expropriation; economic sanctions; granting or withdrawal of foreign aids and investments, and so on (Akinboye, 1998; Akinboye & Ottoh, 2014; Okoro, 2002; 2006). Foreign aids an expression of benevolence,

goodwill, and generosity by the donor nation to the recipient nation. Aids go to few States, especially those that are most strategically relevant to the donor state for the realization of its foreign policy objectives as well as for ensuring the cooperation of the poor state(s). For example, the US Marshall Plan – a \$16.5 billion program – was aimed at reconstructing the war-torn Western European and Japanese nations and economies, and to reduce the spread of Soviet-propagated Communism in Western Europe and Japan. In a relatively open world economy, corporations, governments and individuals often maintain assets abroad, in the form of investments, bank accounts and real estates. If sufficiently large, such assets can become hostages (Holsti, 1992). For example, in 1979, the US froze assets of Iran, amounting to almost \$12 billion, in retaliation for the invasion of the United States' embassy in Tehran. The US and Europe froze the assets of top Russian businessmen who made-up key sectors of the Russian economy because of the Russian invasion of Crimea in 2014. Embargo involves the prohibition of exports from entering the country concerned, thus, starving it of vitally needed scarce resources, lower its citizens' living standard, and create domestic crises for the State. For instance, the Arab oil embargo on the United States was an effort to weaken America's pro-Israeli foreign policy.

## **Culture**

Culture can be seen as the total way of life of a particular group of people. More elaborately, according to Taylor (1924) cited in Okoro (2002) it is the “complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, laws, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society.” Consequently, it can be discern that every society has its own distinctive values and life styles from those of others. These have been, thus, used as a major political weapon.

Sports has become the most prominent aspect of the cultural dimension of some countries foreign policy. Nigeria for instance, has invested much in sports to facilitate and reinforce international understanding and friendship among the various countries of the world. Nigeria's involvement in the World Cup, Olympic Games, Commonwealth Games, World Athletic University Games, and the African Nation's Cup, inter alia, have contributed as influencing factors in Nigeria's foreign relations (Okoro, 2006). For instance, in 1976 and 1978, Nigeria led other members of the OAU and Commonwealth to boycott the Montreal Olympic Games and the Edmonton Commonwealth Games, respectively to protest New Zealand's sporting links with Apartheid South Africa which contravened United Nation's embargo on such links (Akinboye, 1998). Another is the area of festival. The Calabar Carnival is a major tourist attraction which helps boosts Nigeria's foreign relations with the outside world. Also, the creation of the (second) World International Festival of Arts and Culture (FESTAC) organized in Lagos in 1977 was poised at bringing Blacks the world over together to establish close links and solidarity to fight for Black liberation from racism and oppression. It also attracted Afro-American politicians and businessmen to Nigeria (Okoro, 2006).

## **Military Persuasion**

It involves the use of force, terror, and military coercion in conducting foreign policy objectives of States. That is, to achieve and/or defend interests and promote social values abroad, governments may – instead of sending diplomatic notes or making military threats – invade a foreign territory with its troops, influence voluntary organizations, attempt coups d'état, and so on (Akinboye, 1998; Holsti, 1992).

It has been observed that force as an instrument of foreign policy has a face value distinct from its intrinsic value. The face value is that every State has got a force, while the intrinsic value is how effectively such force could coerce other States (Okoro, 2002). Thus, when States' relation center on the survival interests of States defined strictly vis-à-vis national defense, an all-out national effort to protect their citizens is required in the face of immediate danger to the security of the State (Okoro, 2006). For <http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.9.04.2019.p88102>

instance, the United States invaded Iraq in 2003, unilaterally and militarily because it perceived Hussein's Iraqi government as a threat to Iraqi citizens, the US, and the world, as an end of the regime's proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), abuse of human rights, and ties with global terrorism (links with Al-Qaeda).

Owing to its violent nature which often results in wars, it is often adopted as the last resort when diplomacy and other subtler or peaceful mechanisms fail. For instance, in 1991, the UN Allied Forces led by the US went to war with Iraq when series of negotiations failed to resolve the gulf crisis between Iraq and Kuwait. Similarly, Nigeria in 1983, went to war with Chad when the issue at stake defied resolution through negotiation (Akinboye, 1998). Nigerian rulers overtime, sometimes seen as "pacifist", have resorted to the use of military force as an instrument of pursuing Nigeria's national interests rather infrequently. Military forces have effectively been used in peace keeping operations under the auspices of the United Nations, the African Union, and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). For example, Nigeria partook in the peacekeeping in the Belgian Congo in the 1960s, in Liberia during its civil war, in Sierra Leone, and so on.

### **Theoretical Analysis**

The study adopts the Behavioralist theory of International Relations. This theory, a post-World War II creation, is a fall-out of the revolution or the earliest criticism against positivism – Idealism and Realism – initiated by the works of David Easton, Robert Dahl, Karl Popper, David Butler, Albert Somit and Joseph Tanenhaus, Sidney Ulmer, and Richard C. Snyder and his associates in the 1950s, aimed at developing a "systematic treatment of decision-making phenomena in the study of foreign policy and international politics" (Anifowose, 1998; Okoro, 2006; 2012).

This approach focuses on the individual beings, rather than the large political unit or collectivities, as the unit of analysis. The analysis of State behavior centers on these individuals (foreign policy makers) who act in behalf of the State (Okoro, 2006). Ulmer (1961) cited in Anifowose (1998) corroborating this adds that, "Political behavior approach is distinguished by its attempt to describe government as a process made up of actions and interactions of men and groups of men." More elaborately, Anifowose (1998) purported that behavioralism:

*...is concerned with the activities of governments, political parties, interest groups, and voters. Institutions are rejected as the unit of analysis because government, after all, is not made up of merely of documents, containing laws and rules or of structures of a particular form but is fundamentally based upon patterns of actions and activities of men... Thus, the unit of analysis of behavioralism should be the observed behavior and relationships of men (p. 30).*

The approach, therefore, discusses decision-makers as individuals who arrive at their decisions by confronting their values with their image of the environment, i.e. it utilizes both internal and external factors as they influence decisions made and fine-tuned via the eyes of the individual decision-maker; their worldviews or idiosyncratic factors which shape behavior. In line with is, the discourses in political behavior are devoted to the provision of a sound understanding of the relationship between political actions and political process and/or knowledge, and this makes the subject to now cover issues such as political attitude, participation and culture, all of which show the values, orientations and experiences, explain protests, social movement, resistance, apathy, extremism, wars, voting, and so on.

The behavioral approach serves as a scientific and holistic method of analysis. It argues in favor of conceptualization, quantification, formal hypothesis, testing and the systematic investigation, empirical generalization, and systematic theorization of behaviors in international relations. Thagard and Van Fraassen in Okoro (2012) believe that behavioralism aims not to discover truth, but to produce intellectual structures that provide adequate predictions of what is observed and useful frameworks for answering questions and solving problems in a given domain (and in this case, the domain is foreign policy). In this vein, it provides one-minded, creativity, integration and problem solving as opposed to the theoretical specification, discrimination and warfare between the competing positivist theories (Idealism and Realism) (see Okoro, 2012). These scientific techniques are aptly discernible in the pure sciences – Biology, Physics, Chemistry, and so on.

More still, behavioralism emphasizes intersubjectivity in the accumulation of knowledge (Okoro, 2006). What this means is that, for instance, knowledge acquired and utilized in foreign policy is gotten from ideas from other scholars who have conducted researches on foreign policy and relations of states and from other fields of study, especially those in the Social Sciences like Sociology, Psychology, Economics, and so on. Consequently, intersubjectivity is the basic feature of science; whenever any knowledge or generalization is proposed, other scholars must look into such so as to verify its validity, and to know if it is truthful or to prove its reliability.

The relevance of this theory to the study can be seen in the fact that Nigeria, being an economic and demographic giant in Africa, can pursue a robust foreign policy in Africa through whatever means it feels best secures its national interest but basically through a complex set of rapport between nations and non-state actors like international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) and multinational corporations (MNCs). Thus, Nigeria pursues foreign policies that serve its purpose and the purpose of the international organization it may choose to contribute personnel to. It is, therefore, worth reiterating that states' power structure in the international system is not entirely determined by the existing strength of the nations' military or economy but by the networks or alliances they create and maintain. The ability of its armed forces to navigate through the waterways, fly through the air, and march through land gives the nation a very impressive edge to advance its foreign policy military instrument.

## **IMPACT OF GLOBALIZATION OF FOREIGN POLICY TOOLS**

Giddens (1990) noted that globalizing actions and ties reach across space to shape social life. This causes some effects and Brown (1995) in this regard noted that globalization does not abolish difference or power but it does impact change or affect the context of (domestic and global) politics; how states relate, make and design tools to pursue their foreign policies and so on. In this view, since globalization has positive and negative sides, its impacts the foreign policy tools of nations positively and negatively too. Our focus will be on the impact of globalization on the military tool of Nigeria's foreign policy.

### **Impact of Globalization on Military Instrument of Nigeria's Foreign Policy (2014-2018)**

Just as gunpowder helped destroyed the foundations of the feudal order, mass media of communication, rapid transportation, an interdependent economy, weapon technology and mass politics have helped diminish the impermeability of the state (Holsti, 1992). Hence, the international nature of the world has resulted in distinct forms of relations. These relations in most cases, centre on the survival interests of states defined strictly vis-à-vis national defense thus requiring an all-out national effort to protect their citizens in the face of immediate danger to the security of the states (Okoro, 2006). For instance, the regionalization of Boko Haram attacks has posed severe threats to the human security, socioeconomic, political and environmental development of nation-states in the Lake Chad region. The porous borders of the nations in this region has become a matter of serious concern vis-à-vis the flow of persons



illegally, transborder crimes, terrorism, and the easy shipment of small arms and light weapons – the ills of globalization – which usually end up reaching the hands of terrorists. The Nigerian government, through its armed forces, joined in the collaborative effort to curb the spread of terrorism in the Lake Chad region. This collaborative effort is called the Multinational Joint Task Force (MNJTF) between Nigeria, Chad and Niger. More so, Zamfir (2015) opined that the Paris Summit of May 2014, which brought together the Heads of State of Benin, Chad, Cameroon, France, Niger and Nigeria and representatives of the United States of America (USA), Britain and the European Union (EU), decided to enhance regional cooperation in the fight against Boko Haram by means of coordinated patrols and border surveillance, pooling intelligence and exchanging relevant information. This action by the Nigerian government can be justified using Emilio Mignon's statement that the defense of human right dignity (and security) knows no boundaries (Kaarbo & Ray, 2011). All these complement the Nigerian military's active engagement of Boko Haram insurgents, with the sole objective to annihilate the perceived threat to national security, in Sambisa Forest, a location claimed to be the headquarters of all Boko Haram operations in Nigeria, and which once usurped more than 130 villages and control about 20 Local Government Areas in Northeast Nigeria especially in Borno, Adamawa and Yobe states (a territory the size of Belgium), declared the areas an Islamic caliphate and flew al-Qaeda's flag within those communities (Duke, Agbaji & Etim, 2016).

Also transnational organizations e.g., media houses like Cable Network News (CNN) and the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), civil society movements and human right groups, private military firms and so on, influence governments' decision making by providing information owing to their deep knowledge of regional and local issues, cultures and relationships. In view of the hostilities arising from the Northern Mali Conflict between several Islamic rebel groups and the Malian government other states found it needful to intervene through or under the auspices of international regimes like UN and AU among others, to prevent such war from spreading. For example, as reports of vicious attacks on civilians, separatists and Islamists, the ousting of the Malian President, Amadou Toumani, by Amadou Sanogo as well as the destruction of ancient monuments in Timbuktu circulated on the media, social networks and blogs (globalization in information technology) about the Malian uprising of 2012, the UN and AU saw the conflict as a humanitarian crisis demanding international response. So, the Economic Community of West Africa States (ECOWAS) organized and sent a military mission called the Africa-led International Support Mission to Mali (AFISMA) to support the government of Mali against the rebel groups. On January 17 2013 Nigeria deployed air and ground forces to Mali. It is estimated that the Nigerian government deployed about 1200 military personnel for the AFISMA initiative to assist the Malian government (*Al Jazeera English*, 2013). Likewise, the UN established the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) which the Nigerian government also contributed personnel.

Furthermore, globalization has created 'radical fundamentalism.' For instance, Boko Haram terrorists have been trained by Al Qaeda of the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) in Algeria, Mauritania and the Sahel region (Geneva Center for Security Policy, 2017), they adapted the Wahhabist and Salafi-jihadi ideas (Thurston, 2016) – ideological orientations developed in central Arabia, and are financed by international benefactors (links to Al Qaeda and the Islamic State) via International Banks (McCoy, 2014). In fact, one may argue that one reason Nigeria is suffering from religious extremist today is the US-Iraq invasion which multiplied the radical Islamic threat to the US and the world (e.g. currently IS) by mobilizing radical Islamic behaviours and transfer of revolutionary ideas around the world.

## CONCLUSION

This essay has attempted an explication of the phenomena at issue, globalization and foreign policy (tools) which have been defined by scholars all influenced by their personal experiences and environments, hence the inability to arrive at a universally

accepted definition. However, attempts were made to define the terms for the purpose of this work. Likewise, the multifaceted nature of globalization was treated: economic; cultural; and political aspects. These, it must be noted are theoretically distinct but in practice are all woven to aid apt analysis of globalization. The tools which are used to pursue foreign policy were discussed where attempts were made to analyze the military tools, in this vein, the main thesis of this work was treated i.e. identifying the impact of globalization on this tool. Globalization is seen to have impacted the military tools through the sporadic spread of terrorist ideals and rapid transportation to allow states intervene in other states activities. In this vein, states' sovereignty is breached, thus, requiring an all-out national defense effort. Through giant media houses and transnational corporations (TNCs) like CNN, information is given which also shape states' military tools e.g. the Northern Mali crisis, the Libyan crisis, AU and the West's response. Likewise, globalization has created radical fundamentalism. It is this paper's position that globalization has had profound impacts on foreign policy tools and owing to the dynamism of the world and it will continue to impact the world too.

However, it must be noted that the amount of globalization that enters a state is, as Legrain (2003) explained, government controlled. In this vein, national governments must ensure that their borders are effectively manned to reduce the indiscriminate movement of people, drugs, and small and light weapons from country to country since those weapons only end up in the wrong hands and insecurity will of course be the concomitant backwash.

## REFERENCES

- Akinboye, O.A. and Ottoh, O.F. (2014). A systematic approach to international relations. Lagos, Nigeria: Concept Publications Ltd.
- Akinboye, S.O. (2008). Nigeria's Foreign Policy. In Anifowose, R. and Enemu, P. (Eds). Elements of Politics. Lagos: Sam Ironsi Publications.
- Al Jazeera English*. (2013, January 18). "Mali army retakes key towns from rebels." Retrieved on 14 November, 2018 from <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/africa/2013/01/2013118122039129487.html>
- Akinboye, S. O. (1998). "Nigeria's foreign policy". In R. Anifowose and P. Enemu, (eds.), *Elements of politics* (pp. 364-383). Lagos: Sam Ironsi Publications.
- Anifowose, R. (1998). "Political behavior." In R. Anifowose and P. Enemu, (eds.), *Elements of politics* (pp. 364-383). Lagos: Sam Ironsi Publications.
- Baumann, R. and Stengel, F.A. (2010 February). Globalization and Foreign Policy Analysis: Neglect of or Successful Adaptation to Changing Political Practices. Paper presented at the 51<sup>st</sup> Annual Convention of the International Studies Association. New Orleans L.A.
- Brown, R. (1995). Globalization and the End of the National Project. In Macmillan J. and Linklater, A. (Eds). *Boundaries in Question: New Directions in International Relations*. England: Pinter Publishers.
- Duke, O. O., Agbaji, D. D., Charles, R. O., Akhabue, A. G., and Alaga, E. (2018). Nigerian foreign policy posture and global image: An assessment of Nigeria's foreign policy in the Goodluck Jonathan and Muhammadu Buhari's administrations (2011 – 2017). *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 23(9), 58-73.
- Duke, O. O., Agbaji, D. D., and Etim, E. E. (2016). The upsurging waves of Islamic fundamentalism and the case for Nigeria's development: Institution, structural processes, and system. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development (IJIRD)*, 5(13), 219-226.
- Ebegbulem, J. (2010). Government and Politics of the Modern State. Calabar, Nigeria: CATS Publishers.
- Geneva Center for Security Policy*. (2017, September 13). "Boko Haram evolving relationship with Al Qaeda." Retrieved on 14<sup>th</sup> November, 2018, from <https://www.gcsp.ch/News-Knowledge/Global-insight/Boko-Haram-s-Evolving-Relationship-With-al-Qaeda>
- Heywood, A. (2007). *Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hill, C. (2003). *The changing politics of foreign policy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Holsti, K.J. (1992). *International politics: A framework for Analysis* (6<sup>th</sup> Edition) New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Kaarbo, J. Ray, J. I. (2010). *Global Politics*. USA: Wadsworth Lengage Learning.
- Keukeleire, S., and Schunz, S. (2008). Foreign policy, globalization and global governance - The European Union's structural foreign policy. Paper prepared for the ECPR *Standing Group on the European Union Fourth Pan-European Conference on EU Politics*, Riga, 25-27 September.
- Legrain, P. (2003). *Open World: The Truth About Globalization*. London: Ivan R. Dee Publishers.

- Light, M. (1999). *Foreign Policy Analysis*. In Groom, A.J.R and Light, M. (Eds). *Contemporary International Relations: A Guide to Theory*. London: Pinter Publishers.
- Magastadt, T.M. (2009). *Understanding Politics: Ideas Institutions and Issues* (8<sup>th</sup> edition). USA: Wadsworth Lengage Learning.
- McCoy, T. (2014, June 6). "This is how Boko Haram funds its evil." *The Washington Post*. Retrieved on 15<sup>th</sup> November, 2018, from [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2014/06/06/this-is-how-boko-haram-funds-its-evil/?noredirect=on&utm\\_term=.25d02cdf3e10](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2014/06/06/this-is-how-boko-haram-funds-its-evil/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.25d02cdf3e10)
- Obadan, I.M. (2004). *Globalization and Economic Management in Africa*. In the Nigerian Economic Society (NES). *Globalization and Africa's Economic Development* Ibadan: The Nigerian Economic Society.
- Ohmae, K. (1989). *The borderless world*. New York: Harper Business.
- Okoro, J. (2012). "Foreign policy." In C. O. Bassey and G. O. Ozumba (eds.), *Political science: An introductory reader* (pp. 626-651). Lagos, Nigeria: Concept Publications Limited.
- Okoro, J. (2006). *Foreign policy: theories and analysis*: Calabar, Cross River State: Clear Line Publications.
- Okoro, J. (2002). *Understanding Nigerian foreign policy*. Calabar, Nigeria: CATS Publishers.
- Palmer, V. and Perkins, C.H. (2007). *International Relations*. India: A.I.T.B.S Publishers.
- Randall, U. and Theobald, R. (1998). *Political Change and Underdevelopment: A Critical Introduction to Third World Politics* (Second Edition) London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization, social theory and social culture*. London: Sage Publications.
- Rourke, J.T. (2009). *International Politics on the World Stage* (12<sup>th</sup> edition New York, USA: McGraw Hill Companies Inc.
- Scholte, J.A. 2005. *Globalization - a critical introduction*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Thurston, A. (2016). '*The disease is unbelief*': *Boko Haram's religious and political worldviews*. The Brookings Project on U.S. Relations with the Islamic World.
- Trunkos, J. (2011 January). *Changing Diplomacy Demands New Types of Diplomats*. Paper Presented at the Institute of Cultural Diplomacy's International Conference. Washington DC.
- Zamfir, I. (2015). *African-led counterterrorism measures against Boko Haram*. *The European Parliamentary Research Service*. Retrieved on the 23<sup>rd</sup> November, 2018, from [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/ATAG/2015/551302/EPRS\\_ATA\(2015\)551302\\_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/ATAG/2015/551302/EPRS_ATA(2015)551302_EN.pdf)