NIGERIA AND THE POLITICS OF AFRICAN DECOLONIZATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS 1960-1994: HISTORICAL ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR NIGERIA'S CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL AMBITIONS

ADEREMI OPEYEMI ADE-IBIJOLA

STUDENT NUMBER: 213526193

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS) IN THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU NATAL, PIETERMARITZBURG, SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR: DR B.R. MNGOMEZULU

DECEMBER 2014

ABSTRACT

This study is an investigation of the role of the Nigerian state in African decolonization politics in the United Nations (UN) during the period 1960 to 1994 and its implications for Nigeria's contemporary political ambitions. Against this background, the study was carried out in both the historical and contemporary contexts in order to be able to draw the link between Nigeria's past and present political activities. The historical contexts entailed an analysis of the issues which engendered the politicization of African decolonization in the UN such as the Cold War, the Congo crisis - which was also fuelled by the Cold War animosities; the intra-African power rivalry among member states of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), and the Sharpeville massacre in South Africa in 1960 which attracted widespread indignation across the world. The latter ensured that African problems were given special attention in the UN in 1960 and in the years which followed.

Specifically, the study argues based on the preponderance of archival sources and relevant scholarly resources that the deep–rooted worldwide rivalry for world dominance which ensued between the defunct Soviet Union, the United States and allies respectively shortly after the end of World War Two ushered in a period of politicization of the African decolonization process in the UN from 1960 onwards. The study focuses on Nigeria's role in African decolonization politics as well as its advocacy on the colonial problem within the period aforementioned. It also examines the roles played by regional groupings such as the Latin American group, the Afro-Asian groups and other member states of the UN in calling for decolonisation.

The contemporary contexts on the other hand, based on empirical data, analysed the implications of Nigeria's roles as outlined above for the country's present ambition for the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) permanent membership seat. It critiques the arguments made over the years by the Nigerian governments, diplomats and scholars with regards to Nigeria's historical credentials which many believe should be enough to qualify the country to represent Africa on the UNSC. This study argues that Nigeria's greatest credentials for the UNSC seat lie not in its records of service to the African cause but in the combination of that record

with an appreciable domestic condition which is epitomized by good governance, protection of human rights, sound and enduring democratic institutions, dedicated political leadership, zero tolerance for corruption and functional judiciary in the current context. Nigeria's success also depends on ensuring security on the home front, tackling mass impoverishment and working towards a robust economy. Leveraging on the realist political theory, the study demonstrably established that Nigeria's role on issues of African decolonization was primarily and strategically driven by its self-interest which was the preconceived desire to play a dominant role in African affairs. The findings of this study show that Nigeria's position is not guaranteed; neither are those of the other contenders such as South Africa –a country with which Nigeria is juxtaposed in this study.

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this dissertation titled "Nigeria and the Politics of African Decolonization in the United Nations 1960-1994: Historical Analysis and Implications for Nigeria's Contemporary Political Ambitions," except where otherwise indicated, is my own original work. I further declare that:

1. This thesis has not been submitted for any degree or examination at any other university;

2. This thesis does not contain other people's data, pictures, graphs or any other information unless these are attributed to the original authors;

3. Where the exact words of other authors or official and other documents have been used, these have been placed inside quotation marks or indented and referenced accordingly.

14/03/2015

_____   _____
           Candidate   **Date**

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to God Almighty for His mercy and grace towards me.

AKNOWLEDGEMENT

ABREVIATIONS

ACP — African Caribbean and Pacific

ANC — African National Congress

AU — African Union

CBN — Central Bank of Nigeria

ECOSOC — Economic and Social Council

ECOWAS — Economic Community of West African States

FBO — Faith Based Organization

GA — General Assembly

ICC — International Central Organization of Churches

ICJ — International Court of Justice

ILO — International Labour Organization

NACAP — National Committee against Apartheid

NAM — Non-Aligned Movement

NATO — North Atlantic Treaty Organization

NGOs — Non-Governmental Organizations

NIIA — Nigerian Institute of International Affairs

NPC — Northern People's Congress

OAU — Organization of African Unity

PAC — Pan-Africanist Congress

PCR	Program to Combat Racism
SAOCTO	Southeast Asia Organization Central Treaty Organization
SARF	Southern Africa Relief Fund
SC	Security Council
SWAPO	South West African Peoples Organization
TAC	Technical Aid Corps
TC	Trusteeship Council
UN	United Nations
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
WCC	World Council of Churches

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Decolonization was . . . one of the forces that shaped the United Nations.[1]

1.1. Introduction

After the attainment of political independence from Britain in October 1960, Nigeria was admitted into the United Nations (UN) as the 99th member state of the world's foremost organization. Upon its admission into the UN, Nigeria quickly committed itself to the decolonization of the African continent when the country joined other independent African countries in search for political independence from the various colonizing powers which were in control of African territories. Fired by its preconceived agenda to be a continental hegemon in African affairs and to speak "loudest for African concerns", Nigeria saw the African colonial problem ravaging the continent at the time as a ready –made avenue to justify its continental leadership ambitions. Therefore it joined other member states in the UN to help lift the burden of colonialism and institutionalized racism off the neck of the hapless peoples of the Southern African region who were at the time under the thumb of militant supremacist regimes.

Although the colonial problem in the Southern African region has been well articulated at the UN, at the Commonwealth of Nations and other international organizations prior to Nigeria's independence, the arrival of the Nigerian state on the global arena added another forceful and prominent voice to the existing anti-colonial choruses against the white colonial regimes in Africa. Consequently, Nigeria's commitment was cogently captured in the inaugural address of the first Nigerian Prime Minister under the new political dispensation, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa which he delivered to the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) on 7th October, 1960. He stated amongst other things that: "Nigeria hopes to work with other African

---

[1] See United Nations General Assembly Document A/59/565, Dist.: General 2 December (2004) Original: English Version, p. 18.

states for the progress of Africa and to assist in bringing all African territories to a state of responsible independence."[2]

The above declaration underpinned Nigeria's subsequent role in African decolonization issues in the UN. Suffice to say that Nigerian successive governments followed this declaration with demonstrable efforts by providing military diplomatic and material support to the various liberation fighters in countries such as Guinea Bissau, Angola, Southern Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) Namibia, Mozambique, Western Sahara and South-Africa – the apartheid fortress. As earlier observed, there were other states apart from Nigeria which participated actively in and outside the UN towards the liberation of Africa from colonial rule. However, Nigeria features prominently in this dissertation by virtue of it being used as the case study. These countries include independent African countries such as Ghana, the Arab states, the frontline states of Southern Africa and the Nordic states of Northern Europe. However, as mentioned above, this study focuses specifically on Nigeria because the study links the role played by this country with its current bid for a permanent membership seat on the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) should it become available. The study examines the extent to which Nigeria's roles in African decolonization can help its case for the UNSC bid given that there are challenges that Nigeria faces in this respect of which the "domestic condition" plays a dominant role.

As mentioned above, Nigeria became a member of the UN in 1960 and fully participated in the debates that ensued in subsequent years. As an African member state, Nigeria vowed to articulate the views of other African countries and their people, especially those still languishing under colonial rule and apartheid. This historical background provides the context within which Nigeria's political activities in the UN should be conceptualized. Moreover, such background

---

[2] See Mr Prime Minister, A Selection of Speeches Made by Sir, Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Prime Minister of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1960-1966, Published by the Nigerian Ministry of Information, Lagos, Nigeria, 1964, p. 54.

information provides the basis on which Nigeria claims its legitimacy for getting a permanent position in the UNSC.

While being cognizant of the fact that Nigeria is a federal government with 36 states, this study will deliberately use the term "Nigeria" because the views articulated in different platforms did not represent individual states but the country as whole. In the light of the synopsis presented above, this study investigates the issues which directly affect Nigeria's politics within the broader African and global politics. These issues include Nigeria's role in the decolonization of Africa, the contributions and the positions taken in the UN by regional and cross-continental groupings such as the Afro-Asian countries most notably, the Western and Eastern countries, as well as the Latin American groups on the issues of decolonization and looks at where Nigeria located itself in the debates that ensued thereafter.

This study discursively established that Nigeria's foreign policy conformed significantly to the country's political role and contributions on the issue of decolonization of Africa in the UN. Importantly, this study did a discourse analysis which established that Nigeria's activities in the UN were driven by the country's desire to play a leading role in African politics as implied in the current debates on Nigeria's quest for a permanent seat in the UNSC. This study was carried out in both the historical and contemporary contexts in order to be able to draw the link between Nigeria's past and present political activities. The historical context entails an analysis of events and developments as they unfolded from the 1960s onwards, while the contemporary context focuses on the current debates outlined above.

1.2.   Statement of the Research Problem

The major task of this study was to examine the role played by Nigeria as a country on the decolonization of fellow Africa countries working through the UN and its implications for the country's bid for a permanent seat in the UNSC. In particular, the study analyses the historical statements/pronouncements made by various Nigerian leaders regarding their quest for the

liberation of Africa with the view to establishing the motivating factors behind their actions. In view of the foregoing, the following questions were considered in the study:

- What were the reasons behind Nigeria's involvement in decolonization issues in the UN?
- Were the reasons overtly articulated by the Nigerian leaders?
- Why was the issue of decolonization politicized in the UN?
- What role did Nigeria play on issues of decolonization in the UN?
- What should Nigeria do to bolster its case for claiming the permanent seat in the UNSC?

1.3.   Objectives of the Study

Broader issues which this study sought to address include crucial questions which have both historical and current relevance. An attempt shall be made below to invoke the utilitarian role of history in addressing current and future problems. This will include the following:

- The circumstances that led to Nigeria's agitations for decolonization of African countries.

- Stakeholders (individual and collective) which should be credited for ending colonization.

- Factors that motivated successive Nigerian governments from 1960 to 1994 to support the campaign for African decolonization in the UN and;

-The challenges that threaten Nigeria's current bid for a UNSC permanent seat.

1.4.   Scope of the Study

The struggle against colonialism in Africa was one of the history shaping events of the 20th century. The emergence of over a dozen of African countries from colonial subjugation in 1960 was a significant factor in the increased agitation for self-rule in Africa as the liberated African territories joined their freedom-loving comrades across the world to demand freedom from colonial domination and servitude. Nigeria, Africa's most populous country motivated by the urge to assert itself as African leader, joined forces with progressive member states of the UN to seek solutions to the African colonial problem. Against the background of the foregoing, this

study covers the extent to which Nigeria used the UN platform in pursuing its decolonization agenda.

This Study also covers the political developments which characterized the issue of decolonization among the leading countries of the world and the then emerging new countries of Afro-Asian and Latin American origin that participated actively in the debates which ensued in the UNGA on the colonial problem. Thus this study has a timeline which begins from 1960 when Nigeria joined the UN and ends in 1994 when South Africa joined the rest of the African continent in becoming the last democratic country in Africa. Thereafter, the study discusses the contemporary implications of these earlier developments for Nigeria's UNSC seat ambition.

1.5.   Significance of the Study

The study's significance is both historical and current. On the historical front, it provides a chronological analysis of the sequence of events over the three decades, presenting both the positive and negative sides of Nigeria's political activities. The findings of this study will add to the existing body of knowledge and understanding of the subject and theme of this study.   In a nutshell, the study is significant in the sense that it will:

- Provide an in-depth analysis of Nigeria's foreign policy, taking into consideration the manner in which it was used to pursue the decolonization of Africa in the UN;
- Identify and explore the historical developments which led to the politicization of the Decolonization issue in the UN;
- Investigate Nigeria's political role viz-a-viz other key actors like the Western and Eastern Countries, Afro-Asian, the Caribbean countries; and   the   Latin   American nations on the issue of decolonization;
- Examine Nigeria's role in   the anti-colonial committee of the UN in order to ascertain its political role and contribution;

- Analyse the contemporary context, the implications of Nigeria-UN decolonization role on the country's current bid for permanent membership seat on the UN Security Council with a focus on the challenges and the prospects and;

- Generate greater awareness especially within Nigeria as a country on the need to

Tackle the challenges that will be articulated by the study based on collected data.

1.6. Methodology

The author took cognisance of the nature of this study before deciding on the methodology to employ. To this end, this study was crafted based on the qualitative research method. The study relied mainly on archival sources i.e. documents, records, transcripts, proceedings of parliamentary debates which were supplemented by newspapers and literatures that covered events affecting Nigerian/UN relations. Given that this study is historical, a historical analysis approach helped to drive home the arguments presented in this study. This study also did a thorough examination of existing literatures and a perusal of other relevant sources that included internet sources, scholarly/academic journals, magazines, and monographs.

The views collated by the author from respondents in the research field were used to either support or counter/negate the arguments made in the study. Suffice to say that some of the respondents spoke on condition of anonymity while others abstained totally from the exercise. Ordinarily, the use of interview as the primary source of data collection in research ought not to be relevant to this study given that it is a historical research – although this data collection method would have enriched the study in a way if cogently thought through and employed.

1.6.1. Historical Analysis Defined

As earlier mentioned, this study leans on the historical analysis approach. What then does "historical analysis" entail? Historical analysis has been explained by various authors. For instance, Wyche, Sengers, and Grinter (2006), defined historical analysis as a method of discovering from records and accounts what happened in the past. They argued that in

historical analysis, researchers consider various sources of historical data such as historical text, newspaper reports, diaries, and maps. According to these authors, this method is used by historians to gain insights into social phenomena.

Another author, Gardner (2006), described historical analysis as a strategy for establishing a context or background against which a substantive contemporary study may be set. Thus, this study falls within the domain of the foregoing definitions and description of historical analysis as the study was carried out in line with the methods articulated above. From the historical analysis of events and trends which were discussed, this study proceeded to analyse the implications of the findings generated for Nigeria's current bid for the permanent membership seat of the UNSC. The study considered this approach necessary in order not to constrain the study to the past alone.

1.7. Overview of the Study

As earlier noted, this study investigates Nigeria's agency and impact in advocating for African decolonization within the organizational body of the UN in the three decades between its own independence in 1960 and the formal democratic transition of South Africa in 1994. Its focus is on the official national policy and discourses, treating "Nigeria" as a unified governmental entity, and its policy actions constituting an integrated and purposive player. This discourse sheds light on Nigeria's quest for a permanent seat in the UNSC, within an emerging global system of nation states as the Nigerian governmental campaigns have utilized this history since the 1990s to make claims about its popular legitimacy for the UNSC seat. To engage these discursively, this study is presented in six different chapters, each of which addresses a particular theme.

Chapter one presents an introduction and general background to the study. It features the statement of the problem, the significance of the study, the scope of the study, the objectives of the study, methodology, and the overview of the study. **Chapter two** is the literature review. The chapter did an extensive review of existing literatures on the topic under investigation and

considered conceptual clarifications of terms such as colonialism, decolonization, Pan-Africanism, and Cold War in historical perspectives. Theoretically, this chapter examined the political realist theory which was used in framing this study. **Chapter three** embodies the history of Nigeria's foreign policy between 1960 and 1994; it discusses the dynamics of Nigeria's foreign policy within a 34 years period focusing on the advocacy and articulation of the colonial problem as well as the intermittent change of government in Nigeria and how this impacted upon the country's foreign policy agenda. The chapter also identifies the general tendencies across the UN system.

Chapter four may be regarded as the heart of this study as the issues contained therein are critical and relevant to the title of this dissertation. The chapter examined the politics of decolonization in the UN from 1960 to 1994. The issues discussed in the chapter are presented in historical and political contexts including the events leading to the politicization of decolonization issues in the UN. This chapter also covers Nigeria's political role on African decolonization and its activities with other countries in the UN during the period aforementioned.

Chapter five discusses the contemporary implications of Nigeria's role in African decolonization process in the UN for the country's quest for the UNSC permanent seat through the analysis of prospects and challenges. The chapter taps into the empirical data to establish the thinking that guided certain decisions that were taken by the Nigerian leadership on the issues of decolonization. This data is complimented by the views expressed by the other scholars in the literature as far as the subject of this chapter is concerned. **Chapter six**, the concluding chapter presents the conclusions on the key issues discussed in the study. It demonstrates the study's contribution to new knowledge and makes recommendations that should inform future studies and proposes the way forward regarding Nigeria's quest for a permanent seat in the UNSC. Recommendations for other contenders for the UNSC seat as well as for the AU are provided in this chapter for possible consideration.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

A literature review in any field is essential as it offers a comprehensive overview and recapitulation on the given scholarship from past to present, giving the reader a sense of focus as to which direction your new research is headed[3]

2.1.   Introduction

The essence of literature review is to keep abreast on the past and present debates in a given field of study/research. The review of related literatures helps to reshape and more importantly, open up the research questions to new possibilities. Thus, in this chapter, a review of previous works which are related to this study will be done. The review will cover the studies carried out by authors, researchers, as well as the views of relevant stakeholders in the field of international relations. In particular, this chapter will also examine notable works on Nigeria's foreign policy and its role on colonial issues in the United Nations since the country's independence in 1960 and subsequent admission into the world body. Moreover, against the background of Nigeria's governmental campaigns which has utilized the country's historical record in the area of African decolonization in seeking a permanent membership seat for the country in the United Nations Security Council, this chapter will explore arguments for and against this exercise. It will look at Nigeria's role in the UN and the country's political ambitions on the global stage. Simply put, the chapter seeks to establish the relationship between Nigeria's past political activities and its current political ambitions.

---

[3] See Kim S. (2013), "The Importance of Literature Review in Research" available online at:
http://hubpages.com/hub/literature_review.

Furthermore, the chapter will also present the conceptual clarification of key terms used in the study. These terms include: National Interest, Foreign policy, Cold war, Pan-Africanism, Politics, Decolonization, and Colonialism. The foregoing terms are pivotal to this study hence the need for consideration. The theoretical framework for the study - political Realism also features under this chapter. Its relevance to the study, justification for choosing the theoretical framework, as well as the criticism levelled against the theory by scholars and other commentators are subjected to scrutiny in this chapter.

It is a fact that there is vast literature that exists on decolonization and nationalism. However, authors tackle these themes in different contexts and in order to meet different objectives. For example, Anderson's seminal work *Imagined Communities* (1991) theorizes on how and why nations are imagined. Acemoglu and Robinson's work *Why Nations Fail* (2012) discusses the reasons that have made different nations to fail. The reality is that over the years concepts that were assumed to have fixed meanings have been problematized as contexts change. Thus the concepts referred to above have not been immune to this development. However, the focus of the study is not to dwell on the concepts as such but to use them in a general sense in order to understand Nigeria's historical and current political activities. In light of this, the present chapter reviews relevant literatures on the topic for the following reasons:

-To establish what has been covered on this topic over the past few decades so that the study
  Does not fall into the trap of repeating what has already been covered by previous authors;
-To assess the existing sources in order to establish their strengths and weaknesses;
-To identify gaps that still needs to be filled in an attempt to have a better understanding of
- Nigeria's contribution to global politics through the instrumentality of the U.N. machinery; -
And finally to spell out how the present study aims to fill this lacuna in order to enhance our understanding of Nigerian politics and contextualize the country's current ambition to get a permanent seat on the UNSC.

2. 2.   Contextualizing the Politics of Decolonization in the UN

As noted above, Nigeria joined the UN in 1960 and participated in the anti-colonial debates which ensued thereafter. These debates subsequently assumed a political dimension in the world body due to the prevailing situations on the international scene at the time. The Cold War phenomenon; the Congo crisis; coupled with the Sharpeville incident in South-Africa formed the core of the issues which dominated World politics at the time.   Within the context of African continental politics, there were also issues such as the intra-African power rivalry evidently manifested in the ideological division among the then independent African states (Nigeria included) which formed the continental body–the Organization of African Unity (OAU). As a new entrant into the biggest and the most influential diplomatic and political arena of the international system - the United Nations, Nigeria, notwithstanding its inexperience as regards global politics, actively participated in the series of debates that dwelled on the colonial situation in Africa at the time. As an African member state with a strong continental leadership ambitions, Nigeria vowed to articulate the views of other African countries and their peoples, especially those still languishing under colonial rule and apartheid. As mentioned above, there were issues that dominated global politics which the Cold War was part of. The Cold War - the ideological battle for world dominance and supremacy between the Soviet Union and the United States and their allies – was a situation which had existed prior to the time of the debates on the decolonization of Africa in the UN.

This phenomenon was to later polarize the UN along the Western and Eastern divide due to the desire of both camps to dominate the world. It was under these thick clouds of hegemonic struggle – the Cold War that Nikita Khrushchev, the Soviet Union leader submitted a request on September 23, 1960, that an additional item, a declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples to be added to the agenda of the fifteenth session of the UN General Assembly which was slated for October 1960.   The Soviet Union's request received massive support from the UN General Assembly members; a development which politicized the decolonization process as the enlarged contingent of the newly independent African countries

of which Nigeria was part, as well as the Asian and some Latin American countries, gave their support to the Soviet Union's anti-colonial declaration. Kay (1970) observed that Nigeria, despite being a pro-western nation, gave unqualified support to the Soviet anti-colonial declaration. The support garnered by the Soviet Union among the Afro-Asian, and Latin American countries unsettled the western colonialist countries who accused the Soviet Union of being guilty of the same situation they vehemently condemned.

From the above, it can be deduced that the Western and Eastern responses to colonial issues were influenced by prior events which preceded the era of the debates on the colonial question in the UN. The above sentiment was corroborated by Mckay (1963) who argued that the Soviet Union's support for African decolonization was firmly rooted in the country's determination to penetrate the continent of Africa, a move which had been thwarted on several occasions by the western countries prior to the time of the debates on colonialism in the UN. Hence, the Soviet Union diplomats found the UN platform as a valuable instrument for spreading their anti-colonial campaigns and propaganda. According to the author, this attempt was primarily aimed at subverting the western alliance which was a stumbling block to the Soviet Union's interest of fostering the communist ideology on the African continent. The author stated further that the world body became a useful tool in the hands of the Soviet Union representatives. The tactics employed by the country helped to build its reputation as a friend of the colonized peoples. African nationalists' leaders and liberation - burden bearers found that it was the Soviet delegates who stood firm against colonialism and said things they wanted to hear and western delegates who did not. Thus, African leaders and leading lights in the UN saw in the Soviet Union a country that was not only sympathetic about the plight of the colonized African peoples but also an ally in the anti-colonial struggle.

The above was corroborated by Luard (1994) when he opined that the Soviet's action stemmed from her quest to win the support of the Afro-Asian countries who were either former colonies or still languished under the yoke of colonialism at the time. He pointedly argued:

The Russians, in particular…. during the visit of Mr Khrushchev to the UN in 1960, gave every possible emphasis to anti-colonial issues, in an attempt to win the support of the Afro-Asians. The Soviet-sponsored resolution 1514, calling for the end of colonialism and a timetable to bring this about, was a striking example of that strategy (Luard, 1994:157).

The foregoing sentiments were advanced by Dallin (1963:13) when he argued that the Soviet Union's anti-colonial posture was influenced basically by political and economic considerations although disguised as moral concerns. He stated further that the country's interest lied in her desire "…..to deny Africa to the west and especially to deprive the United States and its allies of political influence, economic opportunities, and strategic bases in Africa". Thus the politicization of colonial issues in the UN can be understood against this background. This view was buttressed by Legum (1980:7) who argued that the Soviet Union approached Africa with a particular set of objectives in mind. According to this author, Africa featured in the Soviet Union's global strategic plans. He reasoned: "First is to spread the political and economic influence of the Soviet Union in manner consonant with its role as World power. The second . . . is to diminish or eliminate Western influence and control."

The struggle for global ideological dominance defined and shaped the positions taken by the Eastern and Western World on issues of colonialism in Africa. Baker (1968) lent credence to this when he posited that the Soviet's opposition to western colonialism in Africa was strategically designed to woo the newly emerging states in the hope of isolating them from the western bloc-the former's arch-rival in the international circuit. He went on to say that the most dramatic example of the anti-colonial stance of the Soviet Union happened in 1960 during the fifteenth session of the UN General Assembly. Here, the Soviet leader, Premier Khrushchev, called for the immediate independence and dismantling of all colonial empires on the African continent.

There are recent literatures which support the arguments made above. For instance Meredith (2006) corroborated the views articulated above when he advanced the view that the Soviet Union's backing of the anti-colonial cause was a strategy aimed at gaining the support of African leaders and politicians who were at the time grappling with the scourge of colonialism and racism that bedevilled the continent. The Soviets as noted earlier were desirous of spreading their ideology across Africa. Therefore, they embarked on series of anti-colonial and anti-west campaigns to gain influence among African leaders of the newly independent states. With the entire world engulfed by the flames of the Cold War, issues of global concern and significance like decolonization and racism became politicized due to the sheer desire of the Soviet Union to extend it sphere of influence to Africa. The United States – which was the opposing power bloc of the Cold War era, saw the anti-colonial stance of the Soviet Union and its pro-African independence declaration as a strategic plan which would give its rival bloc, the Soviets, access to the continent. The then U.S President John F. Kennedy perceived the Soviet Union's action as an attempt to turn Africa into an open field in the ideological struggle for World dominance. Between the so - called superpowers, Kennedy asserted: "We see Africa as probably the greatest open field of manoeuvre in the worldwide competition between the communist bloc and the non-communist" (Meredith 2006:143). The statement credited to the former U.S President further indicates that the Cold War crisis played a major role in the African decolonization process.

Furthermore, Meredith (2006) noted that on the global stage African countries attracted the attention of the world's feuding rival blocs. The position that each newly independent country adopted in its foreign relations with the West or East was viewed as a matter of importance. The existence of the Cold War ensured that Africa was considered to be too valuable a prize to lose. While the old colonial powers sought to strengthen the special relationship which they had with their former colonies, the Soviet Union-led Eastern bloc embarked on major campaigns to gain influence in the new countries in order to reduce the power orbit of the Western powers. With both blocs seeking their support, African nationalist leaders and

politicians became the beautiful bride being sought after by the opposing blocs. According Meredith (2006), while some African leaders played along, some preferred to stay aloof of the Cold War crisis. The more idealist leaders such as Tanzania's Julius Nyerere beckoned on his fellow African leaders to steer clear of the sterile quarrels of the Cold War. Some jettisoned his appeal and sought to gain maximum advantage from it. The foregoing shows that the Cold War indeed affected the course of African decolonization as much as it supported it.

There is more evidence to suggest that the African decolonization issue was politicized. For instance, Sullivan (2005:105) buttressed the above arguments when he observed that "At the time of African decolonization, the Cold War was already in the process of being thoroughly globalized. Throughout Africa, decolonization frequently became entangled with the East-West conflict". The author submitted that the issue of African decolonization was viewed through the lens of the Cold War, hence its politicization. Judging from the views expressed by these authors, one can deduce that colonial issues were indeed politicized in the UN. Suffice it to say that this development has its root in historical resentment between the Soviet Union - led Eastern bloc and the Western bloc led by the United States of America and its colonialist European allies. The Soviet Union's decision to demand independence for the colonized African territories politicized the decolonization process as Nigeria along with other African, Asian and some Latin American countries took sides with the Soviet Union in opposition to the Western colonialist countries who delayed in granting political independence to their colonies.

2.3.   Nigeria's Role in the Decolonization of Africa

Where does Nigeria fit in this broader context? The answer could be found from the fact that literature abound on Nigeria's role and contribution towards the demise of European colonialism in Africa. Though Nigeria was not the only country in the anti-colonial vanguard, the available literature however shows that Nigeria made substantial contributions to the anti-colonial project. Garba (1987) reflected on Nigeria's anti-colonial drive when he affirmed that the country intensified diplomatic campaign outside the African continent to gain support for the liberation forces in southern Rhodesia now known as Zimbabwe using the UN as a platform.

According to the author, the then Nigerian Military Head of state General Olusegun Obasanjo had in an address to the UN General Assembly in October 1977, maintained Nigeria's commitment to African decolonization when he condemned the colonial regime in Zimbabwe for working to perpetuate itself in power through a so-called internal settlement arrangement. The Nigerian government used the occasion to call for the unequivocal and unconditional relinquishing of power by the white minority ruling population over the people of the African continent. This however does not in any way suggest that Nigeria acted alone in its anti-colonial pursuit. There is enough evidence to suggest that the country worked in concert with other African states as well as other countries of the world.

While reflecting on the conduct of Nigeria's foreign policy and its role in African decolonization issues, Morgan and Webber (2002:246) lucidly and authoritatively argued that the Nigerian state had since the attainment of self-government in 1960 sustained a foreign policy "characterized by a strident pan-Africanist, anti-apartheid rhetoric and a degree of influence throughout Sub-Saharan Africa." The county, the authors recalled, was a prominent supporter of the anti-colonial cause in Angola and Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) in the 1970s and during the 1980s provided important support for South West African People's Organization (SWAPO) of Namibia and for South-Africa's African National Congress (ANC). Nigeria's anti-apartheid credentials according to these authors, won the country a place in the Eminent Persons Group which was put in place by the Commonwealth in 1986 to mediate in the political crisis in South-Africa's apartheid enclave. The above view was buttressed by Ajaebili (2011) who argued that Nigeria's post-independence foreign policy dwelt on pursuit of the policies of decolonization of Africa; the country's role according to the author was crucial in the independence of countries such as Angola, Congo, Mozambique, Zimbabwe and South-Africa.

The foregoing submission was buttressed by Fafowora (2001:16) when he noted that Nigeria was named a frontline state because of its role in the struggle against colonialism and apartheid in Africa. He put it thus "...there can be no question about Nigeria's outstanding contribution at

the U.N. towards the problem of decolonization as well as the struggle against the racist regime of South-Africa. It was in those early days that Nigeria quickly established itself as an uncompromising opponent of racism in Africa, a position which it has consistently, and without any equivocation, maintained at the United Nations"

The above position affirms Nigeria's contributory role in the decolonization of continental Africa. It is also reflective of the fact that the country utilized the UN platform to press for the independence of other African countries. It should be emphasized here that Nigeria never acted alone on the issue but in unison with other progressive member states in the UN. Nigeria also demonstrated its determination to bring colonialism to a halt in Africa by taking a hard position against the apartheid regime of South-Africa. Adetula (2005) cited Nigeria's activities in the UN on colonial issues as proof of its willingness to help terminate colonial rule in the continent of Africa. But this does not mean that Nigeria acted single-handedly to do the aforesaid, the country joined the rest of the world in doing so.

The above was corroborated by Gambari (2005) who argued that Nigeria established itself as an anti-colonial fighter with her involvement in the UN anti-colonial activities. The author attributes the country's efforts in this regard to the cardinal aspect of its foreign policy which was to assist in the African decolonization process. He asserts:

> Nigeria has established herself as a strong advocate and reliable defender of Africa's concerns and interest at the United Nations-especially on the question of decolonization and the struggle against apartheid. On decolonization, it has been a cardinal aspect of Nigeria's foreign policy to assist, within the limit of its resources, in the decolonization process in Africa. Nigeria's role was central to the struggle against apartheid, the institutionalized form of racism in South-Africa, which was declared "a crime against humanity" and gross violation of universal declaration of human rights and an assault on the dignity of black man….. (Gambari, 2005: 189)

17

Another work that is of relevance to the study is Ogwu's (1986). The author authoritatively captured Nigeria's commitment to the decolonization process in Africa. She advanced the view that Nigeria relied on the UN for the solution of international problems especially those related to Africa. These aims according to the author were clearly demonstrated in Nigeria's active participation and vociferous demands on the issues of apartheid and all forms of inhuman treatment meted out on Africans by the European colonizers. She further stated that in the UN, Nigeria was known for her unyielding stance against colonialism and racism as the country used the various organs of the world body to champion the cause of her fellow African countries still under colonial rule and apartheid. The author argues:

> Because of its interest and commitment to the issue of decolonization and racism, Nigeria since the mid- seventies had been consistently elected to the chair of the special committee on apartheid. The most significant of the committee's achievements is that it has on numerous occasions with varying degree of successes sought to induce various organs of the UN to isolate South-Africa and to scrutinize more closely the inhuman policies of the white minority regime. (Ogwu 1986:117)

From the above, the author seems to give an impression that Nigeria acted solely in the fight against colonialism and apartheid working through the UN's anti-colonial committee. This is not so; Nigeria worked alongside other countries who were members of the UN anti-colonial committee. Although Nigeria occupied the chairmanship post of the committee for decades, the country never acted independently in the pursuit of the committee's mandate. The view that Nigeria acted in concert with other progressive forces to help rid the Southern African region of white minority regimes was well articulated by Ogunsanwo (2010), who noted that Nigeria's total rejection of racism and apartheid was consistent with similar rejection by civilized humanity and progressive forces outside Africa.

Another work that supports the above view is Adeniran (1986). The author maintained in this work that Nigeria's interest in the UN revolved majorly around Africa's colonial plight. This role was manifested in the area of decolonization and condemnation of the apartheid racist political order in South-Africa. According to the author, Nigeria demonstrated her zeal to help stamp out colonialism from the continent when she assumed the leadership of the UN anti-colonial committee for more than a decade. This further reveals Nigeria's commitment to African decolonization working through the UN system. This sentiment was corroborated by *the New Nigerian Features* when the Newspaper noted that the UN has served as a kernel of Nigeria's foreign policy during the struggle against apartheid and supremacists regimes in Southern Africa. The paper observed that Nigeria was instrumental to the UN decision which expelled apartheid South Africa from the UN in 1974.[4]

 While appraising Nigeria's push for the liberation of Africa from European colonialism Uhomoibhi (2008)   posited that the country played a leading role in the termination of foreign rule on the continent. This role was evident during Nigeria's long tenure of the UN Special Committee on Apartheid which spanned over two decades. The above was buttressed by Akpotor and Agbebaku (2010) when they argued that Nigerian successive administrations fought against apartheid and other forms of racial oppression in Africa. Arising from this development, the country became a leading light in the fight against colonialism; though not a member state of the Southern African region became a member of the frontline states in the battle against apartheid South-Africa and colonialism. But there is no indication that such involvement was meant to be used as a political leverage at a later stage as seems to be the case currently.

As mentioned above, Nigeria worked together with other countries in the anti-colonial battle. Adeniji (2005) asserts that Nigeria executed its campaign against colonialism and apartheid in

---

[4] See the New Nigerian, Tuesday, July 14, 1998.

the UN when the country joined other well- meaning member states of the organization to call for the granting of political freedom to those countries still languishing under colonial rule. He summed Nigeria's efforts in this regard thus:

> …the UN provided for Nigeria a valuable forum for the achievement of the much irreversible march to the liquidation of colonialism in Africa….. Nigeria put the liquidation of white minority rule in Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) and South-Africa very high on its foreign policy agenda, and mobilized international support to expedite and achieve black majority rule and democratic dispensation in both countries…… (Adeniji 2005:3-4)

The above position lent credence to Nigeria's UN anti-colonial activities thus making the country one of the frontrunners in the fight for the dismantling of colonialism and apartheid in Africa. The same view is held by Garba-Abdul (1987) who observed that Nigeria used the UN platform to prosecute its decolonization agenda. According to the author Nigeria's endeavours in this regard was evident within the UN General Assembly where the country called for "African decolonization and the eradication of apartheid" (Garba-Abdul 1987: 42). This attests to the fact that Nigeria was not the only country to fight for this cause but added its voice to pre-existing calls.

The truism that Nigeria was not the only country that called for the decolonization of Africa was well captured in Obiozor (1984) when he noted that Nigeria joined other African states to persuade the rest of the world to see apartheid and colonialism as a fundamental threat not only to Black Africans but also to global peace and security which requires urgent attention. These views were expressly articulated in the United Nations where Nigeria worked together with other states of the international community to sympathize with fellow African countries and peoples still under colonial captivity. Nigeria queued behind other progressive forces in the crusade against colonialism. Wayas (1979) argued that the OAU and its member states (Nigeria

included) responded by backing the popular Marxist Movement – the Popular Front for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) of Agostino Neto. The author stated further that the victory of Marxist MPLA of Agostino Neto, through the Military aid of Cuba and the political and economic backing especially of Nigeria played pivotal roles in the liberation of Angola.

The commitment of the Nigerian state to the issues of apartheid and colonialism was never in doubt. Akinyemi (1978) shared this sentiment when he observed that the country demonstrated its willingness to end colonialism when Nigeria aligned itself with other states of the world that were sympathetic to the plight of the oppressed peoples of Africa under colonial regimes. Nigeria's anti - colonial policy became assertive and unwavering in the 60s and 70s. Curry (1988) noted that the country became a leader in search for regional unity and development. Nigeria, according to the author, played key roles in the formation of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) the sub-regional body for West Africa. The country also became a force for pan-Africanism co-operation as evident in the country's activities within the OAU. It was also a leading voice in the liberation of African territories under colonial rule and apartheid.

The country provided support for the frontline states in Southern Africa. In pursuit of these policies, Nigeria's foreign policy occasionally came up against, and overrode certain western interest. These include the United States interest in Angola; that of France in the establishment of ECOWAS, and in the establishment of OPEC cartel. Most dramatically was the issue of Britain when Nigeria unilaterally decided in 1979 to nationalize BP because of its violations of the international oil embargo against apartheid South-Africa. While it is undisputable that Nigeria played an important role in the liberation of African countries from colonial rule and also enhanced African unity both in theory and in practice, however, the issue of the liberation of Africa from European colonialist predates Nigeria's independence. As Ogban – Iyam (1993) argued the issue of colonialism and apartheid had long been raised in the United Nations prior to Nigeria's attainment of political independence in 1960. Implicit in the author's position is the

fact that the UN merely provided the country (Nigeria) with a platform for the denunciation of colonialism and apartheid; and also to advocate for the decolonization of Africa. The views expressed above were reinforced by Sesay and Owoeye (1993) who both observed that Nigeria was highly instrumental to demise of apartheid and colonialism in Africa. According to the authors, there was no other problem in the international scene that captured Nigeria's attention as the issue of apartheid and colonialism. Over the years, Nigerian successive administrations have condemned in the most virulent fashion the anti-human policy of apartheid. Nigeria according to them was among African and non-African countries which supported the UN imposed sanctions against Ian Smith's Rhodesia regime in 1967.

The problems created by the refusal of the three liberation forces in Angola namely the popular front for the Liberation of Angola MPLA, the National front for Liberation of Angola FNLA, and the National Union for Total Independence of Angola - UNITA to close ranks and joined forces to unseat the stubborn Portuguese colonial regime in Angola was a foreign policy challenge to Nigeria as the Cold War clouds descended heavily on Angola. According to Akinboye (1999), Nigeria's initial primary concern was the establishment of a national government by the three leading liberation movements and political groups – the MPLA, FNLA and UNITA. However, the East – West ideological scrambling became manifest as the three groups aligned to each of the existing opposing ideological blocs-the Soviet Union led East and the United States led West. While the MPLA gained the support of the Soviet Union, the FNLA and UNITA were backed by the United States and the apartheid regime of South Africa.

Presented with this scenario, the Nigerian government under Muritala/Obasanjo pleaded with the three liberation groups to jointly work in unity of purpose to gain independence in the interest of their people. The Nigerian government therefore called for a government national unity in Angola which would expedite the sacking of the Portuguese rulers. However, it soon became clear to the Nigerian leadership that apartheid South Africa's machinations was about to produce a puppet government in Luanda through UNITA and FNLA. This forced the Nigerian

government to reconsider its position thus leading to the recognition of the MPLA government as the legitimate government and the one representing the interest of the Angolan people. Nigeria's decision in this regard was instrumental to the Organization of African Unity's OAU decision to accord the MPLA recognition.

As part of its desire to help rid Africa of colonial domination, Nigeria alongside other member states of the world participated in the series of negotiations which led to the independence of countries like Namibia, Angola and Zimbabwe. Tarka (1984) reckons that Nigeria participated actively in the Negotiations as a member of Africa's continental organization – the OAU – and as the then chairman of the defunct anti-apartheid committee of the United Nations. At the UN, Nigeria alongside other freedom loving countries endorsed the UN's resolution 435 on Namibia, and rejected the U.S-South-African machinations which linked Cuban troops' withdrawal from Angola with independence for Namibia.

 This implies that there were attempts by the U.S. and the apartheid government of South-Africa to use the Cold War as a bargaining tool for the attainment of Namibia's independence. It then leads to the conclusion that the ideological battle – cum Cold War leveraged on the decolonization process during the period under study. This further gives credence to the politicization of African decolonization not by African countries but by extra-African forces. This author concluded that the successive Nigerian governments have not only been favourably disposed towards Namibian liberation movements such as SWAPO, but also contributed financially towards the UN established commission for Namibia, a commission set up to train Namibians in the act of governance in anticipation of apartheid South Africa agreeing to pull out from the forcefully occupied territory.

There is evidence that Nigeria took some radical measures against western economic interests (especially that of the British) in Nigeria as part of its strategies to help liquidate colonialism in Africa. Okunnu (1988) observed that Nigeria, in a bid to force the heart-hardened colonialist to

do the needful, took a decision that astonished many observers when the Nigerian leadership under the then military regime of General Olusegun Obasanjo nationalized the British petroleum and also acquired majority equity interests in the British Barclays Bank of Nigeria whose name was changed to Union Bank of Nigeria. The Standard Bank was also affected in the process. This act of bravery displayed by the then Nigerian government was in response to the fragrant business activities which these companies were reported to be having with the racist regimes in Southern Africa. The activities of these British companies were considered by the Nigeria of the time as a major threat and hindrance to the anti-colonial march in Africa. The above is a pointer that Nigeria did not just offer political and diplomatic assistance in the anti-colonial struggle but also employed economic measures which were inimical to the British – the country's ex-colonial power. The views expressed above were buttressed by Akindele (2005) when he argued that Nigeria used the UN platform to pursue its decolonization agenda because the country perceived the UN as the most important diplomatic platform where Nigeria worked with other countries for the purpose of attaining political independence for African countries. The submission shows that Nigeria's pursuit of Africa's decolonization was done in alignment with other countries in the UN and not in isolation.

The fact that Nigeria pursued an anti-colonial foreign policy was indisputable. Adebo (1988) advanced the view that the eradication of colonialism from the face of the earth, particularly from the continent of Africa ran through Nigeria's foreign policy agenda and dominated its foreign policy actions in the UN since 1960 when the country was admitted into the organization. This is in line with the submissions made by other authors. However, like all others, Adebo, a former Nigerian permanent representative to the United Nations does not create an impression that Nigeria did all this in anticipation of a political reward at a later stage such as being perceived as the best candidate for the permanent seat in the UNSC.

There is evidence that Nigeria's activities in the fight against colonialism and apartheid were not consistent throughout nor did they go unhindered. For example, Asobie (2010) argued that

the Nigerian government re-ignited its anti-colonial ambitions immediately after the country's civil war. This means that there was a halt, albeit temporal while the country tried to address its own internal crisis. After the war in question, Nigeria presented a new program of action on the decolonization of Africa in the UN. The author reckons that the plan was strategically designed to expedite action on the colonial situation in Africa.

The plan presented by the Nigerian government sought a timetable which would end colonialism, racism and domination of Africa by Europe. It also encompassed an idea of having a special UN fund which would help to support liberation movements across Africa as well as other colonized territories the world over. In addition to this, the Nigerian government also suggested at the UN that a Special African task force be put in place to support the liberation movements across Africa. This suggestion was premised on the assumption that force would be the most effective strategy for ending colonialism and racism on the continent. The plan also sought to engage the armies of independent African states directly in the liberation struggles of which Nigeria and other independent African countries were expected to bear the burden.

Available literature shows that the UN system has been a solution provider to certain challenges of the Nigerian state. Saliu (2006) noted that the Apartheid aberration in South Africa was one of those challenges that confronted the Nigerian governments since independence. He opines that it was through the effective usage of the UN General Assembly and the UN anti-apartheid committee which had enjoyed a consistent Nigerian leadership for the better part of the committee's existence, that the apartheid state became one of Nigeria's pre-occupation in the realm of international relations; the effect of which made the apartheid rulers to relinquish power to a majority government led by South Africa's foremost anti-apartheid fighter Dr Nelson Mandela in 1994 thus marking the end of colonialism, racism and apartheid on the continent. Even most recent literature corroborates the views expressed by the authors discussed above. Sani (2012) submitted that Nigeria used the UN Anti-apartheid

committee, which was chaired by the country for several years, to draw the attention of the world to the African position on racism and colonialism which bedevilled the African continent.

In its pursuit of decolonization of Africa, Nigeria became a member of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) of the UN in 1976. The ECOSOC is one of the six organs of the UN which comprised of 54 member states. The organ is statutorily empowered and mandated to address and take decisions on key social, humanitarian, and cultural matters that affect the world. Lending credence to this, Oche (2005) reckons that Nigeria used ECOSOC to drum support for its decolonization campaign. The author argued that it was largely the initiative of Nigeria with the support of some African countries that led (ECOSOC) to declare 1973-1983 the decade for Action to combat racism and racial discrimination in Africa. This position shows that Nigeria galvanized other countries (in Africa and abroad) in the decolonization struggle. The view that Nigeria did not act in isolation is well documented. Osuntokun (2005) opined that due to Nigeria's commitment towards African decolonization, the country was able to enlist the support of other countries in the UN. The author maintained that it was easy for Nigeria's foreign policy to find sympathizers in Scandinavia, the socialist countries of Eastern Europe, Asia and Latin America who were once under colonial rule. Such views place Nigeria's cause within the broader international context. Similarly, Nigeria also prosecuted the anti-colonial and anti – apartheid struggles at a huge financial cost. Again, Osuntokun (2008:142) noted that: "The greatest success stories of Nigeria's policy have been the decolonization and anti-apartheid struggle, towards which the country invested well over $1 billion." This shows that Nigeria contributed financially to the African liberation movements.

While emphasizing the integral role played by Nigeria in the emancipation of Africa from colonial rule, Fawole (2003) posits that the country's overall interest lied in the total commitment to the abolition of apartheid and other manifestations of racial supremacist tendencies in Africa. Apart from it political role in the anti-colonial struggle, the Nigerian leadership in the late 1970s employed economic measures which were aimed at unseating the

colonial regimes especially South -Africa's brutish apartheid regime and also headed the UN Committee against Apartheid for the better part of its existence until the committees' mandate was accomplished in 1994 following the collapse of the Apartheid regime in South Africa. Besides, Nigeria also hosted the first World Conference for Action against Apartheid in Lagos in 1997 sponsored by the UN in August 1997. At the Conference, the Nigerian government unfolded the agenda of employing stringent economic measures against foreign multinational corporations in Nigeria which had business dealings with the apartheid regime of South Africa

Nigeria's decades-long fight for Africa's liberation has been noted by various authors who concede that the country did not act alone. Akiba (1998) reckons that from independence in 1960, Nigeria had been opposed to all forms of racial injustice and colonialism on the African continent. Nigeria's opposition was articulated in the United Nations where the country joined other member states to demand independence for countries under colonial rule. Furthermore, as discussed earlier, the fact that Nigeria played a leading role has been reiterated several times in the literature. Spies (2008) contend that Nigeria had since independence in 1960 become the continental leader in the struggle against colonialism, Apartheid and white rule in Africa. The author submitted that Nigeria's historical credentials on the issue of decolonization within Africa are impressive. The position expressed above was corroborated by Ajala (1989) who opined that there was no doubt about Nigeria's commitment to African decolonization. He recalled that Nigeria demonstrated this in the UN when she joined other freedom-loving member states in the UN to adopt the memorable resolution which called for the independence of Colonial Countries and peoples.

At the end of the Nigerian civil war in 1970, Nigeria continued the pursuit of its African decolonization agenda by getting more involved in the struggle for the freedom of fellow African states. Nwolise (1989) gave an account of Nigeria-UN decolonization effort when he advanced the view that Nigeria became more active, assertive, and championing the struggle

against apartheid in the UN in the country's post- civil war years.   Corroborating this view Chinade (2005) Captured Nigeria's role in African decolonization struggle in the UN as follows:

> Nigeria successfully utilized the platform of this world body to effectively pursue its dreams of decolonization of other African countries and particularly the eradication of apartheid and racism from the continent of Africa arising from this commitment, Nigeria organized and hosted the first United Nations conference for action against apartheid in Lagos in 1977, and subsequently chaired the Anti-apartheid committee that was dissolved in 1994.   (Chinade 2005:4)

Illuminating on Nigeria's decolonization strides in the UN, Adeyemo (2002) observed that Nigeria played a leading role against colonialism apartheid, and racism when she assumed the leadership of the UN Special Committee against Apartheid which lasted for twenty years; he recalled that the country's efforts in this regard eventually yielded the desired results with the ascension of South-Africa to independence and subsequent election of Dr Nelson Mandela as the first elected President of non-racial South-Africa in April 1994. The historic event led to the dissolution of the UN anti-colonial committee in May 1994 following the successful completion of the task assigned to it by the World body. The sentiments expressed above were shared by Daura (2010) who noted that Nigeria played important role in the liberation of African continent from colonial rule. Akinboye (2005) reckoned that Nigeria's activities in the anti-colonial struggle was largely due to the nature of its foreign policy which considered issues like colonialism and the apartheid system as unacceptable and antithetical to its foreign policy objectives. This then leads to the conclusion that Nigeria's foreign policy was indeed afro centric in theory and in practice.

There are arguments which suggest that Nigeria's decolonization effort was a function of its preconceived agenda to play a leadership role in Africa using continental issues such as decolonization, apartheid the Cold War and other issues of African concern as a leverage.

Adebajo (2008:12) argues that Nigeria foreign policy towards Africa represents its ambitions to play a "political, economic and military leadership role in Africa on issues related to the continent." Politically, Nigeria sought to exert its leadership at the UN, the OAU and the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), and speak loudest for African concerns. In the Military sphere, the author argues that the country has sent peacekeepers to Congo, Somalia, Chad, Liberia, and Sierra – Leone to help in restoring stability to these countries. Military assistance was also given to East African countries such as Tanzania, while Gambia – a West African country which also benefited from Nigeria's "Big brother" gesture.

In the area of African decolonization, Adebajo (2008) reckons that Nigeria gave support to the Southern African region in the 1970s and 1980 in order to justify its leadership claim. Same was the case at the Sub-regional level when Nigeria "tried to exert its leadership through the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)" this submission instructively points to the fact that Nigeria's foreign policy like that of any country was driven by self-interest. This then shows that Nigeria foreign policy was a product of political realism. Games (2013:5), corroborated this view with the argument that: "Nigeria's post-independence foreign policy was focused on being a leader on the continent. . . Politically, Nigeria's focus was on . . . Africa where it specifically tried to carve out a leadership role. . ."

The above arguments were also buttressed by John Agreen who argued that Nigeria's foreign policy represents its national interests. As he pointed out: "the influence wielded by Nigeria within through the instrumentality of foreign policy can better be assessed within the context of its regional and continental leadership aspirations."[5]This then leads to the conclusion that Nigeria's role in decolonizing Africa was in fulfilment of its leadership aspirations in Africa.

---

[5] Agreen I. J. (2013) "The Problematic of Redefining Nigeria's National Interest in the Context of Global Diplomacy" April 19, 2013, available online at: http://probematicforeignpolicy.htmi.

As a member state of the UN, Nigeria was active in the organization whenever issues such as colonialism and apartheid were discussed and debated. Idang (1973) advanced the view that Nigeria expressed its opposition to colonialism and apartheid and racial injustices in the UN when it sponsored and co-sponsored a series of draft resolutions and declarations which were aimed at liberating the continent from the grip of colonial dictatorship. Nigeria, according to this author, was also a party to the decision that established the UN Special Committee on apartheid. Nigeria subsequently took over the leadership of the anti-colonial committee for decades. But none of the authors discussed thus far give the impression that Nigeria saw its role in the decolonization of Africa as an investment for the country's political leverage at a later stage.

2.4.   The Role of State Actors in the Decolonization of Africa

This study has shown from the foregoing that Nigeria did not act alone during the struggle against colonialism in Africa. To drive home this point properly, it is important to quickly touch on the historical roles played by state actors and regional groupings in the course of the 20th century struggle against colonial rule. In light of this, this section briefly examine the roles played by other state actors such as Ghana, the frontline states of Southern Africa, the Nordic states of northern Europe; and the Middle - Eastern Arab states.

2.4.1. Ghana

At the celebration of Ghana's independence on the 6th of March 1957, a declaration came from the country first - post independence leader – Kwame Nkrumah that: "The independence of Ghana is meaningless until it is linked with the total liberation of Africa." Bukarambe (2010:53), with this declaration, Ghana took the initiative and practically hit the ground running on African decolonization issues in order to march words with action. Being the first Sub-Saharan African country to attain independence, Ghana considered it an historic duty to lead the African continent out of the colonial wilderness which a greater part of African territories was still into

at the time. President Nkrumah spoke of the "historic role" of the Ghanaians "to lead . . . our brethren who are still struggling to be free." (Aluko, 1976:73)

The Nkrumah government thus began to engage itself in a series of diplomatic moves including the formation of the Ghana-Guinea-Mali Union, the Casablanca Powers which consisted of Libya, Algeria; and Morocco, Mali and the United Arab Republic. The formation of the Casablanca Group started a formidable radical African policy toward African unity as well as toward the eradication of apartheid in South Africa in particular; and colonialism and racism in Southern Africa in general. Dumor (1991)

At international platforms such as the OAU and others, Ghana was vociferous in calling for the decolonization of Africa. For instance, at the UN General Assembly meeting in 1961 the spokesman for the Ghanaian delegation Mr Quaison - Sackey launched scathing attacks against the apartheid system of South-Africa thus:

> All here have agreed that apartheid is a menace, that it is a disease, that it is a cankerworm which must be uprooted. We in all the 25 states, the independent African States, and if I may say so, the 200 million Africans, are all with one voice appealing to the Assembly to consider sanctions. To us the sanctions would serve as a sword of Damocles over the head of the Union of South Africa, that is, over the heads of probably two million or one and a half million whites in the Union who are recalcitrant.[6]

The above represents the extent to which Ghana was passionately committed to African decolonization thus it wasn't a Nigerian affair alone. The battle against colonialism was fought

---

[6] See Mr Quaison – Sackey (Ghana), United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 981st Meeting (April. 18, 1961), para. 39.

by all independent African countries and other humanitarian organizations across the world. Next section will examine the roles of the Nordic countries in respect to the above.

2.4.2 The Nordic States

The Nordic countries of Norway, Denmark, Sweden and Finland particularly referred to as the Scandinavian countries gave financial moral and diplomatic support to the liberation in Southern Africa. To this end, Nordic civil societies got involved in development issues and solidarity and humanitarian work. According to Siiskonen (2009), NGOs (the Non-governmental Organizations) and FBOs (Faith Based Organizations) helped arouse consciousness about the humanitarian and political situation in Southern Africa within the Nordic societies. During the liberation struggles African churches and the Nordic church aid and missionary organizations and their workers operating in the field were regularly in contact with the liberation movements in several ways offering direct support to the liberation movements Nordic missionary organizations and their workers played a crucial role in passing information to freedom fighters operating in the field.

As noted in the foregoing, the Faith Based Organizations were actively involved to help find solution to the colonial problem on the African continent particularly in Southern African region. Consequent upon this commitment, the Nordic churches contributed significantly to the course of decolonization in Africa through the International Central Organization of Churches (ICC), the World Council of Churches (WCC); and the Lutheran World Federation (LWF). Thembeka Mufamadi's 2009 work, *the World Council of Churches against Racism in South Africa* hinted on the Program to Combat Racism (PCR) approved by the WWC central committee in 1969 reveals how anti-apartheid work was actively carried out behind the scenes.

The Nordic governments also gave massive financial, moral and diplomatic supports to the oppressed peoples of Southern Africa. As a matter of fact, their huge financial contributions to the Southern African anti-apartheid and liberation struggles were adjudged to be second to none in the annals of the struggle against supremacists' regimes in Southern Africa. E.S. Reddy, the Chairman of the UN Centre against Apartheid till 1985, noted in his 1987 publication that

the Nordic Countries contributed between \$3 to \$4 billion dollars to assist the victims of colonialism and racism in Southern Africa – through the United Nations and other inter-governmental and non-governmental funds, and directly to the liberation forces.[7] As international pressure mounts on the apartheid regime, the Botha apartheid presidency 1984-1989 came up with what could be described as artificial reforms plans in South Africa when he promised to make reforms to the existing apartheid policies. The Nordic countries in particular were unanimous in rejecting the proposed reforms as they continued to give moral and financial support for the ANC. On 21 February 1986 – a week prior to his assassination – the Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme delivered a key note address to the *Swedish People's Parliament against Apartheid* held in Stockholm.

In his address to the hundreds of anti-apartheid sympathizers as well as leaders and officials from the ANC and the Anti-apartheid movement such as Oliver Tambo, Palme declared: "Apartheid cannot be reformed; it has to be eliminated."[8] This was a rare display of comradeship by this Nordic country. The outstanding commitments of the Nordic Countries to the popular struggle against colonialism in Southern Africa not only helped provide humanitarian and educational services, but also gave supports for the fighting forces struggling for freedom. Their generous commitment was geared towards the independence of counties that languished under tyrannical colonial regimes and to ensure the establishment of a non-racial democratic state in South Africa.

2.4.3. Arab States

The role played by the Arab states in African decolonization struggles was more noticeable during the UN General Assembly sessions on colonial issues. The Arabs states were one of the regional groupings that made up the Afro-Asian group which became a powerful force at the United Nations during the debates on colonialism in the early 1960s and thereafter. The Arab

---

[7] E. S. Reddy, 1987. Contributions of the Nordic States to the Oppressed Peoples of Southern Africa and Frontline States, Mainstream Publication New Delhi
[8] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Foreign_relations_of_SouthAfrica_during_aparthied, accessed 2014/10/03, p. 11.

states were favourably disposed to nationalism and struggle for self-governance in Africa and across the world. Bukarambe (2010)

2.4.4. The Frontline States

Since their emergence in 1976, the frontline states of the Southern African region fought the apartheid regime of South Africa with tenacity and unyielding determination. The crumbling of the apartheid regime in 1994 following the transition to a non-racial democratic government was partly as a result of the roles played by the group of Southern African states popularly known as the Frontline States. These states were Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Swaziland, Tanzania, and Zambia. From 1980, Zimbabwe joined the group following its independence from Britain. The Frontline States was formed in 1970 to co-ordinate their responses to apartheid and formulate a coherent policy towards the militant apartheid regime of Pretoria and also to give support to the various liberation movements across the Southern Africa region.

To this end, the advent of the Frontline States was a welcomed development as it became a powerful force in the struggle to retrench colonialism and racism in Southern Africa Niemann (1993). Thus far, this section has examined the different roles played by other state actors towards the retrenchment of colonialism and its attendant features – such as apartheid. The essence of doing so as earlier noted is to avoid giving the impression that Nigeria was the only country which fought against colonialism in Africa. The above has shown clearly that Nigeria only added its voice to the existing calls for African freedom from colonial rule. Next section discusses Nigeria's political ambitions within the context of its historical antecedents and contemporary domestic realities.

2.5.   Nigeria's Political Ambitions within the Context of Historical Antecedents and Contemporary Domestic Realities: An Overview

Having explored various literatures on Nigeria's role in African decolonization issues, it is pertinent to examine some counter-views with regards to the different roles played by Nigeria in the UN and the country's political ambitions. Some authors have linked Nigeria's activities in

the area of African decolonization to the current debates on whether the country can use its historical activities in this regard to strengthen its case for its legitimacy to take some leadership positions in Africa today. A veteran Nigerian diplomat Emeka Anyaoku noted in 2005 that Nigeria's bid for the United Nations Security Council seat may not be attained solely on the basis of the country's record of service to Africa's cause. Explaining Nigeria's dilemma in Africa, he affirmed that in Africa, it is sometimes natural that the big brother is not so loved. The retired diplomat and former Secretary-General of the Commonwealth further stated that Nigeria faces some competition within and outside the continent in the race for the UNSC seat.

In line with the above, a retired Ambassador Dapo Fafowora in 2007 advanced the view that Nigeria cannot expect to win the Security Council seat simply on its record or reputation at the UN due to its "domestic condition" which will come into play when the additional seat for Africa in an enlarged UNSC comes under consideration. According to Fafowora, it was this "domestic condition" that stood in the way of Chief S.O. Adebo being elected UN Secretary-General in succession to (U. Thant) even when it was clear that he was the best candidate for the job at the time. This domestic condition includes inter alia: massive corruption, the Niger Delta crisis, the North-South dichotomy, the Boko Haram terror activities, Mass Poverty in the midst of oil wealth, acute leadership problem, Monetization of electioneering and political process, weak democratic institutions and many such incidents which many commentators within and outside the country have attributed to the absence of a competent, purposeful and responsible leadership in Nigeria.

There is also the view that Nigeria's recent and current political activities matter more than the country's historical activities discussed above. Spies (2008) observed that Nigeria's bid for a UNSC seat might be scuttled by the country's moral standing and international image which has been tarnished by age-long reputation for corruption and political as well as economic instability. Implicit in this statement is the view that corruption and other political ills operated parallel to each other, which meant that Nigeria gained political advantage while at the same

time losing political points. Such contradictions, according to this trajectory, will determine whether Nigeria can claim the "right" to occupy the permanent UNSC seat.

The view expressed above was echoed by Saliu and Omotola (2008) who noted that Nigeria's credentials in the area of African decolonization and active role in global Affairs; which has been employed by the country to strengthen its case for the UNSC seat might end up not yielding the desired result if urgent and workable steps are not taken to address the lingering worsening state of national security, slow pace of economic recovery despite ongoing reforms, the challenges posed by serious African contenders particularly Egypt and South-Africa; and Nigeria's continuing image problem; despite unsuccessful attempts to tackle it. Therefore it can be inferred from the above, that Nigeria faces both the domestic and regional challenge in its quest for glory in the global arena.

Even authors who give Nigeria credit for its role in the decolonization struggle concede that this may not be enough to bolster its current campaign. Adeniji (2005) reckoned that Nigeria's credentials in the UN might not be enough for the country to land the coveted UNSC seat. Adeniji's position was premised on the hints that the Arab world is scheming with all its might to have one of their own in Africa at the council. Egypt had since become their preferred choice although the current political crises in Egypt may have reduced the country's chances to be a contender. This same author in his work, different from the one cited above; advanced his position when he stated that Nigeria's domestic socio-political and economic realities pose a huge threat to the country's UNSC ambition. He argues:

> The prevailing realities in the Nigerian nation nevertheless remain a limiting factor to its ambition. There is the depressed economy with a large external debt. . .the ugly consequences of a depressed economy are visible enough for all to perceive: collapsed infrastructure and social services, mass poverty with a significant percentage of the

population living below the poverty line, rampant corruption, insecurity of life and property. (Adeniji 2005:4)

The author went on to say that the domestic conditions must be made amenable by reviving the economy and ensuring that the present democratic experiment is sustained. He submitted that it will be difficult for the international community to reward a country with a UNSC permanent seat when its domestic front is in shambles. The happenings on the domestic scene showed a country seeking a position of power and responsibility matters a lot. According to Saliu (2009), Nigeria should fix its domestic problems at home before seeking to offer leadership internationally. He lent credence to the above when he advanced the view that the internal happenings in the Nigerian state negate the country's current ambition for UNSC seat. The happenings he listed included: absence of good and responsive governance, credible electoral system, internal insecurity as well as, religious and sectarian crisis. According to him these problems might likely jeopardize Nigeria's bid for permanent seat on the UNSC. The same view is held by Obuoforibo (2011).

Another author who holds similar views is Pham (2007). He posited that the domestic problems constitute a threat to Nigeria's global political ambitions. In his view these problems include: weak democratic institutions; absence of good governance; and lack of respect for human rights at home. The author submitted that Nigeria must fix its domestic misfortunes to make its global leadership aspirations credible. There are other opinions with regard to Nigeria's domestic problems and the country's UNSC ambition. A former Nigerian foreign minister Bolaji Akinyemi in 2005 corroborated the sentiments made above. He opined that Nigeria's hope of getting a UNSC seat might be dashed if the country does not get it right domestically. He cited issues such as bad leadership, and mismanagement of state resources by the ruling class to justify his position. According to him Nigeria's bid will be difficult to attain regardless of its track record in the UN if these problems are not tackled headlong. These views lead to the conclusion that while Nigeria's role in the independence of many African countries cannot be disputed, a

confluence of factors, mainly domestic, stand on the country's way to getting the enviable UNSC seat.

The sources discussed above provide a sound historical background to Nigeria's role in the decolonization of Africa. The authors list various activities Nigeria was engaged in since joining the UN in 1960. Importantly, these authors explicitly state that Nigeria did not act in isolation but worked with other countries to achieve its goal of liberating other African countries; this study has also considered relevant literatures to establish the factuality of these submissions by discussing the various roles played by other actors in this regard. But what is worth noting is that none of these authors give the impression that Nigeria planned to use its political activities as a bargaining point at a later stage. For this reason, it is necessary to analyse various statements made by different political actors at the time and also read closely the writings of various authors to establish if there is evidence that Nigeria's activities over three decades had unstated aims and ambitions. Such an analysis is pertinent today given the debates on whether or not Nigeria is the best candidate for the permanent seat in the UNSC. It is in this area that this study will make a significant contribution.

2.6. Conceptual Clarification of Key Terms

In a research of this kind, the definition of key terms which are employed in the study is absolutely essential if the study is to be understood clearly from its roots. The importance of defining these terms is further underscored by the need to facilitate and enhance the readers' understanding of intended meanings. Thus, under this section, the clarification of key concepts which features immensely in the study is done in order to establish their meanings. These concepts include: Colonialism, Pan-Africanism, Cold War, and Decolonization. Theoretically, this chapter examines the political realist theory which was used in framing this study. The concepts listed above will be clarified in a relative fashion; this implies that the concepts will be discussed in line with the theme of this study. In other words, the clarification of concepts will be operational. These will be examined below.

2.6.1. Colonialism

The term colonialism is historical. Colonialism is the conquest and imposition of alien rule on a certain geographical area. The term colonialism gained prominence in the 19th century when African territories and its peoples was brought under the forceful political and economic control of various European states that come in search of raw materials and market for their goods. In a nutshell, this work sees colonialism as the forceful seizure of one country and its political social and economic destiny through the instrumentality of military superiority of an alien country. Brett (1973), described colonialism as a system of rule which assumes the right to impose their will upon another while (Christopher 1984 and Hodgkin, 1957) argues that colonialism is the act of establishing colonies in foreign country by people from another territory. While authors have generally defined colonialism in light of foreign subjugation of overseas countries by powerful countries, some scholars have given a conservative definition of colonialism which suggests the age-long European belief that colonialism was primarily about civilization.

As J.A. Hobson stated in 1938: "Colonialism, in its best sense, is a natural overflow of nationality; its test is the power of colonists to transplant the civilization they represent to the new natural and social environment in which they find themselves."[9] Hobson definition of colonialism is simply reflective of the "white man's burden" philosophy which Europe claimed was responsible for African colonization in the 19th century. Other authors such as E.M. Winslow also spoke of colonialism as the "occupation of virgin territory in which conflict was incidental, or even unnecessary, and subordinate to the desire of Europeans to find a place to live."[10] Now, two points could be drawn from the Hobson and Winslow's arguments about colonialism. First, the these arguments are Eurocentric and historically fallacious given that the conquered colonial territories and their peoples had lived for centuries before coming into contact with the Europeans.

---

[9] Hobson, J. A. Imperialism: A Study, Third Edition. (London, 1938), p. 7.
[10] Cited by Palmer D. and Perkins H.C. (2010), International Relations The World Community in Transition, Third Edition, A.I.T.B.S. Publishers India Pg. 161.

Thus, the argument suggesting that occupied territories were in virgin form that is, had no human beings living therein on the eve of European colonization has failed all archaeological scrutiny. Second, colonialism and civilization is antithetical at least in the African colonial context as the brand of colonialism experienced in Africa was brash, suffocating, racially discriminative, physiologically upsetting, militantly suppressive, economically politically; and socially non-inclusive. Where then does "civilization" come in? On the other hand, some African scholars had over the years provided a counter view of the term colonialism. Prominent among these scholars was Walter Rodney, who noted in 1972, that European colonialism retarded the development of Africa. He asserts:

> Colonialism was not merely a system of exploitation, but on whose essential purpose was to repatriate the profits tom the so-called "mother country". From an African viewpoint, that amounted to consistent expatriation of surplus produced by African labour out of African resources. It meant the development of Europe as part of the dialectical process in which Africa was underdeveloped.[11]

The above represents an African perspective of colonialism. Horvath (1972) advanced the view that colonialism is a form of domination – the control by individuals or groups over the territory and/or behaviour of other individuals or groups' colonialism is an exploitative system which places emphasis on economic considerations. Horvath (1972:50), also defines settler colonialism – the brand of colonialism experienced in some African countries as that form "of intergroup domination in which settlers in significant number migrate permanently to the colony from the colonizing power." Another definition perhaps the most detailed of the term colonialism came from J. F. Kennedy, United States President (1961-1963). In an address before

---

[11] Rodney W. (1972), "How Europe Underdeveloped Africa" (Dares Salaam: Tanzania Publishing House, 1972, and London, p. 6.

the United Nations General Assembly on September 25, 1961, President Kennedy stated amongst other things that: ". . . colonialism in its harshest forms is not only the exploitation of new nations by the old, of dark skins by light, or the subjugation of the poor by rich . . . we know what colonialism means; the exploitation and subjugation of the weak by the powerful, of many by the few, of the governed who have given no consent to be governed. . ."[12]

2.6.2. National Interest

National interests represent the aims and objectives a state seeks to pursue in the course of its interaction with other states. National interest drives the foreign policy actions of state actors in the international arena. National interest is a country's goals and ambitions whether economic, military, political or cultural. The concept is an important one in international relations where pursuit of the national interest is the foundation of the realist school.[13] Morgenthau (1948) emphasized the importance and primacy of "the national interest", as the motivating factor behind inter-states relations in the international arena. Joseph Frankel categorised national interest as "operational" "aspirational" "explanatory" and "polemical". On the aspirational level, national interest refers to some ideal set of goals, which the state would like to realize, if possible. At the operational level, national interest is the sum total of interests and policies actually which are practically pursued. On the "explanatory" and "polemical" level, in political argument, the concept of national interest is used to explain, evaluate, rationalise or criticize foreign policy.[14]

2.6.3. Foreign Policy

Foreign policy represents the set-goals a state intend to pursue in the course of its interaction with other states in international system. Foreign policy can also be define as the guiding principles in inter-states' relations. We shall examine briefly some definitions offered by

---

[12] See the address delivered by J.F. Kennedy, President of the United States: 1961-1963 before the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York, September 25, 1961, Pg. 3, online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, the American Presidency Project, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?=8352.

[13] Wikipedia.org/wiki/National-interest.

[14] Cited by Rosenau J. N. (1968), National Interest, International Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences

international relations scholars. Northedge defines foreign policy simply as "an interplay between the outside and the inside."[15] To Charles Lerche and Abdul A., "The foreign policy of a state usually refers to the general principles by which a state governs its reaction to the international environment."[16] However, T.B. Millar posited that "foreign policy is presumably something less than a sum of all policies which have an effect upon national governments."[17] Joseph Frankel simply defines foreign policy as "consisting of decisions and actions which involves to some appreciable extent relations between one state and another."[18] Frankel again in another work defines foreign policy as "a dynamic process of interaction between the changing domestic demands and the support and the changing external circumstances."[19] Solomon Akinboye described foreign policy as "essentially the instrumentality by which states influence or seek to influence the external world, and to attain objectives that are in consonance with their perceived national interest."[20]

The development of foreign policy is influenced by domestic considerations, the policies or behaviour of other states, or plans to advance specific geopolitical designs. Leopold von Ranke emphasized the primacy of geography and external threats in shaping foreign policy, but later writers emphasized domestic factors. Diplomacy is the tool of foreign policy, and war, alliances, and international trade may all be manifestations of it.[21] To sum it up, foreign policy is generally the reflection of a country's national interests which are of economic, political, military significance to its well – ness.

---

[15] Northedge F. G. (1968), "The Foreign Policies of the Powers," London: Faber, p.15.
[16] Charles O.L. and Abdul A. (1979), "Concepts of International Policies," in Global Perspectives 3rd edition, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1979, p.32.
[17] Millar T.B. (1969) "On Writing About foreign Policy," New York: The free Press, p. 59.
[18] Frankel J. (1975), "British Foreign Policy," London: Oxford University Press, p. 9.
[19] Frankel J. (1963), "The Making of Foreign Policy," Oxford University Press.
[20] Akinboye S. (1999) "Nigeria's Foreign Policy," in Elements of Politics, Remi Anifowose and Francis C. Enemuo (eds) Malta House Press Ltd, Lagos Nigeria.
[21] http://global.britanica.com/EBchecked/topic/213380/foreign-policy.

2.6.4. Pan-Africanism

Pan-Africanism is an ideology and movement that sought to encourage the unity and solidarity of black people the world over. The origin and historical evolution of the pan-Africanist movement can be traced to 1893 when educated people of African descent in the Diaspora began to galvanize their fellow African brethren against the established order of European colonialism, racism and slavery which had been unleashed on them. Put simply, pan-Africanism is a counter-force movement initiated by Africans and people of African descent against the forces of slavery, racism, and colonialism. Frick, Janari, etal (2006), sees Pan-Africanism as the belief that unity is vital to economic, social and political progress and aims to unify and uplift people of African descent while Minkah (2011), argues that the Pan-African ideology asserts that the fate of African peoples within and outside the continent are intertwined – the core believe of Pan-Africanism is a belief that African peoples, both on the continent and in diaspora, share not just a common history, but a common destiny.

2.6.5. Decolonization

Decolonization is the reverse of colonization. The term suggests the former withdrawal of colonial powers from a territory which was forcefully occupied, conquered and subjugated. The term has also been described as the undoing of colonialism, where a nation establishes and maintains dependent territory.[22] (Fanon 1963), defines decolonization as follows: the attempt to change the order of the world, agenda for disorder, a historical process; and the need to challenge the colonial situation.

2.6.6. Cold War

Nothing defines the 20th century international relations better than the Cold war. The Cold War was one of the most profound events of the 20th century after World Wars One and Two. The Cold War is defined within the context of the ideological warfare for world dominance which ensued between the United States and Soviet Union after World War 11. The Cold War lasted

---

[22] http://www.bing.com/search?q=topic+1o93+decolonization .

for upward of 45 years. According to Martin (2004), a Cold War is a state of conflict between nations that does not get involve in direct military combat but who pursued their aims primarily through economic and political actions, propagandas, acts of espionage and through proxy wars waged by surrogates and satellite states. These surrogates' states are allied to the Superpowers on whose behalf wars are prosecuted. In a Cold War situation, blocs' leaders will always provide economic or military aid, such as weaponry, tactical support or military advisors to the allied states that fronts for them. Thus far, this section has focused on the conceptual clarification of key historical term which that features prominently in this study. Next to be considered is the theoretical framework of analysis – the political realist theory.

2.7. Theories of Political Realism

This section examines the characteristic features of political realism in order to be able to state how Nigeria fits into the defining features of the theory thereby justifying the relevance of the theoretical framework to this study. The political realists theory is one of the most dominant and popular theories in international relations. In analysing the foreign policies of states that make up the international system, political realism has been employed by students and scholars over the years. One of the most compelling analyses of realism can be found in the works of leading exponents of the realist school such as Hans Morgenthau, E.H. Carr, and others such as Aron Raymond, Henry Kissinger, F.S Northedge and Kenneth Waltz. Hans Morgenthau – a leading authority of the realist school of thought argues in his *"Politics among Nations"* that politics be it local or international is basically a struggle for power and prominence among the actors involved. In other words, states actors' interactions and participation in the international arena are driven either by stated/unstated interests. These interests could be economic, political or military depending on the aims of the state involved. It is even possible for a state's national interests to embody the three. Morgenthau asserts:

> International politics and indeed all politics, is a struggle for power. Whatever the ultimate aims of international politics, power is always the immediate aims.

44

Statesmen and peoples may ultimately seek freedom, security, prosperity or power itself. . . But whatever they strive to realize their goal by means of international politics, they do so by striving for power.[23]

The struggle for power therefore is assumed to be an integral part of human make-up as the realists suggests. The import of the realist theory as put forward by Hans Morgenthau indicates that synergy and cordiality exists when interests compliments each other but collide when interests clash. Consequently, the extent to which a state and the international system will survive depends largely on what realists described as the intelligent pursuit of national interests. This then explains why the realists described the international system as anarchical.

2.7.1. International Relations and Political Realism

The discipline of international relations has contending general theories or theoretical perspectives which help in understanding international relations issues. Realism, also known as political realism, is a perspective of international politics that stresses and discuss its competitive and conflict-prone side. It is usually contrasted with idealism or liberalism, which tends to emphasize cooperation.[24] Realists' exponents consider the main actors in the international system to be states, which are concerned about their own national interests, concerned about their own security, acts in pursuit of and struggle for power. The negative side of the realists' emphasis on power and self-interest is often their scepticism regarding the relevance of ethical norms to relations among states. National politics is the realm of authority and law, whereas international politics, they sometimes claim, is a sphere without justice, characterized by active or potential conflict among states. This explains why the realist described international politics as anarchical. However, what is of interests to this study is that

---

[23] Morgenthau H. J. (1967), Politics among Nations (New York: Alfred Knopf,) p. 27.
[24] See the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Political Realism in International Relations. First Published, Monday July 26, 2010; substantive revision, April 2, 2013, available online at: www.httpplato.stanford.edu/entries/realsim-intl-realtions/ .

feature of the realists' thought which stated that states actors acts in "pursuit of their national interests; and acts in pursuit of and struggle for power".[25] This will help understand Nigeria's role in African decolonization struggle which is the focus of this study.

The realist theory has been described as a major theoretical framework employed by students of International Relations in their analysis of foreign policy of any given state. Adeyemo (2002). It has since the end of the Second World War dominated international relations in a way no other theory has ever done. Philip Nel and McGowan (1999:53) opined that realism has endured not "because it is necessarily the best theory, but because it is by far the oldest, and most influential, theory in the discipline of international relations." As noted earlier, the realist theory has produced an array of thinkers and proponents who contributed to the development of the realist paradigm since the turn of the 20th century. Political realism was explained by Walter Scott Hudson in 2010 as an approach to the practice of international politics. It emphases the role of the nation-states and makes a broad assumption that all nation-states are motivated by national interest, or at least, national interest disguised as moral concerns.[26]

Prominent among these realist thinkers are E.H. Carr (1939) George F. Kennan (1951, 1954) Han Morgenthau (1948) Reinhold Niebuhr (1947) Kenneth W. Thompson (1960). The realist theory is well articulated in the works of the American realist scholar (Hans J. Morgenthau) who is a leading proponent of the realist approach or power politics, he affirmed in his work Morgenthau (1967) that politics on the International stage is characterized by the obsession for power and a struggle for power. He argued that the ultimate aim of international politics is power and that the state actors who are the key players in the international system are selfishly driven by their national interest. This view was corroborated by Deutsch (1989) who likened the realist thought to a game which is played with the sole aim of acquiring power, using that power, increasing the power and projecting it. He puts it thus: "…..the game of international

---

[25] Ibid.
[26] See Walter Scott Hudson (2010), available online at http//fightinworldwordsusa.wordpress.com/2010.

politics revolves around the pursuit of power; acquiring it, increasing it, projecting it, and using it to bend others to one's will." (Deutsch 1989:29) the author further argued that realism is "essentially and unchangeably a struggle among self-interested states for power and position………..with each competing state pursing its own national interest"

The views expressed above were supported by Mingst (2004:65-66) when he observed that "realism is based on a view of the individual as primarily selfish and power seeking. Individuals are organized in states, each of which acts in a unitary way in pursuit of its own national interest…" As noted above, realism is primarily about self-preservation and protection of national interest in international relations. This view was echoed by Karpowicz, and Julian (2013) when they viewed realism as the pursuit of national interest by states in the international arena, While Steans and Pettiford (2001) reckoned that realism revolves around the pursuit of power and national interest by states who constitutes the main actors in the international relations. The foregoing arguments was buttressed thus by other authors such as Couloumbis and Wolfe (1990), Jackson and Sorensen (2003), Rourke (2008), Duncan et al. (2009), Goldstein (2001), Art and Jervis (2007). From the submissions made so far, it can be concluded that states actions in the international domain are indeed driven by one single factor which is national interest. Implicit in the realist arguments is the fact that global interactions among nation-states are a reflection of the pursuit of national interest. To the realist, power is synonymous with interest and interest is defined in terms of power. With power, a state is empowered to safeguard it territory as well as protect and promote it national interest sometimes at the expense of other states if need be. It is instructive to note therefore that the Nigerian and Ghanaian leadership tussle of the 60s ensued basically as a result of both counties' desire to promote their national interests at the expense of each other. Thus this study falls within the defining features of political realism as it is supportive of the fact that Nigeria's roles in African decolonization was driven by the preconceived agenda to play a dominant role in African affairs. The next section will do a critique of the realist theory.

2.7.2. A Critique of the Realist Political Theory

For several decades virtually all discourses in international relations have been interpreted and analysed through the theoretical aid of the realist school of thought known as political realism or power theory. The theory has endured popularly among the intellectual community of international experts and enthusiasts because of its seeming faultless theories about international politics and the motivating factors behind it. However, for a very long time, much of scholarly literatures have faulted some of the theoretical underpinnings of the realist school of thought. Critics of the realist' school downplay the role of power in the interaction of states and emphasizes such other factors as values, international morality and institution. Like any other theory in international relations, there are a number of objections against any theory of international politics which places premium on power politics. Critics of the realist approach have been of the view that states actions in the international system should not just be interpreted from the power angle alone as states actors use other strategies such persuasion, manipulation, propaganda, as well as economic measures and instruments such as rewards, grants and other forms of assistance (Akinboye, 2005). In spite of these criticisms against the realist theory, the theory still remains perhaps the most compelling theory in international relations as it has for decades provided a lucid picture concerning the key elements which drive the foreign policies of state actors in the international system.

2.8.   Conclusion

This chapter has examined relevant literatures on the topic, especially with regards to Nigeria's activities in the decolonization issues in the UN and the country's ambition for the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) seat. The chapter also examined the roles played by other countries during the struggle against colonialism and apartheid in order not to create the impression that Nigeria acted alone given that Nigeria is the subject of this inquiry. The chapter discussed the realists' political theory considering its inherent features and argued that Nigeria as an international relations actor falls within the defining features of realism given its pursuit of self-interests, and national interests. This will help lay the background for the discussion of

the issues that come up for consideration in the next chapter. The next chapter will examine the history of Nigeria's foreign policy as well as the general tendencies across the UN system.

CHAPTER THREE

A HISTORY OF NIGERIA'S FOREIGN POLICY (1960-1994) AND THE GENERAL

TENDENCIES ACROSS THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

Nigeria's foreign policy is largely predetermined by the linkage between the domestic constituency……and the predestined right to exert a leadership role in Africa[27]

Fundamentally…a foreign policy is the projection of internal sentiments and aspirations influenced by external realities. In the case of Nigeria, the country's foreign policy reveals the aspirations of Nigerians to make their country play a leadership role in Africa….A look at the country's African policy and indeed extra-African policy easily reveals this special attachment to African leadership [28]

3.1. Introduction

The last chapter focused on the review of related literature and the analysis and clarification of terms used in this study. In the present chapter the history of Nigeria's foreign policy and its motives with regards to its anti-colonial stance during the struggle against the twin problems of colonialism and racism in Africa will be considered. The chapter will also demonstrate through the discussions and analysis how Nigeria subscribed to realism as a theoretical framework in international relations which was used in framing the study. The struggle for power in international politics as noted in the previous chapter, is according to the realist proponents, a contest for power between nation-states which are the principal actors in the international system.

---

[27] Sinclair M. (1983), An Analysis of Nigeria's Foreign Policy: The Evolution of Political Paranoia, the South African Institute of International Affairs, Braamfontein, South Africa. Pg. 12

[28] Saliu, H.A. (2006), Essays On Contemporary Nigeria Foreign Policy, Vantage Publishers Ibadan, Nigeria Pgs. 3-4

The question becomes: how then did the Nigerian state subscribe to this theory? The chapter will seek to provide an answer to this question. In light of this premise, the chapter has the following as its set premise. It argues that Nigeria's activities on colonial issues were strategically driven by the country's desire to play a leading role in African politics as implied in the current debates on Nigeria's aspiration for a permanent seat in the UNSC. This will be done through the analysis of historical statements and relevant documents

This chapter will also lay the foundation upon which our arguments in subsequent chapters shall be based. These chapters will consider the fact that Nigeria's foreign policy objectives guided the country's actions and behaviour in international relations, especially in the United Nations where Nigeria, through the instrumentality of its foreign policy, played different roles on issues such as anti-colonialism; anti-racism and apartheid. To this end, the chapter will discuss the history of Nigeria's foreign policy between the year of its own independence in 1960 and the formal democratic transition in South-Africa in 1994 when the country joined the rest of the world as an independent country thus bringing an end to the last phase of European colonialism on the African continent. Thus, this chapter examines, as mentioned above, the origins and the evolution of the country's diplomacy since the dawn of its diplomatic engagement with the rest of the world; and also consider the reasons behind Nigeria's involvement in the anti-colonial cause between the periods aforementioned.

To understand Nigeria's decades-spanning diplomatic behaviour vis-a-viz its role and contribution to the anti-colonial crusade in Africa an inquiry into the country's policy since independence will be of uttermost value to the study and the reading public. Moreover, the essence of examining and analysing the country's foreign policy is to keep abreast on the fundamental principles and objectives; the determinant factors; (internal and external); foreign policy efforts of successive Nigerian governments– 1960-1994; the changes and the continuities n Nigeria's foreign policy. An analysis of these salient issues will be of huge significance to our understanding of a country's policy and actions for a period of 34 years in the United Nations which of course forms the core of this study.

Thus to achieve the above stated objectives, the analyses and discussions as noted above will be carried out on the basis of each government diplomatic effort. Suffice it to say that Nigeria's anti-colonial pursuit within the period aforesaid can best be studied from the perspective of leadership personality and ideological convictions hence the need to focus our analysis on each of the Nigerian successive governments military and civilian.

In addition to the above, this chapter also discusses the general tendencies across the United Nations System since the emergence of the multilateral diplomatic organization in 1945. This has become imperative given that the study set-out to know about the advocacy and foreign policy actions of a country on the platform of an organizational body like the United Nations. Consequently there is a need to understand the inner workings of the world body itself and what it stands for before zooming in on Nigeria. In light of the foregoing synopsis, this chapter will be examining these themes under the following headings: Nigeria's anti -colonial foreign policy at independence and post-independence era; 1960-1994; How Nigeria subscribed to realism, the general tendencies across the United Nations System; and Conclusion

3.2.   Nigeria's foreign Policy at Independence

Nigeria's foreign policy was first articulated on the global stage by the country's Prime Minister, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa during his inaugural address to the United Nations General Assembly on October 7, 1960. This was the day Nigeria was admitted into the United Nations Organization as a member of the world body. On that occasion, the Prime Minister spoke on the operational principles upon which the newly independent state would conduct its bilateral and multilateral diplomacy. He stated thus:

- It is the desire of Nigeria to remain on friendly terms with all nations and to participate actively in the work of the United Nations Organization
- Nigeria, a large and populous country has absolutely no territorial or expansionist intentions
- Nigeria is committed to uphold the principles upon which the United Nations Organization is founded

- Nigeria do not intend to align itself with any of the power blocs
- Nigeria hopes to work with other African states for the progress of Africa and to assist in bringing all African territories to a state of responsible independence.[29]

It should be noted here that while the above did not sufficiently express in clear terms the national interests of Nigeria, the fundamental objectives and principles as enunciated by the Nigerian leader at independence later became the guidelines for the country's foreign policy actions in the post-independence decades even though some key events during this period necessitated changes of approach in the pursuit of these objectives (Ogwu, 1986). It is important to mention here that the above stated principles reveal that the Nigerian leadership at Independence took cognizance of the situations in the world at the time before coming up with a policy statement – that was expected to help guide the conduct of the infant country on key issues which were of interest to the Nigerian state in international affairs. For instance, the issue of non-alignment with any power bloc which the Nigerian leader mentioned was consequent upon the ideological battle between the West and the East at the time – a phenomenon which permeated the international political space even before Nigeria's ascendancy to independence.

Another major point of the foreign policy statement was the commitment made by the Nigerian state to join hands with other African states to end colonialism on the African continent and to also form one of the major role-players that dominated international discourse at the time of Nigeria's independence. By and large it can be unequivocally said that Nigeria's foreign policy at independence and in the post-independence decades was both influenced by internal and external realities. This leads us to the next sub-section whereby we shall consider the factors/reasons behind Nigeria's foreign policy positions especially as it relates to Africa.

---

[29] See Mr Prime Minister, A Selection of Speeches Made by Alhaji (Sir) Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Prime Minister of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1960-1966, Nigerian National Press Ltd, Apapa Lagos, Nigeria, 1964, pp. 50-51.

3.3. Determinants of/Reasons for Nigeria's Foreign Policy in Africa

The foreign policy of any state is a reflection of internal and external realities. Therefore, from a general perspective, the formulation of states' foreign policies should begin with taking cognizance of the domestic and the extra-domestic domain in which such policies intend to function. In short, it is the combination of these compelling realities (internal and external) that influences the formulation and the conduct of a state's foreign policy. According to Saliu (2006:3) "the foreign policy of a state is predicated upon its understanding of the environment in which it operates. This environment has internal and external components."Adeyemo (2002:56) opined that "the foreign policy of any country is an interaction between internal (domestic) and external factors." From the foregoing therefore, we can infer that the foreign policy of the Nigerian state, like any other state of the world, could not have been driven by a sole factor but rather by a combination of actors which are categorized as internal and external. Now the question that should be asked at this juncture is: to what extent can both the internal and external factors shape and determine the direction of a state's diplomacy judging by their imposing constraints and limitations on the foreign policy framers and implementers? The answer to the question posed above lies in a country's internal socio-economic and political status at a given time.

For instance, a state that is bedevilled by acute leadership problem, economic misfortunes which are mostly occasioned by sheer mismanagement and corruption; internal disunity; dearth of human resources; and the absence of patriotic cooperation among its citizenry will find it difficult if not impossible for it to come up with a concrete and coherent foreign policy. The effect will render such a state incapacitated by not being able to craft out a workable foreign policy that could secure a rewarding interaction with its external environment. As Idang (1973:35) persuasively argued, the primary concern of most foreign policy actors is "to relate their domestic environment to the contingencies of the international system". The international system referred to by the author represents the external factor in the foreign policy formulation process. The above sentiments were corroborated by Utete (1985) who

maintained that foreign policy decisions are made after receiving inputs from both the internal and external domain thus making the foreign policy formulation process a complicated exercise. According to this author, there are important factors which influence the external policy of a state. These include: the strength of the economy; national sentiments; and aspirations; the level and quality of information at the disposal of the government; leadership perception, etc. The foregoing synopsis therefore leads us to the discourse of the internal and external determinants of Nigeria's foreign policy especially with regards to Africa which is the focus of Nigeria foreign policy in the next sub section.

3.3.1. Desire for African Leadership

Nigeria's obsession with African continental leadership predates its existence as a legal geo-political and geographical sovereign entity. This obsession as it were was the principal motive behind the country's foreign policy towards Africa, especially on the issues of Anti-colonialism and the crucial issues which were of concern to the African continent. Long before its independence from Britain in 1960, Nigerians would be leaders, politicians, intellectuals, and the media had all subscribed to the concept of Nigeria's having a predestined leadership role to play in Africa. What then could be said to have been responsible for these nationalistic ambitions? As expected, there were compelling factors that birthed this expectation.

In February 2005, Prof. Bolaji Akinyemi, Nigeria's former external affairs minister (1985-1987), delivered a public lecture titled "Nigeria – The Blackman's Burden." In the text of the lecture, Akinyemi noted expressly that Nigeria's leadership aspirations in Africa was fired, energized and influenced by the early independence of its neighbour Ghana who had obtained independence in 1957, three years before Nigeria's political independence in 1960. This he observed "motivated" and "spurred" the consciousness of the Nigerian elites who believed that Nigeria had an important role to play in global affairs and that their country must quickly assert itself as the leader of Africa. He said that the early independence of Ghana which was the perceived

genuine African voice on the global stage did not go down well with Nigeria.[30] According to Akinyemi, Ghana's early independence and subsequent venturing into the anti-colonial struggle was considered within Nigeria's domestic circle as the usurpation of the role that should be an exclusive preserve of Nigeria, as: "Nigeria felt that this was an affront to the role which should have been reserved for Nigeria because of her mega size."[31] Thus it can be inferred from the foregoing that Nigeria perceived Ghana's early independence as a threat and challenge to its pre-independence thought of becoming Africa's continental leader. This is the role the Nigerian state felt it could use as the launch pad in attaining the status of continental leadership. To the Nigerian leadership elites, surpassing Ghana's effort in the decolonization race was tantamount to actualizing their country's leadership aspirations on the continent.

The fact that independent Ghana hit the ground running on Cold War issues and on other pan-African issues such as decolonization, forced the Nigerian leaders to begin to stark out foreign policy positions even before Nigeria's independence. It is for this reason that Akinyemi talks about ". . . the activist policy pursued by Ghana. She practically hit the ground running on Cold War issues and on Pan-Africanism. If Ghana had achieved independence and kept out of the international limelight, Nigeria would not have felt the urge to stake out foreign policy positions long before independence."[32] One critical point could be deduced from the above quote. It is the fact that Nigeria's anti-colonial policy was strategically shaped by the country's national interest which was the desire to lead Africa and more importantly become the continent's voice on issues pertaining to Africa.

To drive home the point, we shall refer to some of the historic statements which were made by prominent leaders of the Nigerian state, top diplomats and politicians about the leadership role they believed Nigeria should play in Africa. Theorists of the realist school argue that states

---

[30] See Akinyemi B. (2005), "the Blackman Burden" Text of the public lecture delivered on February 24, 2005, Lagos, Nigeria. p. 12
[31] Ibid
[32] Ibid

actors in the international system are motivated primarily by factors such as national interest and self-interest. The question which arises is: was Nigeria's participation in the anti-colonial struggle motivated by the country's national interest? Is there any link between those roles played and Nigeria's obsession with African leadership? As aforesaid, we shall briefly examine few of the statements credited to Nigerian leaders (politicians and diplomats) before and after independence in order for us to understand the thinking which guided the Nigerian state in its inter-African relations and most importantly to give answers to the questions posed above.

In March 1957, Ghana became the first black African state to obtain political independence from colonial rule. This development was a milestone not only in the history of Africa but also in global politics as it gave independent Ghana the leverage to speak for Africa in international Affairs albeit in de facto capacity. Kwame Nkrumah, the post-independence leader of the newly independent state of Ghana spoke glowingly of the "historic role" (Ghana) was to play in the liberation of other African countries from colonial subjugation.[33] This he claimed was "to lead …… our brethren who are still struggling to be free."[34] Subsequently in 1958, Kwame Nkrumah made another powerful statement while addressing the country's parliament stated amongst other things that: "whether we like it or not history has assigned to us a great responsibility, and we (must not) fail all the millions on this continent who look to us as a symbol of their hopes in Africa."[35]

From the Ghanaian perspective, these statements were not just issued for the sake of it they were laden with all elements of political realism as events which followed proved. As a matter of fact, the statements were driven by the sheer desire of Ghana to assume the leadership role in Africa; a development that did not go down well with the Nigerian Leadership who at the time was into a series of negotiations with Britain geared toward the attainment of Nigeria's

---

[33] Cited by Aluko O. (1976), Ghana and Nigeria 1957-1970: A Study in Inter-African Discord, Rex Collings Ltd, London, pp. 73-74.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid.

political independence in 1960. Consequently, from the Ghanaian perspective, the country, just like Nigeria, was also motivated by its nationalistic ambition which was to play a leadership role in Africa. Ghana led by an outstanding African leader in Nkrumah believed it was capable of playing a leadership role on the African continent regardless of its size or any other indices of power which Nigeria on the other hand projected and had used to lay claim to African leadership. In essence, it was these collisions of national interests of both countries (Nigeria and Ghana) that gave rise to the bitter rivalry and competition for African leadership within the period 1960 and 1970s. As Olajide Aluko argued in 1976, the Nigerian-Ghanaian rivalry for African continental leadership struggle was a function of their national interests: The struggle for leadership between Ghana and Nigeria "centred largely on the question of who should be Africa's spokesman in international affairs on such things as anti-colonialism, anti-racism, neo-colonialism, African unity and African ideology."[36] The foregoing make true the realists argument which states that International politics is the struggle for power among states actors who pursue their national interests selfishly; and at the expense of each other.

The leadership struggle between Nigeria and Ghana for the leadership of Africa assumed a different dimension when Nigerian leaders, politicians, and the press in an apparent reaction to President Nkrumah's claim to African leadership responded with varying degree of temperament to the Accra's leadership claim. It is pertinent for this study to consider a few of those reactions here in order to further justify how Nigeria subscribed to political realism – the theoretical framework upon which this study is built. In 1957, Chief S.L. Akintola, the leader of the Action Group party, the main opposition party in the Nigerian House of Representatives, launched a verbal attack on the Ghanaian leadership when he declared contemptuously that the whole of Ghana was same in population as two of Nigeria's provinces, of Kano and Kaduna.

---

[36] Aluko O. (1976), Ghana and Nigeria 1957-1970: A Study in Inter-African Discord, Rex Collings Ltd, London, pp. 73-74.

Hon. Akintola said: "Ghana must deal with us as elder brother" referring to Nigeria.[37] In the following year, precisely in 1958, Mr R.A. Fani-Kayode, also of the Action Group party in the federal legislature echoed Nigeria's leadership sentiments when he declared that "Nigeria is destined to lead Africa………black Africa as a whole to the total emancipation of all our peoples….".[38] Suffice to note that these nationalist sentiments continued to be trumpeted until 1960 when Nigeria eventually obtained its independence from Britain. On the attainment of Nigeria's political independence, the country's leaders, politicians and parliamentarians began to think on how to stop Ghana from playing that leadership role which many Nigerians such as Chief Anthony Enahoro – a federal parliamentarian considered to be Nigeria's "birth right."[39] As Nigerian independence approached, Nigeria relished the prospect of establishing itself as the leader of Africa which the country's elites believed could only be achieved by dislodging Ghana from the eminent leadership position it had attained on the continent through the instrumentality of the country's role in African decolonization and other pan-African issues.

In furtherance of this objective, the leader of the Nigerian delegation to the Second Conference of Independent African States which was held in Addis Ababa the Ethiopian capital in June 1960 few months before Nigeria's independence (Maitama Sule) spoke strongly against anyone - apparently referring to Ghana's Nkrumah who tagged himself "a messiah"[40], "with a mission to lead Africa"[41], to jettison the idea. In the same vein, Sir Abubakar Balewa, Nigeria's Prime Minister (1957-1966) had earlier in January 1960 expressed the country's continental leadership ambitions in anticipation when he told the Nigerian parliament that Nigeria would have a "wonderful opportunity" to speak for Africa at the United Nations - the world's most influential multilateral diplomatic platform.[42]

---

[37] Ibid.
[38] Ibid. p. 75.
[39] Ibid. p. 74.
[40] Ibid.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Ibid.

In the same year, 1960, during the debate on Pan-Africanism in the Nigerian parliament, some national parliamentarians called on the Nigerian political leadership to assert the country leadership in Africa by getting more involved in the African project. The country's parliamentarians were of the conviction that their country - Nigeria should assert itself by playing a leadership role in pan-African affairs. For instance, Hon. E.C. Akwiwu, a member of the Nigerian parliament had during the debate proposed the setting up of Ministry of Pan-African affairs which would be independent of the Ministry of external affairs. The legislator argued that doing so was "absolutely important that something special should be done to see that our government is well advised and plays its due part in matters relating to Africa"[43] Hon. Akwiwu's views were corroborated by another member of the Nigerian House of Representatives – as it was then known. While adding his voice to the need for Nigeria to assume continental leadership, Hon. Kalu Ezera, argued that "there is a crying and urgent need for Nigeria to project her personality adequately into the scheme of things relating to the destiny of Africa…"[44] Also in January 1960, Festus Okotie – Eboh, Nigeria's finance minister spoke concerning Nigeria's leadership ambitions thus:

> Nigeria must show that by her size . . . population . . . economic potentialities and all the resources at her command, she is prepared to lead Africa so that Africa can be seen as a principal personality and a nation that will be recognized not as a second – class nation but a first class (nation) in the comity of nations.[45]

Doubts about Nigeria's continental leadership quest was doused in 1961 when Jaja Wachucku, the then Foreign Affairs Minister declared: "…Nigeria….is the largest single unit in Africa….and so must lead Africa…and we not going to abdicate the leadership position in which God

---

[43]See Akinterinwa B. (2012), Overview of Nigeria's Foreign Policy, 1960-2010: Challenges and Recommendations" in review of Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Issues and Perspective, E. Anyaoku ed, NIIA Publishers, Lagos, Nigeria, p.18.
[44] Ibid.
[45] Cited by Bassey E.A. (1987), Decolonization and Dependence: The Development of Nigerian – U.S. Relations, 1960 – 1984, Westview Press/Boulder, p. 54.

Almighty has placed on us."[46] This particular statement suffices to say was in response to the challenge posed by Ghana to Nigeria's leadership aspirations. The two countries perceived each other as obstacles to their desires for dominance. For instance, while Ghana's continental leadership credentials was based on the fact that it got independence before any Black African country, Nigeria's credentials for African leadership flew from the country's superior numerical advantage which Jaja Wachukwu – Nigeria foreign minister 1960-1961 claimed gave Nigeria the right to lay claim to African leadership. Aluko (1976:15) captured the interests – laden leadership struggle between Nigeria and Ghana thus: "Just as Ghana viewed Nigeria as the greatest obstacle to her dominance in Africa, so also did Nigeria view Ghana." This then leads to the conclusion that both countries typify the realist argument which states that national interests underpins the struggle for power in international politics. The fact that Nigeria's obsession with African continental leadership was in line with the country's national interest was unambiguously established by Jaja Wachukwu, cited in Olusanya and Akindele (1986:511). The Nigerian minister declared that Nigeria's foreign policy is tied to her national interests: "…the policy of the Government for each occasion is to be selected with proper independent objectively in Nigeria's national interest. Nigeria's policy at all times is to be founded on Nigeria's interest…." This statement indicates that Nigeria's foreign policy is strategically designed to protect, advance, and project the country's national interest.

Conclusively it can be inferred from the above discussion that Nigeria's foreign relations were primarily and fundamentally driven by its national interests. This was overtly shown by the country during the leadership struggle with Ghana for continental leadership. Other authors have also argued that Nigeria's foreign policy was aimed at playing a leadership role in Africa which even included some Nigerian diplomats and top politicians have made arguments that suggested that Nigeria continental leadership had hegemonic undertones. For instance, Shehu Shagari, Nigeria's president from (1979 to 1983), once noted: "Just as President Monroe

---

[46] Cited by Sinclair M. (1983), An Analysis of Nigeria's Foreign Policy: The Evolution of Political Paranoia, the South African Institute of International Affairs, Braamfontein, South Africa. Pg. 1

proclaimed the American hemisphere free from the military incursions of European empire builders and adventurers, so also do we in Nigeria and in Africa, insist that African affairs be left to Africans to settle."[47] Relatedly, a former Nigerian Defense Minister, Akanbi Oniyangi, spoke about Nigeria's foreign policy and its objectives thus: "We . . . agreed that Nigeria should provide leadership role in Africa. . . By and large our people would want Nigeria to become and remain the dominant power in our Sub-region, and on the African continent as a whole."[48] This statement again reveals the undercurrents of Nigeria's foreign policy. Two keys words can be extracted from the statement above. First is the resolve to provide leadership to the continent. Second is that hegemonic aspiration of wanting to become the "dominant power" on the African continent. This justifies the realist assertion that state actors acts in pursuit of their national interests and that international relations is basically about the struggle for power.

Thus, from the foregoing, it is clear that Nigeria's foreign policy, especially as it relates to Africa, has been guided since independence by the country's national interest which as explained above was motivated by the desire to lead the continent and this explains Nigeria's efforts in the anti-colonial activities between the period of its own independence in 1960 and the formal democratic transition in South-Africa in 1994. It has to be noted that even before independence, Nigeria never at any time hid its leadership aspirations in Africa. It was therefore in furtherance of this aspiration that the Nigerian state got involved in the anti-colonial struggles in Africa. There were other factors which prompted the country's behaviour in the area of African decolonization which will be discussed extensively in this chapter and subsequent chapters. However, those factors were secondary when viewed from the foreign policy angle of the Nigerian state and the historical statements credited to Nigerian leaders and

---

[47] Cited by Adebajo, A. (2008) "Hegemony on a Shoestring, Nigeria's Post-Cold War Foreign Policy," in Gulliver Troubles, Nigeria's Foreign Policy after the Cold War, A. Adebajo and A. R. Mustapha (eds) University of KwaZulu Natal Press, Scottsville, South Africa, p. 13.

[48] Cited by Akinyemi B. "Nigeria Foreign Policy in the 21st Century," Text of a public lecture delivered to the senior executive course no 25. Of the national institute for Policy and Strategic Studies, Kuru, Nigeria, June 17, 2003.

politicians some of which have been discussed in this chapter. Thus, from the realist political perspective, it can be deduced based on the statements discussed above that Nigeria's endeavour regarding African decolonization revolved primarily around its national interest and leadership aspirations. The following sub sections examine other factors that shaped the making of Nigeria's foreign policy.

3.3.2. Population Size

One of the key determinants of Nigeria's foreign policy is the size of its population. The country (Nigeria) is home to the largest concentration of black people on the planet. It is often said that out of every four to six blacks one is a Nigerian. Duke (1999) and Joe-Garba (1987) both shared this sentiment. According to Osuntokun (2005) population was one of the key determinants of Nigeria's foreign policy at independence. This he argued led to Nigeria's feeling that she had a responsibility beyond her boarders as well as a legitimate claim to the leadership of the African continent and the black Diaspora. The importance attached to the size of Nigeria's population was articulated shortly after independence on a global platform by the first Nigerian leader of the post-colonial era- Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa during his inaugural address to the United Nations General Assembly on 7th October 1960. The Nigerian leader had on two occasions in the course of his speech claimed that his country had a population advantage vis-à-vis other countries in Africa. He stated thus "We in Nigeria appreciate the advantages which the size of our country and its population give us…"[49] He stressed further: "We in Nigeria are a populous country - there are nearly forty millions of us –and our territory is relatively large. [50] This further explains the role of the population as a key determinant of Nigeria's foreign policy. The importance attached to it by the Nigerian leader is a reflection of the premium placed on it

---

[49]   See. Prime Minister, A Selection of Speeches Made by Alhaji (Sir) Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Prime Minister of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1960-1966, Nigerian National Press Ltd, Apapa, Lagos, Nigeria, 1964, p. 55.

[50] Ibid.

within the domestic circle in the formulation of the country's policy of international relations. There is more evidence that population played a role in determining Nigeria's foreign policy. Osuntokun (2005) argued that a country's national power has direct relevance to its foreign policy. In the case of Nigeria, the author cited the size of the country's population as an element of its national power that places Nigeria in a strategic advantage in the sense that the country cannot be easily overrun and that with such population come a big market for foreign investment.

3.3.3. Economy

Economic considerations also played an important role in determining the foreign policy of Nigeria. Undoubtedly, Nigeria is richly endowed with money - spinning natural resources that include: bitumen, crude oil, uranium, gold, phosphates, coal, cocoa, coffee, tin, columbines, rubber, and groundnut. According to Duke (1999) the possession of these resources meant that Nigeria could leverage on them to achieve it foreign policy objectives. Adeyemo (2002:58) argued that "The possession of abundant natural resources increased Nigeria's freedom to manoeuver in international (or world) politics." His views were corroborated by Akinyemi (2005) who maintained that economic considerations not only played an integral role in determining Nigeria's foreign policy but also bred an expectation of a leadership and activist role for the country in the global system using its economic potentials and strength as a launch pad in this regard. The leadership and activist role according to the author was expected to help attain Nigeria's manifest destiny to become a black power. This proves that Nigeria's foreign policy towards Africa had a leadership and power undertone.

3.3.4. Military

A country's Military potential forms one of the parameters for measuring its standing in the world, especially internationally (Duke, 1999). In the case of the Nigerian state, its military potential had since independence become one of the instruments which Nigeria has used to project and justify its leadership credentials on the African continent. According to Fawole

(2003), the notion of a leadership role for Nigeria in African affairs was not only a reflection of the mentality of the country's citizens and its leadership alone, but was also to some extent a function of the role the Nigeria state was deemed capable of playing in Africa by the international community. It was in recognition of this therefore that the United Nations beckoned on Nigeria barely a month after its own independence to allow its military to take part in the UN peacekeeping operations in the Congo - a request which the Nigerian government acceded to by sending a large contingent of Nigerian soldiers and policemen to assist in quelling the Congolese crisis. Nigeria's participation in the UN peace keeping operations in Congo according to Gray Cowan cited in Fawole (2003) suggests that the country was expected to play a decisive role in African politics. He went on to state that the dispatch of Nigerian troops to the Congo created a new public awareness at home of the fact that Nigeria now has a place in world affairs as well as on the African scene.

This argument illustrates the fact that Nigeria was indeed desirous of a continental leadership role. The consciousness generated on the home front and the significance attached to Nigeria's military intervention in the Congo crisis coupled with the expressed satisfaction it engendered attest to the premium placed on this element of its national power as an instrument of influence for Nigeria in international affairs. Cowan submitted that the Nigerian leaders and elites were of the impression that their country had all it takes to assume a sub-imperial role in Africa – the role which Nigeria had envisioned even before its independence.

3.3.5. Public opinion

The role of public opinion in the formulation of Nigeria's foreign policy is important in the study of the country's actions on key issues of national and international importance. Public opinion constitutes the chunk of the views that are expressed by interest groups within the country. These views are reflections of the thoughts of the general public who articulate their views through the use of the mass media like the print and the electronic media which consist of Newspapers, magazines radio, television, etc. Other platforms in which public opinions are

articulated include seminars, workshops, conferences, and public lectures. In Nigeria, public opinion is also expressed by parliament, political parties, students, professional bodies, labour organizations, academics, research institutions, the business class/sector, educational institutions, and the press. These groups exert a degree of influence in foreign policy decision making process in Nigeria (Akinyemi, 2005; Iroh, 2005; Ogwu, 1986; Ajibola, 1978).

The above statement is instructive in the sense that it affirms the role of public opinion in Nigeria's foreign policy decision making process. Thus far we have examined the internal determinants of Nigeria's foreign policy. At this juncture therefore, we shall shift our attention to the external determinants of the country's foreign policy which are discussed below.

3.4. External factors/determinants of Nigeria's foreign policy

Having considered the internal factors/determinants that shaped the formulation of Nigeria's foreign policy, the external factors/determinants which also shaped Nigeria's foreign policy are discussed below.

3.4.1. Cold War Crisis

The Cold War as mentioned in the preceding chapter refers to the era of high tension competitiveness and bitter rivalry between the Eastern and Western power blocs led by the Soviet Union and the United States respectively. The Cold War crisis ensued shortly after World War Two and ended in 1990 with the collapse of the Soviet Union. This however is not the focus of this chapter; our focus here is to discuss, albeit briefly, how the cold war situation influenced Nigeria's foreign policy. Nigeria as earlier observed became independent in 1960 – in a period when the cold war crisis became the defining factor in international politics – the political divisiveness it engendered within the global system gives credence to this assertion.

As a newly independent state with virtually no experience about the intricacies of the international system, Nigeria, cognizant of the Cold War situation and its ominous agenda, took an official position which the country's foreign policy decision makers felt was the most

appropriate for Nigeria. It was therefore in recognition of this ideological crisis - cum Cold War between the *dramatis personae* – the East and the West that necessitated Nigeria's resolve to declare a non-align policy on the cold war situation.

Nigeria's position was captured in the acceptance speech which was delivered by the Nigerian Prime Minister, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa on October 7 1960 before the UN General Assembly. On his country's stance on the cold war crisis, He stated: "we do not intend to align ourselves as a matter of routine with any power blocs"[51] The Nigerian leader gave some explanations to his country's stance on the crisis citing its relative lack of experience on the field of international politics; its readiness to learn it; and its unwillingness to rush into it. He went on to say that: "We are willing to learn before we rush into the field of international politics…" the Prime Minister stated further that Nigeria was "totally unwilling to be diverted from the ideals which we think true."[52] To him the existence of bloc politics in the United Nations was a contradiction in terms which he (Balewa) abhorred. He maintained: "…indeed I hate the very idea of blocs existing at all in the United Nations – it seems to me to be a contradiction in terms."[53]The argument presented so far demonstrates that the Cold War played an integral part in the formulation of Nigeria's foreign policy. Even though Nigeria was never aligned to any of the power blocs in ideological sense, it was economically tied to the British and Americans.

3.4.2. Colonial situation in Africa

The colonial situation especially in the Southern African region created a sense of consciousness for Nigerian foreign policy framers so much more that the country had to take a stand on the issue right from the time of its independence. As at the time of Nigeria's independence, the Southern African region was still under the grip of white racist regimes that initiated and

---

[51]See. Prime Minister, A Selection of Speeches Made by Alhaji (Sir) Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Prime Minister of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1960-1966, Nigerian National Press Ltd, Apapa, Lagos, Nigeria, 1964 p. 55

[52]Ibid
[53]Ibid

enacted various oppressive and suppressive colonial policies; the most extreme being the draconian apartheid policy in South-Africa. It was against this background therefore that Nigeria declared its readiness to help in the attainment of political independence for African countries still under colonial rule.

This commitment was cogently captured in the inaugural address of the first Nigerian prime minister under the new political dispensation, Sir AbubakarTafawaBalewa which he delivered to the UN General Assembly on 7th October, 1960. He stated amongst other things that: "Nigeria hopes to work with other African states for the progress of Africa and to assist in bringing all African territories to a state of responsible independence."[54]The above declaration underpinned Nigeria's foreign policy behaviour on issues of anti-colonialism, racism, and decolonization in the years which followed.

3.4.3. Pan African Movement

Pan Africanism as noted in the preceding chapter originated from the Caribbean towards the end of the 19th century. The pan-African movement played an important role in stocking the fire of anti-colonialism, the political wind which brought independence to Africa. How then did this movement influence Nigeria's post-independence foreign policy? Claude Philips gave an answer to this when he argued that before Nigeria's independence thought had been given to foreign policy as one of Nigeria's frontline nationalist, Dr Nnamdi Azikwe, who later became Nigeria's ceremonial president at independence had for twenty-five years been in the forefront in preaching Pan-Africanism. The pan-Africanist consciousness of Azikiwe and other Nigerian leaders formed part of the factors that influenced Nigeria's post-independence foreign policy. This view was advanced by Otunla (2005:313) that "the cardinal principles of Pan-Africanism…inform Nigeria's foreign policy." Thus far we have concentrated on the determinant factors of Nigeria's foreign policy; the next section will be devoted to Nigeria's foreign policy discourse and analysis under each administration.

---

[54]Ibid

3.5.   Nigeria's foreign policy under successive administration, 1960-1994

As mentioned in the foregoing, this section shall be preoccupied with the analysis and the discourse of Nigeria's foreign policy between the above stated periods. To this end, our objective will be to understand the dynamics, the trends, and the changing roles of the country's foreign policy on anti-colonialism and other issues in international politics which were of interest to the Nigerian state. Why is the study of Nigeria's foreign policy periodized in this case? The answer lies in the fact that there were global changes during this period which were of continental and global dimension. Nigeria as a member of the world community was not immune to these developments. For instance, issues like the Cold War, African continental politics, and significant internal dynamics in Nigeria are the core of the issues that dominated this period which this section will consider. In other words, this section will be investigated in relation to the global and continental changes enumerated above. We begin with Prime Minister Sir Balewa's regime.

On October 1, 1960, the British colonial administrators handed over the mantle of political leadership to Nigerian indigenous leaders thereby bringing to an end a 99 years period of British colonial rule. With independence secured, Nigeria, under the Balewa administration hit the ground running by unveiling the country's foreign policy agenda which was to guide activities on issues which were of interest to Nigeria in international affairs. As observed earlier in this chapter, the Prime minister of the newly independent state Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa articulated the operational principles of his country's foreign policy in his debut address to the United Nations General Assembly on October 7, 1960. The highlights of these principles were: absence of territorial or expansionist intentions; friendly relations with neighbouring countries; commitment to the principles upon which the United Nations Organization as enshrined in its charter; non-alignment with any of the power blocs - East or West; commitment to the progress of Africa; and the desire to assist in bringing all African territories to a state of responsible independence. According to Gambari (2005:187-188), "the national interest of Nigeria has been developed along these broad principles and pursued with vigour by all subsequent

governments in Nigeria since the country's independence." This view corroborates that of Ogwu (1986) that the foreign policy statement of the Nigerian state is a reflection of its national interest.

The foreign policy action of Nigeria during the Balewa regime was laden with mixed features. It was conservative; moderate; and occasionally pragmatic owning to two reasons: the manner at which Nigeria attained its independence; and the personality nature of the Prime Minister which compelled his government to operate this kind of foreign policy in the immediate post-independence years which is under focus. Nigeria's independence suffice to say was a product of "consensual decolonization" (Duke 1999) which means not through armed struggle or guerrilla warfare like those experienced in the Southern African liberation struggles but through conferences and dialogues where decisions were reached without acrimony or bitterness. Even Sir Abubakar attested to this assertion that his country was fortunate to have obtained independence without violence. He said: "we in Nigeria have been fortunate in achieving our independence without bloodshed or bitterness…"[55] Having attained its independence on a seeming platter of gold, the Balewa regime therefore thought it worthwhile to protect the interest of the British government in the country's foreign policy activities. The last in the series of these conferences and dialogues which ushered in the country's independence was held in 1958 in London where the 1960 date for Nigeria's independence was agreed upon. Secondly, the personality nature of Balewa as noted above has been described by authors and commentators as having been calm and compromising. This made the Nigerian leader vulnerable to extra-African manipulation especially in the hands of the Britain and America.

When Nigeria obtained independence in October 1960 there was an anti-colonial foreign policy declaration of intent by the political leadership of Nigeria. Although the international

---

[55] See. Prime Minister, A Selection of Speeches Made by Alhaji (Sir) Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Prime Minister of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1960-1966, Nigerian National Press Ltd, Apapa, Lagos, Nigeria, 1964, p. 55.

community had already condemned all forms of colonialism, racism, and apartheid prior to Nigeria's emergence on the international scene, however, Nigeria's presence and voice was added to the existing army of anti-colonial resentments across the World. After providing the theoretical basis of his government on the colonial situation in Africa, the Balewa-led regime swung into action in an attempt to put the principles of the country's policy into practice. This happened when Nigeria joined all other anti-colonial and freedom loving member states of the United Nations in December 1960 two months after its admission into the world body. Nigeria joined other countries to adopt the historic resolution which called for the granting of independence to Colonial Countries and peoples. The support given to this declaration was a clear demonstration of the country's readiness to help eradicate out of the continent the vestiges of colonialism. The Balewa regime's commitment was reiterated by the then foreign affairs minister Jaja Wachukwu who elaborated on Nigeria's resolve in this regard. The total eradication of all forms of racial discrimination was a prominent feature on Nigeria's foreign policy agenda (Ajala, 1989).

Afterwards he affirms: "our second objective is the total liberation of the whole of African continent from foreign domination. There can be no going back on that: colonialism in all its manifestations anywhere in Africa must be ended. We would be failing in our duty if we did not use our full resources-mental and material –in the struggle for the emancipation of the rest of the continental" (Ajala 1989:176). The Nigerian Prime Minister Sir, Tafawa Balewa expressed his governments' commitment to the struggle against colonialism and racial discrimination at the maiden submit of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in 1963 thus: "On the question of colonialism and racial discrimination . . . we in Nigeria will never compromise" (Ajala, 1989:177). The question which we seek to provide an answer to now is: did the regime match its words with action in this regard? The answer can be found in the fact that the regime did albeit not unimpeded. The Balewa regime, as earlier observed, was rope - tied to the whims and caprices of the Western powers (especially Britain and America) apart from the circumstance under which Nigeria obtained its independence. Apart from the personality nature of Balewa himself which we mentioned earlier there were other reasons why Nigeria's

foreign policy under the Balewa regime was deemed to have lack "consistency" "to be contradictory and self-defeating" Idang (1973). The country's bilateral relationships with its ex-colonial power – Britain and the United States within the six years created and imposed on the Balewa's government a sort of foreign policy restraints and limitations for Nigeria especially on the critical issue of decolonization in Africa.

The Balewa regime according to Bassey (1987:23-24) had to strike a balance between the "necessity of external dependence in the realization of crucial state interests against the virtue of domestic pressures regarding the desirability of a mobilizing, radical anti -colonial regional posture that would threaten Anglo-American interests and objectives in Africa." This dilemma can be attributed to the fact that Nigeria's major external economic partners in areas such as technical assistance, capital aid, private investment and trade during the Balewa regime were Britain and America. Thus the economic dependency of the Balewa regime on these two major powers limited its options in the discharge of the country's foreign policy objectives especially on the African decolonization progressed. Hence the conservative posture of the regime. Despite the Balewa regime's conservative disposition, Nigeria under his leadership still operated a foreign policy that was commitment to the eradication of colonialism and racialism in Africa. Consequently, there is need to examine the Balewa regime's responses to these issues by examining its actions on the African colonial situation. The first policy action on decolonization of Africa by the Balewa regime was taken shortly after independence in October 1960 following the Sharpeville incident in South-Africa which claimed 69 people to be exact and left scores. This incident generated wild-spread indignation reaction across the Nigerian state.[56] Chief Obafemi Awolowo, the leader of the opposition party- the Action Group (AG) called on the Nigerian government to take immediate and effective steps Balewa regime as a matter of urgent importance against the apartheid regime in South Africa.

---

[56] See Akiba O. (1998), Nigeria's Foreign Policy towards Africa: Continuity and Change" Peter Lang Publishers, New York, pp. 137-138.

The Nigerian Prime Minister was particularly asked to expel all white South Africans and business interests from Nigeria forthwith following the murderous Sharpeville incident. The Nigerian opposition leader Chief Obafemi Awolowo also urged Prime Minister Balewa to work towards expelling South Africa from the British Commonwealth because according to Chief Awolowo, there could be no affinity or family ties with a sadist and barbaric regime that had "displayed a sadism and barbarism which are rare in the annals of man."[57] This was followed by the Western Nigeria House of Assembly's unanimous resolution calling on the federal government to invoke appropriate sanctions against the apartheid regime in South-Africa.[58] The temper of the times was evident in intensive rallies mass rallies, political demonstrations which were organized by political parties, various youth movements, trade unions, and church groups who all condemned in the strongest terms the mass killings of the peaceful protesters in Sharpeville. They ended their demonstrations with a call on the Balewa regime to brace up and be more assertive in the revolutionary and diplomatic activities aimed at eliminating the scourge of apartheid and other forms of alien domination of African peoples in the continent.[59]

In his reaction as the leader of the country, Sir Abubakar who had earlier expressed his sadness and condemnation over the killings, drew the attention of the British government to "the concern felt throughout Nigeria as a result of the incident"[60] He therefore charged the western powers to do everything possible to expedite action towards the elimination of apartheid and colonialism in the Sothern African region. In an apparent move to satisfy the yearnings of the populace, the Balewa regime took immediate steps against South Africa by expelling the South-African Dutch Reformed Church from Nigeria. Furthermore, on April 5, 1960, a private member's bill was passed which urged "the Government to take appropriate steps to ban the importation of South-African goods in the country." This was followed by other measures like the termination of the appointment of white South-Africans who were in the service of the

---

[57] Ibid.
[58] Ibid.
[59] Ibid.
[60] Ibid.

Nigerian federal government. The Nigerian government afterwards called on the three regional governments to follow suit. The Balewa regime also revoked the contracts which had been awarded earlier to South-African companies with a vow that no white South-Africans would be offered employment again by the regime.[61] Balewa's political party – the Northern People's Congress (NPC) also established a trust fund for the Sharpeville massacre victims.

At the Commonwealth conference of 1961, the Balewa regime in furtherance of its criticism of apartheid used the platform of the Commonwealth to call for the expulsion of South-Africa from the Commonwealth of Nations if the racist regime insisted on preserving the status-quo. This, according to Duke (1999:39), "became a case of using moral persuasion to achieve foreign policy objectives." To the Nigerian leader, the apartheid situation was more of a moral question which then explained the Prime Minister's decision to seek South-Africa's ousting on the grounds that it had lost every right as a racist regime to retain its membership in an association of free and equal nations. Consequently, with the collective strength of other progressive countries such as Canada, New Zealand, Great Britain, Ghana, Pakistan, Malaysia, Tanzania and India, apartheid South-Africa was forced to withdraw from the British Commonwealth in 1961 (Akiba 1998; Duke, 1999). Following the apartheid regime's expulsion from the Commonwealth, an enraged South-African Prime Minister Verwoerd launched a barrage of verbal assault on those countries that facilitated South-Africa's ousting from the organization. The then South-African apartheid leader labelled them as "detractors" "vindictive and hypocritical" elements. He particularly singled out the Nigerian Prime Minister for attack because of his views with respect to issues of white/non-whites relations in South Africa. Prime Minister Verwoerd accused labelled Balewa a fanatic for not being realistic in his assessment of the racial policies in South-Africa (Duke, 1999).

---

[61] Ibid.

As earlier argued, economic dependence of the Nigerian state on Western countries such as Britain and the United States, the nature and process of Nigeria's decolonization and the personality being of the Prime Minister were all factors that influenced the regime's posture on colonial issues. Thus, Nigeria's foreign policy began to manifest conservative traits as early as 1962 due to the absence of political will, and the much needed assertiveness which the leadership of the country lacked. In 1963, Nigeria joined other independent African states to mid-wife the Organization of African Unity OAU into existence. In a continent that had been bedevilled with the ills of colonialism, and racism for many decades' the emergence of the OAU was not only seen as a precursor to fostering continental unity but also seen as a platform through which , 1960-1966, Nigeria joined the moderate "conservative"- Monrovia group. Suffice to say that this was at a time when passionate pan-Africanists associated with the militant, vociferous group who demanded for immediate freedom and emancipation of all Africans and peoples of African descent. This period represents one of the lowest moments in Nigeria's anti-colonial history due to the fact that many had expected Nigeria to act in concert with the more forceful Casablanca group in expediting the process of African decolonization but Prime Minister Balewa and its officials choose to align themselves with the "Monrovia" group (Duke, 1999).

As is usually the case with divergent ideological groups, the ideological underpinning of the Monrovia and Casablanca groups was conflicting. While Nigeria favoured a functional approach to continental unity, the Casablanca adopted a radical political approach which sought to bring the entire African continent under a single political union. Ghana's President Kwame Nkrumah was one the leading apostles and promoters of the idea. The idea of African unification was subsequently repudiated by the Nigerian Prime Minister – Balewa during the pan-African submit in May 1963. Elaborating on Nigeria's position with regards to Ghana's continental unification agenda which was presented by the Casablanca group, the Nigerian Prime Minster Abubakar Tafawa Balewa reminded his fellow African leaders that:

Nigeria's stand is that if we want unity in Africa, we must first agree to certain essential things; the first is that African States must respect one another. There must be acceptance of equality by all states. No matter whether they are big or small, they are all sovereign and sovereignty is sovereignty. The size of a state, its population or its wealth should not be the criteria. It has been pointed out many times that the smaller states in Africa have no right to exist because they are too small. We in Nigeria do not agree. . .[62]

Nigeria's backing of the UN led anti-Lumumba forces in former Congo (now Democratic Republic of Congo) was opposed to Ghana's hard stance against the UN intervention in the Congo crisis of 1960. Nigeria sent troops to Congo under the auspices of the UN without fully supporting the embattled Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba who had cried out for support from fellow African countries following the bombardment of his country by the forces of Cold War (Dokubo, 2010). These were some of the manifestations of a deep-seated rivalry between Nigeria and Ghana for the leadership of Africa. Nkrumah's radical, pro-communist inclination and the support for radical opposition groups in Nigeria also underlay the rivalry between the two countries. The rivalry between the two countries was summed as follows, "anti-Nkrumahism was a major factor theme of Nigeria's foreign policy in the first republic".[63] This suggests that a leadership rivalry existed at the time between Nigeria and Ghana. There was further deterioration of the Balewa decolonization policy when Nigeria shocked many observers within and outside the country with its decision to maintain relations with Southern Rhodesia and Portugal and for even allowing the representatives of these countries to open offices in Lagos, the then Nigerian capital before it was moved to Abuja. The Balewa regime thus demonstrated its unsavoury attitude of permissiveness and compromise on the decolonization question despite the fact that Portugal the (Colonial aggressor in Angola) had

---

[62] Proceedings of the Conference of Independent African States, Vol. 1, Section 2 Addis Ababa, May 1963. Statement by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister of Nigeria, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa.
[63] Cited in Beyond 50 Years of Nigeria's Foreign Policy, Issues, Challenges and Prospects, Osita C. E. eds, 2010, NIIA, Lagos, Nigeria

earlier refused to grant a minimal condition which was sought by Jaja Wachukwu - the foreign affairs minister of Nigeria as way of finding a solution to the crisis in Portuguese controlled territories but instead suppressed by armed measures the internal movements agitating for independence.

The Balewa regime's action in this regard was not only self-contradictory but also a mockery of its avowed foreign policy stance on the colonial problem. What even made it more ironic was the fact that the 1963 OAU resolution on decolonization of which Nigeria was a signatory to expressly forbade member states from preserving any kind of diplomatic links with the Portuguese colonial government in Angola but Nigeria as a foundation member and signatory to the OAU charter – and to that particular decision failed to perform its obligations because its leadership believed that it's more vital economic interests require policy harmonization with the United States one of the major economic backers of Nigeria during the Balewa years and also a NATO ally of Portugal. In January 1963, Mr Jaja Wachuckwu – Nigeria's foreign affairs minister took another swipe at the apartheid regime in South Africa when he said: "the problem of apartheid would be solved as a situation in which three million whites lording it over eleven million Africans could not last."[64] Also in May 1963, the Nigerian labour minister, Chief Modupe Johnson, resigned from the presidency of the International labour Organization (ILO), in solidarity with the African stand against South Africa's apartheid policy. The Nigerian minister's resignation was as a result of South Africa's presence at the 108 - nation ILO conference which later led to the boycott of the conference by independent African states.[65]

As earlier indicated, Nigeria's conservative and moderate foreign policy posture during the six years premiership of Sir Abubakar Balewa was as a result of the county's overdependence on its so-called Western partners. Even on the issue of non-alignment there were evidences that suggested that Prime Minister Balewa's regime was tactically aligned with the west albeit

---

[64] See the Nigerian Tribune Newspaper, Thursday, January 17, 1963.
[65] See the Nigerian Tribune Newspaper, June 19,1963

undeclared. The regime's unfriendly attitude to the Eastern European countries – the opposing bloc of the Cold War were proves that Lagos had soft-spot for the West although undeclared as noted above. For instance, while Balewa and his colleagues found it convenient to limit the number of Soviet diplomatic staff in Lagos to 10, those of the US and Britain were not limited to any number as they were allowed to carry out their diplomatic activities unrestrained. In addition to this, communist literatures were banned while the Balewa regime also declined grants and scholarship offers by Eastern European countries to students of Nigerian origin to study in Russia (Duke, 1999)

In summary, the Balewa regime can be credited to have played some commendable roles on the anti-colonial issue in Africa which was in line with the regime's declared intention in this regard during this period. However, the conservative posture the regime manifested subsequently towards the issues of decolonization, and racism was in contrast to the progressive measures taken earlier by the regime. The Balewa regime was toppled in a bloody coup led by young military officers after six years in the saddle on January 15, 1966. The coup in question marked the beginning of military incursion into Nigerian politics which had a tremendous effect on Nigeria's anti-colonial foreign policy. The post-Balewa regime produced Major General Thomas Aguiyi Ironsi who declared himself Head of state and commander-in-Chief of the Armed forces of Nigeria. The termination of the Balewa regime via a military coup led to the emergence of the first military regime in Nigeria headed by the General Officer Commanding (GOC) the highest ranking military officer at the time General Aguiyi Ironsi. Upon assumption of office, General Ironsi declared that his regime would not breakaway from the anti-colonial policy of his civilian predecessor. On the issue of decolonization, the regime at inception took a radical stance against the white minority regimes in Southern Africa. The Ironsi regime despite the short time it spent in the saddle before its ouster continued to provide freedom fighters with the much needed support. In February1966, the regime sent a protest delegation to the United States government against US collaboration with Ian Smith's illegal and minority regime in Southern Rhodesia (Now Zimbabwe) for allowing the Ian Smith rebel

government to operate an information Office in Washington. Three months later, the regime declared the Portuguese and White South-Africans prohibited immigrants and followed this action up when it sent a letter to notify the United Nations officially about the decision to ban the unrepentant colonialists from Nigeria. In the said letter, which was written to the UN Secretary – General U. Thant, the regime told the UN Chief about Nigeria's ban on Portuguese and South-African ships and aircrafts from Nigeria due to their brutish colonial policies in Africa. In June 1966, while addressing Nigerian diplomats who were assigned to serve in foreign missions in other African countries, General Ironsi echoed the sentiments expressed by Nigerian leaders when he linked the country's anti-colonial foreign policy with its leadership aspirations in Africa. To Ironsi, Nigeria's continental leadership aspirations would be judged by the role it's was able to play on the African continent especially on the anti-colonial battle. He however confidently believed Nigeria could play such roles by the virtue of its population size and potentials. He asserted that his regime held dearly Nigeria's African policy. He articulated his view thus:

> The greatest importance to our African policy, we are aware that because of our population and potentials, the majority of opinion in the civilized world looks up to us to provide responsible leadership in Africa; and we realized that we shall be judged, to a very large extent by the degree of success or failure with which we face up to the challenge which this expectation throws on us. We are convinced that whether in the political, economic or cultural sphere, our destiny lies in our role in the continent of Africa.[66]

The above position corroborates the views expressed by other authors that Nigeria's anti-colonial drive was reflective of the country's continental leadership ambitions. The use of its national elements of power like population, economy, and others were measures perceived by

---

[66] See Daily Times Nigerian Newspaper, June, 10, 1966

the country's leadership as tools of projecting Nigeria's continental leadership credentials. Ogwu (1986:9) linked Nigeria's roles on African decolonization to the country's leadership interest. The author argued that: "Nigeria's active role in the African continent" was a "prerequisite to attaining its aspiration of greatness." This further shows that Nigeria's roles on decolonization were to serve as a launch pad for achieving a leadership role on the continent. As observed earlier, the regime lasted for merely six months before it was sacked on July 28, 1966 in a violent counter-coup which was orchestrated by Army officers from the Northern part of Nigeria. The aftermath of the putsch was the assassination of General Ironsi and subsequent emergence of Lt. Col Yakubu Gowon – a military officer of Northern origin as the new military head of state of Nigeria.

The Gowon regime on assumption of duty expressed its commitment to give moral and diplomatic support to African anti-colonial struggles, but was initially cautious and conservative like the Balewa regime on the anti-colonial struggles which were going on in Africa. The new regime at inception faced a plethora of domestic crises which were direct consequences of the January 15 and July 29 coup and counter-coups in Nigeria. The Gowon regime turned down the idea of sending arms directly to liberation fighters in the colonially subjected Southern African region, and even constituted a stumbling block in the raising of OAU liberation committee budget when the case was made that the budget should be increased. The Nigerian government under General Gowon bewildered many by voting for the reduction of the OAU liberation committee budget from 45,000 pounds to 35,000 pounds. This conservative disposition was reminiscent of the Balewa regime's approach towards the colonial question as earlier mentioned.

However, the outbreak of the Nigerian civil war necessitated a change in the regime's initial cautious and conservative behaviour as the racist regimes of Portugal, South-Africa and Southern Rhodesia cashed in on the Nigerian war situation by declaring their total support for the secessionist Biafra rebels. It was at this point therefore that it became obvious to Gowon's

regime that Nigeria under his leadership needed to employ a workable approach that would lead to the collapse of the reactionary racist regimes in Southern Africa. To the Gowon regime, the racist regime's support for Biafra constituted a huge threat to the survival, independence and territorial integrity of the Nigerian state and by extension other African states. Thus the Gowon regime without further hesitation jettisoned the Balewa regime's conservative approach and adopted a more pragmatic approach that could guarantee a speedy eradication of colonialism and supremacist ruler on the African continent.

Having realized the enormous danger the supremacist regimes posed to its existence as a corporate entity, Nigeria under the Gowon regime, initiated and presented a proposal to the OAU which indicated that the organization should assign to some independent Africa states the task of liberating key colonial enclaves from the grip of alien rulers. This single act, it should mentioned, marked a clear departure from the earlier posture of the regime to the colonial crisis as Nigeria afterwards continued to mount diplomatic pressures on the western powers at various international platforms. For instance, Nigeria had through it permanent representative to the UN Dr Okoi Arikpo in October 16, 1970 during a speech at the UN General Assembly accused the west of not showing concern and sympathy about the plight of Africans under colonial rule and also in the anti-colonial cause. The Nigerian diplomat called on the western powers to make their stance known on the colonial crisis. He declared:

> Either the western powers prefer to stain their hands with the precious blood of our people until we can tolerate it no longer or should join hands with all men who abhor oppression and exploitation to fight apartheid and thereby remain true friends of Africa.[67]

---

[67] Nigeria at the United Nations: A Partnership For Better World," A Ministry of External Affairs, Federal Republic of Nigeria Production, (Third Press Publishers, Lagos, Nigeria 1991).

The above represents Nigeria's stance on anti-colonialism and the country held on to this at a time when it was battling an internal secessionist rebellion. Some African states of the OAU took a conservative posture having apparently been compromised on the anti-colonial struggle when they called for a dialogue rather than the use of violence in ending apartheid and colonialism in Africa. The Nigerian state with the support of Ethiopia in June, 1971, rebuffed the idea of dialoguing and thus called on the OAU council of ministers to take a general pan-African posture on the issue of dialogue with the apartheid regime. The aftermath of this action was a declaration by the OAU ruling out dialogue as a means of settling the colonial crisis. The Gowon regime followed this anti-colonial stance by providing financial and material support for the liberation struggles in Africa. Despite being in a state of war, the Gowon regime still found it necessary as a matter of historical routine and the circumstances of the time to make a mark on the anti-colonial struggles in Africa. As earlier noted, the challenge posed by the colonial regimes of Southern Africa to the survival of Nigeria coupled with the desire of the Gowon regime to continue with the tradition of its predecessors in the anti-colonial struggle, shaped the regime's foreign policy behaviour in the civil war years. There are also other factors which affected the foreign policy of Nigeria during the Gowon regime. For instance, Nigeria erupted in a gruelling civil war during this period which lasted for thirty months.

The civil war broke out in 1967 when the eastern part of the country declared its secession from the Nigerian federation. The aftermath of this incident was the proclamation of the Republic of Biafra by the leader of the group Colonel Odumegwu Ojukwu. The Nigeria federal government in an attempt to bring back the seceded part of the country acted promptly with the announcement by General Gowon that his government was prepared to quell what he described as an act of rebellion. Thus the stage was set for an all-out war between the Nigerian government and Biafra. Indeed this had a great effect on the focus of Nigerian foreign policy at the time due to the roles of foreign countries in the war. To the Nigerian leaders preserving the unity and territorial integrity of the country was the most paramount while the Biafrans rebels on the other hand felt that the security and survival of their people could no longer be

guaranteed by the Nigerian government hence the need to break away from Nigeria. With both sides unprepared for war, the need for arms acquisition became a matter of urgent necessity for both the Nigerian government and Biafrans (Duke, 1999).

Therefore the warring sides solicited arms from foreign countries to advance their war objectives. While Nigeria looked to the west for arms supplies, the secessionist leaders of Biafra attempted to internationalize the conflict in order to seek diplomatic recognition for their regime. Nigerian leaders on the other hand sought to block outside interference in the crisis. Nigeria felt it had all it takes to bring the situation under control decisively and deal with the threats of secession while Biafra realized that they were in dire need of help from outside Nigeria's Borders (Stremlau, 1977). Consequently, the Biafra secessionist leaders put in place one of the most effective war propaganda machinery of all time to win the support of the outside world. In the course of the war, the Nigerian government suffered two major shocks, First, the Gowon regime had anticipated the military support of the Western powers; the country's traditional friends. The regime held the view that Britain and the US governments would automatically supply the country with the much needed weapons to wage the war upon payment; secondly, the Nigerian regime also suffered another blow in its diplomatic efforts to dissuade any African states against the recognition of Biafra. With the US government not showing any sign of providing support for the embattled country, and Britain initially hesitant to offer assistance; Nigeria was compelled to turn to the Soviet Union who agreed to supply the Nigerian military troops with the needed arms. Surprisingly, the British government that was initially hesitant declared its intention to offer military assistance to Nigeria in a desperate move to stop the Soviet Union from getting involved in the war especially in the heat-era of the cold war.

The US government's refusal to offer help stemmed from the fact that its domestic environment prevailed on the country's leadership not to do so. The foregoing therefore epitomizes the tremendous effect of the cold war on Nigeria's foreign policy and more

importantly its non-aligned mantra. However, the Gowon regime later issued a statement that Nigeria under his leadership still maintained its non-alignment policy despite the regime's romance with the eastern bloc. Gowon regime's continued with its war-time military policy towards the east with a state visit to Moscow, the first of its kind by any Nigerian leader. The military regime looked elsewhere for friends who were ready to do business selling weapons and receiving cash (Stremlau, 1977). During the Moscow visit the Nigerian government negotiated arms and cultural agreement and by August 1968 broke with tradition by importing massive military equipment from the USSR and Eastern Europe all in an attempt to halt the war. The Biafran leaders were supplied with weapons by the apartheid regime of South Africa the white ruled Southern Rhodesia and the Portuguese government. Among the then independent African states, there were countries which supported Biafra. Among these counties were the Central African Republic and Benin Republic who played various roles during the war (Ogunbadejo, 1976). The Benin Republic was quite sympathetic to the cause of the Biafran people with the argument that Biafra was big enough to be an independent country of its own. The Nigerian leadership felt betrayed with the position of its west-Africa neighbour's leadership on the Nigerian civil war and reacted swiftly by ordering the immediate partial closure of its border with the republic of Benin. Nigeria also broke diplomatic relations with Gabon which also recognized the Biafra government. The Biafra government was also recognized by other four African countries in 1968. These countries include: Tanzania, Zambia, and Ivory Coast and the French government. The biafrans also got support from the Apartheid and Portuguese colonial regimes.   Africa and Portugal also gave support to the Biafrans for understandable reasons though (Duke, 1999).

The period 1970-1975 was indeed a turbulent one for Nigeria, particularly for General Yakubu Gowon's government. After the civil war, Nigeria demonstrated that it was willing to bury the hatchet when the Gowon regime restored diplomatic relations with Nigeria's war time adversaries namely: Zambia, Benin Republic, Tanzania and Ivory Coast; the African States that recognized Biafra during the Civil War. This post-war foreign policy behaviour played a crucial

role in reuniting the Organization of Africa Unity - thereby saving it form internal discord and potential collapse. Suffice to mention here that if the Gowon regime had failed to act in the direction it did, two things would have happened.

First, the march towards a colonially free Africa would have been retarded. Second, the much touted continental leadership credentials of Nigeria which its leaders had projected since independence would have been called into question. Thus Nigeria had its interest at stake which had to be protected; as it would have been difficult for the country and its leadership to make an impact in the anti-colonial struggle in an atmosphere of continental discord as the country would not have done anything in isolation. Thus the regime decided to adopt a foreign policy approach of personal diplomacy to reunite itself with its war-time antagonists. The Gowon regime's reconciliatory effort started yielding fruits as early as 1975 when the Economic Community of West Africa states (ECOWAS), the sub-regional organization of West Africa, came into being. The emergence of this organization was a huge development. This was despite the initial reluctance of the Franco-phone speaking states of West-Africa to support the initiative due to the understandable fear that Nigeria, with its numerical superiority and enormous human and economic potentials, would dominate the organization's affairs in all spheres. The other factor which prompted this fear was the French factor in Franco-phone West-African politics. According to Amuwo (1987:115) France considered "…Nigeria as a potential or real dominator, a sub-imperial power" within the West-Africa region. It is worthy of mentioning that the highest number of French African ex-colonies is in West-Africa. Thus the fear of Nigeria's hegemonic control of the region underpins France's decision to fully support solely Franco-phone sub-regional groupings such as CEAO, ANAD, Conseil de l'-Entente, etc. with the aim of undermining Nigeria's perceived "overwhelming power and influence", in the Sub-region.[68] Nigeria's leadership role in the formation of ECOWAS was laden with vested national interest.

---

[68] Amuwo K. (1987), "Nigeria and the International Order: Thoughts on the Past, the Present and Reflections on the Future – Review Article," The Nigerian Journal of International Affairs Volume 13, Number 1, 1987, p. 115, Vantage Publishers (Int.) Ltd, Ibadan.

As Kunle Amuwo argued, Nigeria's "leadership role" was in consonance with "the country's national interest in West-Africa" which "is essentially about self-preservation (of Supra).[69]" Implicit in the above position is the fact that both Nigeria and France justified Morgenthau's power theory postulation which states that international politics is basically a struggle for power. However, the fears expressed by the Francophone countries was latter allayed by the Nigeria government by assuring the sub-regional bloc that the objective of the body was to ensure that other African states moved as fast as Nigeria wanted in seeking solutions to African problems. Suffice to note here that the personal diplomacy of Gowon generated goodwill from the international community who were happy with the country's leadership for having forgotten so quickly the scars and bitterness of the Civil War era (Duke, 1999).

As part of its desire to stamp its leadership authority in the region, Nigeria under Gowon offered to supply the Ivory Coast (also known as Cote d'Ivoire after independence) refinery with crude oil which proved further that the country had embraced reconciliation with a war-time enemy state like Ivory Coast. The oil boom of the 70s and the economic national prosperity it engendered played a defining role in Nigeria's foreign policy adventure in the Gowon years. The huge availability of petro-dollars earnings meant that Nigeria could use its new found wealth to advance and assert its leadership ambitions on the continent especially in the area of anti-colonialism. The country demonstrated this in 1972 when Nigeria contributed 126,000 pounds to the OAU liberation committee, reflecting an increase of 50 percent following a unanimous decision by the continental body to raise member's contribution by that percentage. Nigeria played a key role in arriving at that decision that there should be increment in the liberation committee funding Furthermore, at the Accra meeting in January 1973, Nigeria contributed a staggering 180,000 pounds to the OAU committee fund. This was followed by other financial donations to the anti-colonial struggles in Africa until they became liberated from colonial

---

[69] Ibid.

servitude. Even on the attainment of independence, Nigeria gave substantial assistance to African countries that became independent during the period.

These countries include: Cape Verde (1975) Guinea Bissau (1974) Mozambique (1975) and Sao Tome and Principle (1975).These countries were all given cash donations to help fix their immediate national needs. The regime also came up with a laudable initiative which was geared toward unseating the white minority regimes when it suggested that an African command be set up in order to oust the reactionary colonial regimes in Africa. During the Rabat Submit of the OAU in June 1972, General Gowon expressed his regime's resolve to motivate the freedom fighters by equipping them with the needed manpower and material resources that would lead to the collapse of the alien ruler in Africa (Stremlau, 1977). This was the anti-colonial mood of the Gowon regime until the time of its ousting in a bloodless coup which ushered in the regime of General Muritala/Mohammed Obasanjo on February 13, 1976. While Mohammed emerged as the new Nigerian leader, Olusegun Obasanjo became his deputy. The regime is generally referred to as Muritala/Obasanjo regime because both leaders shared the same philosophy. This will be discussed next.

The military regime of Muritala/Obasanjo is widely regarded within the Nigerian foreign policy elites, intellectuals, and the academic community as the "golden age" of Nigeria foreign policy. Indeed the ascendancy of the regime to power ushered in the era of radicalism in foreign affairs especially on the anti-colonial struggle which the regime inherited from its predecessors. According to Fawole (2003:38), the advent of the regime was the dawning of "dynamism and invocation of manifest destiny" the phrase that showcases Nigeria's continental leadership ambitions at independence. The duo of Muritala/Obasanjo both shared the sentiment that their country Nigeria "had an ordained role to play in African politics and were therefore passionately committed to uplifting the dignity and integrity of the Black man" (Fawole, 2003:38). In pursuit of the commitment, the Muritala/Obasanjo regime took a hard line against colonialism in Africa. In 1976, the regime came up with a set of new foreign policy objectives of

which many were vague and realistically unattainable. The only one the regime succeeded in achieving with demonstrable results was that of African decolonization – which was radically pursued by the regime without any apology to any foreign interest or power. The regime consequently set up a committee made up of eminent Nigerians that were drawn from the armed force, the universities and career diplomats from the Ministry of External Affairs to review the whole basis of Nigeria's foreign policy with the purpose of formulating a new guideline for Nigeria's foreign policy. At the end of the committee's sittings, the regime adopted their recommendations. The following was agreed to be the foreign policy objectives and guidelines of the Muritala/Obasanjo regime:

- The defence of our sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity;
- The creation of the necessary political and economic conditions in Africa and in the rest of the world which will facilitate the defence of the independence and territorial integrity of all African countries while at the same time fostering national self-reliance and rapid economic development;
- The promotion of equality and self-reliance in Africa and the rest of the developing world;
- The promotion and defence of social justice and respect for human dignity especially the dignity of the Blackman, and
- The defence and promotion of world peace (Fawole, 2003; Garba, 1987; Adebajo, 2008).

As aforesaid, the regime's foreign policy outline was vague in several aspects. Apart from the area of African decolonization and the defence of Nigerian sovereign status, the remaining objectives were beyond what the regime could have achieved in practical sense. Having crafted its foreign policy agenda, the regime swung into action afterwards in a "radical" "revolutionary" and "nationalistic" fashion. There are reasons responsible for this renewed commitment to the decolonization cause.

First was the oil power which Nigeria used in asserting its leadership role in Africa. The Muritala/Obasanjo regime was the first in post-independence Nigerian history to inject several young, and bright dynamic military officers and civilian intellectuals, with overtly radical views concerning Nigeria's role in Africa, into governance. Prominent among this category of Nigerians were the then Dr Bolaji Akinyemi who headed the major foreign policy think-tank in Nigeria – the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA), as its Director General. The NIIA under Akinyemi's stewardship played a critical advisory role to the regime's policy actions towards the settlement of the Angolan colonial problem. Colonel Joe-Garba became the regime's commissioner for external affairs. Adebayo Adedeji on the other hand was drawn from the civil service to head the committee that reviewed Nigeria's foreign policy – the committee was popularly referred to as the Adedeji commission. The radical trait of the regime's foreign policy began to manifest as early as 1975 when the regime announced that it had postponed indefinitely the earlier scheduled visit of the Queen of England Elizabeth Two who had earlier been scheduled to pay a state visit to Nigeria and preparations were already in top gear prior to the overthrow of the Gowon regime. The regime perhaps mindful of the potential damage the Queen's visit could cause its anti-Britain and by extension anti-West approach to the colonial situation, tactically avoided the visit which would have been detrimental to the Mohammed/Obasanjo radical anti-colonial posture. The events that followed lent credence to this assertion. The postponement acted eventually as a precursor to the outright cancellation of the British monarch's visit - a situation that was considered by the British government as an embarrassment for its monarchy. On the anti-colonial tuff, the regime began its campaign inwardly.

The regime in an unprecedented fashion boosted the morale of freedom fighters across the continent of Africa by mobilizing the domestic populace against the injustices meted out on African colonized territories and their people by the stone-hearted colonialists that held sway. The regime called on the Nigerian public to support the anti-colonial crusade in solidarity with Africans under colonial captivity (Adeyemo, 2002). In addition to this, the regime also

established an institution which was known as the National Committee against Apartheid (NACAP) to domesticate by way of dissemination the injurious policy of apartheid hence the regime as a result of these actions made Nigeria a home for liberation fighters. All these and other impressive contributions earned Nigeria the status of a frontline state in African decolonization under the regime. Nigeria's political involvement and contributions under the regime also included giving diplomatic recognition and status to several liberation groups which were granted express permission to open offices in the then Nigerian capital – Lagos. These groups were: the Patriotic Front (Coalition of the Zimbabwe People's union and Zimbabwe African National Union), African National Congress and South West African People's Organization. The regime's effort in this regard was followed by the rejection of Bishop Muzorewa as Prime Minister of Zimbabwe – on the suspicion by the Nigerian authorities that Muzorewa was a stooge of the West who were working at the time to install him through electoral manipulation. It was indeed a "politics of deceit" that played out in this case to use the phrase coined by General Joe Garba while describing the white ruling machinations to cling to power at all cost in Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) (Garba, 1987:49).

The radical anti-colonial posture of the regime led to a serious collision of interest between the Nigerian government and that of the United States on the colonial situation in Angola and the way to solving it. Nigeria's perception of the Angolan tragedy was fundamentally opposed to that of the US government's perception of the same problem. Hence actions which Nigeria took to help effect a settlement ran counter to actions taken by the US – this situation did not go down well with the American government. On Nigeria's part, the initially held position was that a government of national unity would be the most appropriate in resolving the deep division among the three leading guerrilla groups that sought to unseat the Portuguese colonial regime in the country. The Nigerian government believed that the three liberation groups should bury their differences in order to bring joy, happiness and relief to their oppressed peoples. Nigeria felt that it was absolutely unnecessary for the liberation factions to be scheming for post-

independence political power while their people languished under the tyrannical rule of the Portuguese colonial masters.

Thus, the Nigerian state was strongly of the view that these groups, namely: MPLA, FLNA, and UNITA, should come under one single platform that could help mid-wife the country into independence. The Nigerian position on the Angolan crisis remained unchanged until foreign intervention compelled the regime of Mohammed/Obasanjo to shift its approach in helping to solve the crisis. The United States had in sharp contrast to Nigeria's position on the issue supported the idea of a government of national unity in Angola that would protect its interest in Southern African. The US's aim was to prevent the ascension of a radical minded crop of leaders that would seek to dislodge the colonial political structures in Southern Africa. Thus, the US's interest on the Angolan crisis and by extension on Southern Africa was clear. In an era of Cold War, the US was more concerned about giving support to its colonialist allies in order to retain their support in the ideological conflict with the Soviet Union. Consequently, the US took a strategic decision and decided to throw its weight behind the FLNA and UNITA liberation factions which enjoyed the support of the apartheid South African government; the US also maintained a grave silence when South Africa got involved militarily in the Angolan crisis, but showed a high degree of hypocrisy when it criticized and condemned the Soviet Union and the Cuban forces' military intervention in the crisis. This did not come as a surprise. The Soviet Union and Cuba were leading Cold War adversaries of the United States. The two countries intervened in support of the MPLA group.

As the above situation played out, Nigeria was on the side-line watching and strategizing on which path to follow in the ensuing game. The Nigerian government having discovered that apartheid South-Africa had deployed its troops into Angola to fight on the side of FLNA and UNITA, decided to commit itself to the MPLA (Garba, 1987:49). The aim of South-Africa and its co-travellers was to install "a puppet reactionary regime" of the FLNA and UNITA. Nigeria firmly believed that the MPLA had the legitimate right to represent the aspirations of the Angolan

people hence the moral, financial and diplomatic support that they were given by the Nigerian government. Worried by the Muritala/Obasanjo regime's policy position on the issue and the decision of the OAU to recognize the MPLA, President Ford of the United States wrote personal letters and also deployed the country's (US) diplomatic machinery to African leaders and governments of the time to dissuade them from following the step taken by Nigeria on Angola. The US urged those who had accorded recognition to the MPLA to reverse their decision. The United States machinations attracted a tougher reaction by the Muritala/Obasanjo regime. Nigeria replied with indignation and made its reply public. The regime took radical measures against the US when it cancelled the scheduled visit of the US Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger to Lagos. The regime's relations with America deteriorated when the Nigerian government took over the US Information Service building and radio monitoring centres in Lagos and Kaduna respectively. On January 11, 1976, General Muritala Mohammed the Nigerian Head of State delivered a speech at the OAU Extraordinary Summit in the Ethiopian capital of Addis Ababa where he criticized the West in strongest terms for aiding and abetting colonialism and also for paying lip service to the African colonial predicament and not taking critical steps to help end colonialism on the African continent. From the rostrum of the OAU conference centre in Addis Ababa, General Muritala Mohammed declared:

> First, we call attention to the diabolical role of apartheid. The main elements of that criminal doctrine are too well known to this Assembly to necessitate any detailed analysis. Suffice it to say that the whole rationale behind this doctrine which the United Nations Organization had aptly condemned as a crime against humanity is the perpetual subjugation of the Africa in order to create a paradise on earth for the white. When I contemplate on these evils, of apartheid, my heart bleeds and I am sure the heart of every true blooded Africans bleeds. When we talk of these evils, we assured of "sympathy" of the Western countries, but when we call for sanctions to end this shame of Western civilization, suddenly the glitter of gold in the form of high dividends becomes more

convincing in consideration than the lives, liberty and well-being of Africans (Garba, 1987:102).

The regime held on to its position on African decolonization until February 13 1976 when Genera Muritala Mohammed was assassinated in a failed coup d'état which culminated into the death of the Nigerian leader. As result of this tragic incident, the mantle of leadership shifted to his deputy General Olusegun Obasanjo who became Nigeria's fourth military Head of state. As someone that shared the same ideological inclination with his departed boss, General Obasanjo on assumption of office expressed his regime's determination to continue with the decolonization policy program of General Muritala Mohammed without any alteration in the approach to the colonial problem. According to Garba (1987:102) General Obasanjo spelled out Nigeria's continuing commitment in unambiguous terms while speaking at a dinner for President Kaunda of Zambia on 14 January, 1977 where he said:

> The Nigerian Government and people are totally committed to the cause of freedom and respect for human dignity in Southern Africa, not simply for its own sake, but because we are convinced that Africa freedom is a sacred duty that must be done.

The Nigerian leader went on to state:

> …in the pursuit of this objective, we shall not consider any sacrifice too great nor any weapon too mean to hasten the end of all oppression and injustice in Southern Africa and to ensure the total liquidation of apartheid, foreign domination and economic exploitation

All – round battle against colonialism in apartheid South Africa got a big boost in Nigeria on December 18, 1976 when the Nigerian government launched the Southern African Relief Fund (SARF), which sought to relieve the oppressed in Southern Africa. Speaking on the occasion, the Chief of Staff, Supreme Headquarters and second in command to the Head of state – Brigadier

Musa Yar' Adua expressed belief that no African country could feel free until the entire continent was liberated from the evils of colonialism, apartheid and racism. Brigadier Yar' Adua recalled the principles and consequences of apartheid and racial elitism as applied by the white minority regimes in South Africa, Zimbabwe, and Namibia. At the launch of the initiative, Yar' adua called on other countries across the world to rise in support of the struggle while being confident of eventual success. He noted:

> This struggle in Southern Africa is, therefore, our collective struggle. We should all be personally committed and deeply involved. We shall win the struggle the determination of our brothers to set themselves free through their own efforts and through the mobilization of materials and human resources of their brothers and sisters elsewhere on the continent to aid and sustain the struggle, will bring in victory. [70]

The SARF sought financial contributions from all strata of the Nigerian community. The funds realized according to Garba (1987) were to be used in ameliorating the sufferings of the peoples of the embattled Southern-Africa region and also to help provide Scholarship for citizens of the region who are willing to pursue their education outside the racist enclaves. Other active commitment showed by the regime against apartheid in particular and colonialism in general included Nigeria's hosting of the first United Nations conference against Apartheid in 1977 and the nationalization of British petroleum by the Nigerian government in 1979 when it became apparent that Britain was not favourably disposed to the issue of Zimbabwean independence. The decision to move against the British economic interests in Nigeria was to force the British government to prevail on the colonial leadership of Zimbabwe to relinquish power.

In conclusion, from the above, it is evident that the regime of General Olusegun Obasanjo played an outstanding role in the struggle against apartheid and colonialism in the Southern African region. Next to be examined is the activities of the civilian administration of Shehu

---

[70] "Relieving the Oppressed in Southern Africa," See the Nigerian Daily Sketch Newspaper, December 18, 1976

Shagari, 1979-1983 in the struggle against colonialism. After thirteen uninterrupted years of military rule, the soldiers relinquished power and returned to their abode - the Barracks. Consequent upon this development, General Olusegun Obasanjo became the first Nigerian military Head of State voluntarily hand over power to the first democratically elected president in the person of Alhaji Shehu Shagari who was sworn into office on 1, October 1979. From the foreign policy angle especially on the African decolonization issue which has been a recurrent foreign policy goal of Nigeria since the Balewa days, the new civilian government failed to pursue a robust, dynamic and vibrant anti-colonial policy (Duke, 1999; Adeyemo, 2002).

The failure of the Shagari civilian government to sustain the tempo of the previous Nigerian administrations military/civilian in this regard can be attributed to two reasons: first, was the prevailing internal conditions – the rampant corruption and economic mismanagement which bedevilled the country; second, was the oil gut crisis, and the then global economic recession all these factors undermined the Shagari government's foreign policy actions towards the colonial problem. Regardless of the foregoing problems that the government encountered, the Nigerian leadership still contributed albeit morally and diplomatically in ensuring that colonialism and all its features were wiped out of the African continent. The government at inception issued a declaration that it was committed to the Southern Africa liberation movements and opposed to all forms of racial discrimination in the region and the world over. The government backed this anti-colonial declaration with action when President Shehu Shagari appointed a special envoy, Alhaji Maitaima Sule, to lead an observer delegation to the Lancaster conference in London, which ushered in Zimbabwean independence in 1980 (Duke, 1999).

In addition to this, the government also put in place a Nigerian observer's team which was sent to monitor the March 1980 elections in Zimbabwe. The decision by Nigeria to send observers to Zimbabwe to monitor the country's first post-independence elections was to ensure that

Zimbabweans were allowed to freely choose their leaders. The Nigerian observers joined the commonwealth team which supervised the elections in the country.[71] From the forgoing, it is clear that the Shagari administration still kept faith with Nigeria's anti-colonial policy despite the domestic and global challenges which confronted the administration at inception. On December 31, 1983, Major General Mohammadu Buhari toppled the Shagari government in a military coup. The coup marked the beginning of another round of successive military rule in Nigeria. Announcing his ascendance to the saddle, Major General Buhari in an ambitious address to Nigerians said that Nigeria hinted that the new leadership was poised to fixing the rot left behind by the deposed civilian government of Shehu Shagari. To the new regime, the sacked government had lost focus and plunged the country into avoidable socio – economic and political crisis hence the need to intervene to salvage Nigeria and its populace from imminent socio-political and economic collapse (Fawole, 2003). The Buhari regime inherited a very fragile economy from its predecessor nevertheless he declared that his regime was an offshoot of the Muritala/Obasanjo regime. This declaration gave the regime a popularity of some sort from within and outside the country. Consequently the regime from its inception articulated its foreign policy agenda forcefully. According to Prof Ibrahim Gambari, the regime's foreign policy focus mainly revolved around Africa which constituted the area of primary concern to the regime (Gambari, 1984).

It was in pursuit of this Afro-centric policy that the regime gave continued support to the various liberation movements in the Southern African region. As an offshoot of the Muritala/Obasanjo regimes as proclaimed by the regime itself, Nigeria under General Buhari gave due attention to the issues of the struggle for Namibian independence and particularly to the issue of apartheid in South-Africa. The regime's unqualified support for the right of Namibian people for independence remained strong and unwavering. The Buhari regime threw all its weight behind the full implementation of the UN resolution 435 calling for a cease-fire to

---

[71] See the Nigerian Newspaper Daily Times, April 1980.

avoid needless blood-splitting and to allow for elections to be conducted under the guidance and supervision of the UN (Fawole, 2003).

The regime also gave financial support to the Namibian liberation movement - the South West African Peoples Organization (SWAPO), while at the same time providing moral and diplomatic assistance to the African National Congress (ANC) and the Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC). The regime also joined forces with other progressives in calling for the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and other incarcerated anti-apartheid activists. Furthermore, the Buhari regime demonstrated its willingness to assist in liberating Africa from the grip of colonial rulers at international organizations such as the United Nations, the OAU, the Non-aligned movement and the Commonwealth of Nations. Next to be considered is the Military regime of General Ibrahim Babangida and its anti-colonial policy actions. On August 27, 1985 General Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida took over the affairs of the country from General Buhari through a bloodless palace coup. The new Head of state in his maiden address to Nigerians launched a scathing criticism against the sacked Buhari regime for not doing enough to project the country's image in an appreciable manner in the international scene. To the Babangida regime, its predecessor failed to operate a foreign policy that ought to have been characterized by dynamism, consistency and coherence. Thus General Babangida declared that his regime's foreign policy focus would be anchored on finding solutions to African problems. Having declared its commitment to help resolve African problems particularly the menace called colonialism, apartheid and racism.

General Babangida in an attempt to match words with action held onto Nigeria's foreign policy on apartheid which he had inherited from his predecessors. The regime demonstrated consistency and unyielding commitment to the liquidation of apartheid. As early as 1986, Nigeria pursuant to its declared anti-colonial objectives headed the list of 32 Commonwealth countries that boycotted the Commonwealth games held in Edinburg, Scotland in July, 1986. The decision by Nigeria and its fellow Commonwealth member countries which boycotted the

games stemmed from the failure of the then British Prime Minister, Margret Thatcher's to impose sanctions on South-Africa as agreed earlier at the mini-commonwealth summit held in 1986. Consequently Nigeria acted swiftly in order to give credibility to the country's Afro centric foreign policy which was meant to project Nigeria as the most influential black African state (Duke, 1999). Subsequent efforts of the regime in respect to colonial issues included giving financial assistance to the frontline states following the brutal attacks on them by the racist regime of Pretoria who came in search of ANC liberation fighters who were believed to have been harboured by the frontline states of the region which included – Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe etc. The regime's decolonization efforts were further buoyed by the election of Nigerian leader General Babangida as the chairman of the Organization of African Unity for the 1991-1992 sessions. Nigeria's ascendancy to the OAU chairmanship was the second in the country's history and thus served as an impetus for Nigeria to pursue the struggle against colonialism and apartheid to a logical and productive conclusion (Adeyemo, 2002).

The regime's commitment to African decolonization played a significant role in fast-tracking the process of Namibian independence in 1989. The Babangida regime also witnessed the dawn of the long awaited fundamental changes in the socio-political and economic landscape of South-Africa after decades of apartheid rule. The regime gave an unqualified support to the apartheid regime of President F.D. Klerk - the last apartheid leader of South-Africa when Klerk hinted that reforms were under way to abolish the human – degrading system of apartheid. The F.W. de Klerk apartheid presidency subsequently lifted the ban on the liberation movements such as the African National Congress (ANC) and the Pan-African Congress (PAC). Leading figures of the anti-apartheid struggle such as Nelson Mandela and Walter Sisulu regained their freedom in 1990 after spending decades in apartheid prisons. These development elicited joy among the Nigerian populace and the leadership. The Nigerian leadership in appreciation reassured the transitional apartheid government of continued support in the quest to bring about the first multi-racial democratic election in South Africa.

Within 1989 and1990, Nigeria initiated the Technical Aid Corps Scheme – the program designed to assist in training African, Caribbean and Pacific states with technical manpower which would ensure self-reliance and economic development of the countries involved after gaining independence. To this effect, Nigerian professionals such as trained medical doctors, nurses, engineers, architects, academics, teachers, legal experts and financial experts, accountants, managerial personnel, etc. were sent out in batches to accomplish the task assigned to them by their country (Uhomoibhi, 2008). Moreover the General Babangida regime hosted Nelson Mandela in Lagos, Nigeria in 1990 shortly after his release from prison. This was followed by the visit of President Frederick De Klerk to Nigeria on April 9, 1992 which was an historic one being the first apartheid President to do so thus marking a departure from the bitter and confrontational relations between the two countries. During his visit, President Klerk called for restoration of diplomatic ties between the two countries and equally canvassed for Nigeria's support to join the Organization of African Unity, OAU – the continental organization. On the global stage, the regime presided over one of the most glittering eras of Nigeria's diplomatic sojourn. During the Babangida years, Nigeria's international image rose impressively especially in Multilateral organizations with the appointment of Nigerians into strategic international posts, such as the election of Major General Joseph Garba as President of the 44th session of the United Nations General Assembly while Chief Emeka Anyaoku emerged as the Secretary-General of the Commonwealth of Nations. As earlier said, the Technical aid Corps Scheme (TACS) which was the brain child of the regime brought together willing young Nigerian professionals who were posted to serve in Africa Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries for a time-frame period of two years.

Prior to the reforms that led to the collapse of apartheid, the apartheid regime of P.W Botha which F.W. de Klerk succeeded, redoubled its efforts to neutralize Nigeria's anti-apartheid struggle when the racist regime of South-Africa approached the government of Equatorial Guinea – Nigeria's Southern neighbour on the Atlantic with the request for a military base in its territory which they could use in terms of attack against the country because it could have

been difficult to attack Nigeria straight from the racist enclave hence the need to use a country like Equatorial Guinea as a target base against one of the major enemies of the apartheid. It would be recalled that the same regime had prior to that time attacked with impunity independent frontline states in the Southern - African region under the pretence of searching for freedom fighters. Consequently, it would not have been impossible for the apartheid regime to attack Nigeria if the Babangida regime had failed to respond swiftly to the situation in the manner it did. As the reforms progressed, the Nigerian leadership waited cautiously until it became confident that the reforms had swept away the policies of apartheid. Some major governmental structural changes were carried out by the last white minority regime of President F.W. de Klerk between 1990 and 1994. These changes ushered in the first ever multi-racial democratic elections which led to the emergence of Nelson Mandela as the first black president of South-Africa in April 1994, few months after Babangida left office. The ascendancy of Nelson Mandela to the presidency of South-Africa ushered in a new phase in Nigeria-South-Africa relations as the two countries for the first time ever exchanged ambassadors thus bringing to an end officially and formally the anti-colonial and anti-apartheid struggles of the Nigerian state (Fawole, 2003).

Having examined Nigeria's decolonization foreign policy efforts in Africa under successive governments both Military and civilian since 1960, it is important to discuss the areas where different governments had exercised continuity of policy in their desire to pursue Nigeria's twin objectives of - African decolonization and the projection of Nigeria's power and continental leadership ambitions. Since independence Nigerian leaders have pursued these objectives continuously without any form of alteration. On the other hand, there were changes which also occurred as a result of the different approaches employed by the various governments in the pursuit of decolonization. From the Balewa government in 1960 to Babangida, the Southern African colonial problem has been one of the major foreign policy pre - occupations of Nigerian governments since the attainment of political independence in 1960. Official pronouncements and the pro-active measures taken by the Balewa, Ironsi, Gowon, Muritala/Obasanjo, Shagari,

Buhari and Babangida civilian and military regimes attests to Nigeria's consistency and continuities in policy articulation of the colonial problem in Africa. Consequently it could be concluded that Nigeria operated an assertive Africa policy as discussed in this chapter. It is germane to mention however that successive Nigerian regimes which inherited the problem of Southern Africa pursued the decolonization agenda with varying degrees of intensity and vigour (Ogwu, 1986). The differences in the approach adopted by the various Nigeria regimes differed significantly. Next, we briefly examine the approaches employed by the various military/civilian governments in dealing with the African colonial problem.

As earlier mentioned, there was continuity and consistency as well as changes in the approach employed by various Nigerian leaders in the struggle against colonialism. The changes in this case are reflected in the varying degrees of vigour and temperament that the various Nigerian governments employed in carrying out the country's policy of decolonization in Africa. For a country whose obsession with African leadership is legendary the need for assertiveness in continental issues and affairs was second to none in the minds of the country's leadership civilian/military. The changes in the leadership styles and ideological orientation of Nigerian leaders was to a large extent determined by the natural instincts of individuals and human beings in general gave them the latitude to view issues and things in ways that are usually at variance with one another. To put it simply, a leader's traits comes to bear when taking decisions and actions on issues that are of interest to them, their country and the people they lead. During the struggle against colonialism in Africa, Nigerian leaders in line with the country's decolonization policy adopted diverse approaches in helping to solve the colonial problem. For instance, some observers believed that the Sir Abubakar Balewa government struggled to assert itself on the issues of African decolonization because his calmness, moderate and conservative nature (Idang, 1973). It was this leadership personality trait that caused the Balewa government to reverse its early stance and decision on apartheid. It will be recalled that the government at inception declared that it would not negotiate with the white regime in South-Africa or any of their co-travellers in the Southern-African region, however the

prime minister "knack for compromise" nature ensured a reversal of his government's earlier position on the issues of decolonization.[72] The Balewa government shocked many within and outside the country with its decision to allow Southern Rhodesia and Portugal to open diplomatic offices in the then Nigerian capital of Lagos. This single action contradicted the decisions reached at the OAU council of Ministers in which Nigeria was a party to and also a signatory to the resolutions taken at the summit. At the said meeting in 1963, African member states agreed to break diplomatic relations with Britain owing to Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence but the Nigerian government of the time unfortunately and to the surprise of many was caught in the web of not taking a tough stance against the British government over the latter's Rhodesian policy.[73]

This was a time when the majority of African member states of the Commonwealth were at loggerheads with Britain as a result of its failure to take a tough stance against the white regime in Rhodesia. Thus one may in this regard conclude that it was Balewa's personality traits that compelled the conservative posture which the government later assumed on the decolonization issues thereby justifying the conservative label placed on the Balewa government by authors and observers. The Balewa government found it extremely discomforting to move against the British interest regardless of Britain's culpability in the colonial situation in Rhodesia. However the brief stay of the military regime of General Aguiyi Ironsi employed a radical approach in the struggle against colonial rule. The regime was unequivocal in its abhorrence and disdain for the colonial system in Africa. This was demonstrated when Ironsi's junta expelled the Portuguese and white South-Africans from the country in protest of their obnoxious colonial policies. The regime of General Gowon which succeeded Ironsi failed to toe the line of its predecessor's radical posture on decolonization due

---

[72] See Idang G. J. (1973), Nigeria: Internal Politics and Foreign Policy 1960-1966, Ibadan University Press, pp 51-55.
[73] Ibid.

to the "personality limitations on the ability of Gowon to pursue an assertive foreign policy".[74]
Regardless of the fact that the Gowon regime gave moral and financial supports to the
liberation movements, the anti-colonial temperament of General Gowon was considered to be
"patient and cautious".[75]

The military regime of Muritala/Obasanjo which toppled Gowon was widely believed to be the
most assertive not only in the area of African decolonization but also in the history of Nigeria's
international relations. On the issue of decolonization, the regime outclassed both its
predecessors and successors by demonstrating to the world that Nigeria was indeed capable of
being the leader of Africa. The Muritala/Obasanjo regime was uncompromisingly radical in its
disposition to the decolonization of Africa. On the Angolan crisis, the regime took an anti-
American position which was aimed at frustrating the United States' Cold War scheming in
Angola. The Muritala/Obasanjo's regime's decision to back the MPLA movement in Angola as
opposed to the U.S and apartheid South-Africa's support for Western surrogates movements
such as the FLNA and UNITA forces led to strained relations between the United States and
Nigeria. The United States' failure to influence the Nigerian regime's decision on the Angolan
crisis coupled with Nigeria's successful effort to galvanize the majority of OAU member states
to recognize the MPLA as the authentic representative of the Angolan people angered the
United States government who felt demystified by the Nigeria governments' decision.

Upon his assassination in 1976, General Olusegun Obasanjo – Muritala's deputy continued with
the radical policy orientation of his late boss in dealing with the colonial problem in Southern
Africa. The Obasanjo regime had in 1979 nationalized the British Petroleum to protest Britain's
reluctance to impose sanctions and to put pressure on the Rhodesian colonial authorities to
relinquish power to the indigenous people of the country. The regime's decision was
unprecedented in the annals of Nigeria's relations with Britain. This decision helped in

[74] Ibid.
[75] Ibid.

expediting the independence of the then Southern Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) which was secured a year after. The civilian regime of President Shehu Shagari reverted to conservatism in the pursuit of the anti-colonial cause in Africa. There are two reasons that can be adduced to this: first was the personality trait of President Shagari who was regarded as courteous, gentle, soft-spoken, and self-effacing.[76] By his personality traits, there was nothing in him that suggests that he is in any sense a militant politician let alone a radical.[77] Second, was the fact that the government on assumption of office sought an IMF credit guarantee; and in the process succumbed to the United States' pressure in 1983 which compelled his government to support the replacement of Cuban forces with a pan - African peacekeeping force in Angola. This was contrary to the OAU's decision and those of the frontline states that there should be no linkage of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola with Namibia's independence, as it was then demanded by the United States. The regime jettisoned the OAU decision by giving its backing to the United States proposal thus marking the second time when Nigeria violated an OAU decision on decolonization -the first being under Balewa.

The military regimes of General Buhari which replaced the Shagari regime at inception demonstrated its willingness to follow the path of the Muritala/Obasanjo radicalism on African decolonization. This however did not materialize as the regime was constrained in light of the economic crisis it found itself in at the time. The Babangida regime on the final note pursued Nigeria's decolonization policy in a moderate and non-militant manner. Unlike the regimes of Muritala/Obasanjo and the Ironsi which took drastic actions against western economic interests in an attempt to force them to listen to the voice of reason and act decisively against the colonial establishment in Africa, the General Babangida regime choose to articulated its position against colonialism in Africa in a way devoid of radicalism even though the regime disagreed with foreign powers when necessary on the issues of decolonization - the regime's

---

[76] Ogwu J. (1986), "Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Alternative futures" Macmillan Nigeria Publishers.
[77] Ibid.

actions in this regard were limited to boycotts of sporting activities and criticism of Britain unsatisfactory handling of the situation in Southern Africa particularly in Zimbabwe.

3.6.   General Tendencies across the United Nations System

A discourse of the general tendencies across the United Nations system is imperative in a study of this kind. The reason for this lies in the fact that this study seeks to investigate Nigeria's anti-colonial behaviour on the colonial problem in Africa on the platform of this organization, hence the need to discuss the organization and its component organs. Suffice it to say that since Nigeria attained independence, the country has played one role or the other in the UN. It is in this connection that we shall consider Nigeria's roles and contributions to the world body as well as the behaviour of other member states of the U.N within the period when Nigeria became a member; and the demise of colonialism in Africa. In this part, our objective therefore will be to provide an insight into the historical evolution, structural setting, and the objective and principles of the organization.

The evolution of the UN can be traced to two major events of the 20th century; the World Wars One and Two. The fall-out of the First World War was the League of Nations; the weakness and inefficient nature of the League of Nations made the outbreak of World War Two inevitable; while the need to forestall World War Three necessitated the emergence of the United Nations Organization (Basu, 2004).The UN came into being in the age of intense global conflict. Its creation, as noted above, was consequent upon the quest of the victorious allied leaders to have machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes that may arise among states of the world. The primary purpose of avoiding another world war by keeping the defeated Axis powers in check if not bondage played a critical role in the advent of this organization.

Consequently in June 1945, a conference was held in San-Francisco, United States where the charter establishing the United Nations was finally signed. A total of 45 countries signed the UN Charter into existence in 1945.

3.6.1. Objectives of the United Nations

At inception, the primary objectives of the United Nations were contained in the preamble of the Organization's Charter. It read thus:

WE THE PEOPLES OF THE UNITED NATIONSDETERMINED

> To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our life time has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.[78]

Therefore, it is evident from the above declared objectives that the agonizing and destructive impact of the (WW One and WW Two), coupled with the resultant humanitarian effects it engendered were factors which influenced the formation of the UN. Likewise, the purposes and principles of the United Nations were spelt out in Chapter 1 Article 1, of the charter as follows:

Purposes of the United Nations are:

> To maintain international peace and security; and to that end: to take effective collective Measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;[79]

> -To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of

---

[78] www.un.org/charterarticle.
[79] Ibid.

Equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate

Measures to strengthen universal peace.[80]

-To achieve international cooperation solving international problems of a

Social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging

Respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without

distinction

As to race, sex, language, or religion.[81]

- To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these

Common ends.[82]

The pre-eminence given to the maintenance of international peace and security in the charter by the drafters is reflective of the fact that without the presence of international security, and peaceful neighbourliness within a country's borders and among states which made up the international community, none of the organization's purposes and principles can be actualized.

3.6.2. Structure/Organs of the United Nations

Under chapter 111, of Article 7, the principal organs of the United Nations are listed as follows:

-The General Assembly,

-Security Council,

-The Economic and Social Council,

---

[80] Ibid.
[81] Ibid.
[82] See the United Nations Charter, available online at www.un.org/charter.

- Trusteeship Council;

-The International Court of Justice,

-The Secretariat.

We shall proceed to discuss the membership composition and the general tendencies across each of these organs. This will be done in the order presented above.

3.6.3. The General Assembly - Functions and powers

The General Assembly of the United Nations is one of the main organs of the organization. The General Assembly occupies a key position as the chief deliberative, policymaking and representative organ of the world body - the United Nations. It comprised of all 193 Members states of the organization; and it offers a unique forum for multilateral discussion of the full spectrum of international issues which are enshrined in the organization's Charter.

In addition to this, the General Assembly also plays a significant role in the process of standard-setting and the codification of international law. The Assembly holds its annual regular session from September to December each year, and thereafter as required.[83]

According to the Charter of the United Nations, the General Assembly has the power to:

- Consider and approve the United Nations budget and establish the financial assessments of Member States;

---

[83] www.unga.com/roles .

- Elect the non-permanent members of the Security Council and the members of other United Nations councils and organs and, on the recommendation of the Security Council, appoint the Secretary-General;

- Consider and make recommendations on the general principles of cooperation for maintaining international peace and security, including disarmament;

- Discuss any question relating to international peace and security and, except where a dispute or situation is currently being discussed by the Security Council, make recommendations on it;

- Discuss, with the same exception, and make recommendations on any questions within the scope of the Charter or affecting the powers and functions of any organ of the United Nations;

- Initiate studies and make recommendations to promote international political cooperation, the development and codification of international law, the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and international collaboration in the economic, social, humanitarian, cultural, educational and health fields;

- Make recommendations for the peaceful settlement of any situation that might impair friendly relations among nations;

- Consider reports from the Security Council and other United Nations organs.[84]

Other powers conferred on the Assembly by the Charter include taking action in cases of a threat to the peace, breach of peace or act of aggression, when the Security Council has failed to act owing to the negative vote of a permanent member. In such instances, according to its "Uniting for Peace" resolution of November 1950 (resolution 377 (v), the Assembly may consider the matter immediately and recommend to its Members collective measures to maintain or restore international peace and security.

---

[84] www.unga.com/roles

Voting Pattern and Consensual Practice in the General Assembly

All the 193 Member States in the Assembly are entitled to one vote. Votes taken on designated important issues — such as recommendations on peace and security, the election of Security Council and Economic and Social Council members, and budgetary questions — require a two-thirds majority of Member States, but other questions are decided by simple majority.

In recent years, an effort has been made to achieve consensus on issues, rather than deciding by a formal vote, thus strengthening support for the Assembly's decisions. The President, after having consulted and reached agreement with delegations, can propose that a resolution be adopted without a vote83.

3.6.4. The Security Council of the United Nations

As enshrined in the Charter, the functions and powers of the Security Council are:

-to maintain international peace and security in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations;

 -to investigate any dispute or situation which might lead to international friction;

 -to recommend methods of adjusting such disputes or the terms of settlement;

-to formulate plans for the establishment of a system to regulate armaments;

 -to determine the existence of a threat to the peace or act of aggression and to recommend what action should be taken;

-to call on Members to apply economic sanctions and other measures not involving the use of force to prevent or stop aggression;

-to take military action against an aggressor;

-to recommend the admission of new Members;

-to exercise the trusteeship functions of the United Nations in "strategic areas";

-to recommend to the General Assembly the appointment of the Secretary –General and, together with the Assembly, to elect the Judges of the International Court of Justice.[85]

The UN charter stipulates that the Security Council should be made up of fifteen members, five of which are permanent members; while the remaining 10 are traditionally elected to serve in the council. The permanent members of the Security Council are the World superpowers namely China, France, the United States of America, Britain and Russia. The charter of the UN confers on these countries, the exclusive power of veto – which permits them to veto any decision of the council that infringes on the interest of their country. The original proposal was that the Security Council should have a military force at its command which it could use to keep order among nations. In signing the Charter, the founding members of the organization agreed on how to set up a UN police force, except in the case of Korea.

Any nation, whether or not a member of the UN may bring to the attention of the General Assembly or the Security Council any dispute that may lead to the breach of international peace. Both Security Council and the General Assembly are empowered under the United Nations Charter to find ways of settling such disputes peacefully before resorting to the use of force. An example of this was the United Nations attempt to persuade Iraq under Saddam Hussein to withdraw its troops from the illegally occupied territory of Kuwait in 1990. In this case, the U.N gave the Iraqi leadership an appreciable ultimatum to pull out its troops from Kuwait but the appeal fell on deaf ears. This subsequently led to the U.N mandating its member states to use military means to restore the sovereignty of Kuwait. The Security Council has the right of veto on the admission of new members.

---

[85] www.unsc.org/charterroles.

3.6.5. Economic and Social Council

The Economic and Social Council consist of eighteen (18) members elected by the General Assembly for a three-year term. This organ is charged with the responsibility of promoting higher standards of living, better health, respect for human rights and international cooperation in education and the arts. ECOSOC has created various committees and commissions to study and report on various subjects ranging from the economic condition of Europe to the international drug trade. It is ECOSOC that enters into the agreement with specialized agencies such as food and Agricultural Organization, Universal Postal Union, subject to the approval of the General Assembly.

ECOSOC also recognizes that non-governmental organizations have technical knowledge that may be in its work. Many of such organizations have been granted "consultative status" by this recognition, and permitted to send observers to public meetings of the Council and its commissions. They may also speak at such meetings and present written statements. The consulting organizations include international Chamber of Commerce, International Confederation of free trade Union, International, Association of Juvenile Court Judges, Rotary International, Salvation Army and international Islamic Economic Organization. ECOSOC reports regularly to the General Assembly and occasionally submits issues upon which the General Assembly may wish to pass resolutions.

3.6.6. The Secretariat

The UN Secretariat is situated in New York with a staff of over three thousand, working directly under the Secretary – General. Regional headquarters are located in cities like Geneva, Bangkok, The Hague, Montreal, Santiago de Chile, etc. - where the specialized agencies have their staff population. Article 100 of the UN Charter provides that the Secretary General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any authority outside the organization.

3.6.7. The role of the UN Secretary General

The Secretary –General is the chief Administration officer of the UN. He has important political responsibilities. He is appointed by the Secretary General on the recommendation of the

Security Council. Before the Secretary General is voted upon by the General Assembly, the name of the proposed Secretary General must be approved by the Security Council, subject to the veto of any one of the five permanent five. This procedure enhances the importance of the Secretary General for he has been accepted by the Great Powers, at the time of his election. The Secretary General is in a position to mediate in times of severe tension. He has the privilege given him by the Charter, of coming before the Security Council to present for its consideration; any matter he feels may threaten peace. The Secretary presents yearly reports on the work of the organization to the General Assembly. He also acts as the administrative officer for the meetings of the General Assembly, the Security, the trusteeship Council and the Economic and Social Council. He employs various members of the Secretariat for the effective performance of his duties.

3.6.8. The Trusteeship Council

The Trusteeship Council operating under the authority of the General Assembly was established to assist the General Assembly in carrying out the functions of administration and supervision of certain non-independent territories, more of which were liberated or extracted from the defeated AXIS powers or their allies after the World War 11.The following are the basic objectives of the Trusteeship system:

-To promote international peace and security;

-To promote the political, economic social and educational advancement of thee inhabitants of the trust territories and their progressive development towards self-government or independence etc.

-To encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms of all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion etc.

3.6.9. The International Court of Justice (ICJ)

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) is the main judicial organ of the United Nations. It functions in accordance with the statute based upon the statute of the Permanent Court of

International Justice and forms an integral part of the United Nations Charter. Under Article 94 each United Nations member undertakes to comply with the decision of the International Court of Justice in any case to which it is a party.

3.7.   Conclusion

Two conclusions can be inferred from this chapter. First, it has demonstrated that Nigeria's African decolonization policy was initiated with the mind-set of playing a leadership role in Africa. The chapter considered the statements and the position of past Nigerian leaders as well as the views of various authors to reach this conclusion. The Ghanaian ascendancy to independence in March 1957 gave Ghana the opportunity to lead the continent in the area of African decolonization. Ghana buoyed by the pride of being the first Black African country to obtain political independence thus assumed the driving seat among the community of independent African states in the decolonization struggle. This development was perceived by the Nigerian leadership and elites as the usurpation of the role Nigeria was predestined to play in African affairs. This led to intense rivalry between Nigeria and Ghana for the better part of the 1960s.

The Chapter has argued that the desire for leadership and power were the driving factors behind the role played by Nigeria during the struggle for African decolonization. The intermittent change of government in Nigeria within the period this study covers impacted on the country's anti-colonial policy as different approaches were used in addressing the colonial problem. As noted above, all the Nigerian governments surveyed in this chapter demonstrated varying degrees of commitment to the decolonization of Africa but these commitments fluctuated significantly as Nigeria could not stick to a particular approach in pursuing its African decolonization agenda. Secondly, the chapter considered the general tendencies across the UN system by discussing the role and the functions of each of the organs of the world body. The next chapter will focus on the politics of decolonization in the UN and consider the role played by Nigeria in that regard.

CHAPTER FOUR

NIGERIA AND THE POLITICS OF AFRICAN DECOLONIZATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS, 1960-1994: HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

> *At the time of African Decolonization, the Cold War was already in the process of being thoroughly globalized. Throughout Africa, decolonization frequently became entangled with East-West conflict…* (Sullivan 2005:105)

> *The Cold War shaped much of global politics for 45 years . . . Nearly all . . . struggles for liberation were viewed through the prism of East-West rivalry. . .*[86]

4.1. Introduction

The last chapter dwelt majorly on Nigeria's foreign policy and its roles in the decolonization of Africa beginning from the time of the country's political independence in 1960 and the enthronement of a non-racial democratic government in South-Africa in 1994.The chapter also examined the general tendencies across the UN system. In the present chapter, attention will be given exclusively to the discourse of decolonization politics in the UN and the historical issues which engendered the phenomenon. The present chapter will consider the roles of different actors, more importantly the roles of Nigeria in this regard. The present chapter also lays the foundation upon which the issues that will come up for consideration in the next chapter (Chapter 5) shall be discussed. This takes into consideration the fact that this study seeks to examine whether Nigeria's historical antecedents over a period of 34 years in the UN can be used as a tool for getting a permanent membership seat in an enlarged UN Security Council as the current debate about Nigeria's credentials for the seat suggests.

---

[86] United Nations General Assembly Document A/59/565, 2 December (2004) Original: English Version, 59th Session Agenda Item 55, p. 18.

It is popularly said in scientific parlance that for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. Consequently, European colonization of Africa in the 19th century and the subsequent calls by African nationalists and peoples for the decolonization of the continent gives credence to this aphorism. In other words, without African colonization by European countries, the need would not have arisen in the first place to embark on the decolonization struggle. It could be said therefore that the agitations for African decolonization was the direct reaction by Africans to European colonial action on their African continent. It is in this connection therefore that this chapter examines the themes enumerated below in historical chronological order. The reason for doing so is to be able to establish a lineage between one event and the other, and also to avoid discussing history in a vacuum.

As implied above, decolonization was a product of colonization or colonialism hence it is essential to discuss the chain of events that gave rise to the issues which will form the core of our discussion in this present chapter. This chapter is divided into two parts. Part one will examine the following: the European Colonization of Africa, the Berlin Conference and the Consolidation of European Colonialism in Africa, the African resistance to European Colonization; Pan-Africanism and African Challenge of Colonial Order. The second part of this chapter addresses the following: the Politics of decolonization in the U.N, which is the central theme of this chapter from 1960 to 1994. It examines how issues such as the Cold War crisis (most notably), the Sharpeville incident, the Emergence of new states in the U.N; the emergence of the Organization of African Unity in World politics and the Congo crisis contributed to the politicization of African decolonization issues in the U.N.

4.2. European Colonization of Africa: An Overview

The colonization of Africa by European countries in the 19th century was a milestone in the history of Africa and its indigenous peoples. According to Ehiedu Iweriebor, as early as the mid-1870s, the Europeans had begun to make inroads into African territories for the purpose of economic and political colonization. Suffice to say that it was during the last quarter of the 19th

century, precisely between the 1870s and the year 1900 which marked the dawning of the 20th century, that Africa faced European imperialist incursions, organized military assaults that eventually paved the way for the geographical control of the inhabitants of the conquered African territories. By the start of the 20th century, European colonization of virtually all African territories had become a mission accomplished.[87] Worried by the forceful occupation of their ancestral lands by aliens, African societies expressed their discontents to the colonial action by putting up different kinds of resistance which were later suppressed through the use of superior weapons of the colonial forces. Consequently, by the dawn of the 20th century a preponderant of the African continent with the exception of only Ethiopia and Liberia had fallen under the sword of European colonizing powers. This marked a new epoch in African history. As expected, there were pressing factors behind Europe's decision to colonize Africa. The European colonizers of the 19th century were motivated by three major factors, namely economic, political, and socio-cultural. Economically, the colonialist countries saw Africa as the continent where they could source for raw materials following the abolition of the obnoxious slave trade in the 19th century as well as the enlargement of the frontiers of European capitalist Industrial Revolution. Politically, the Europeans were not oblivious to the fact that for them to lay siege on the material resources of their colonies, political colonization would have to come first. With political power, they could initiate and impose policies that could help facilitate the economic exploitation of their colonies. Consequently, the colonizing powers converged in Berlin in 1884 to expedite action on their colonial agenda.

The socio/cultural factor stemmed from the European colonialist portrayal of Africa as an uncivilized continent, with the "white man's burden" label. To the colonizers, Africa prior to their invasion, was seen as a "Dark Continent". Consequently, Europeans felt that they owed it a duty to the continent and its peoples to "civilize" and "uplift" them.[88] As Vincent Khapoya

---

[87]Ehiedu E.G. Iweriebor, The Colonization of Africa, Hunter College, Africana Age, African and African Diaspora Transformations in the 20th Century, (2001), available at: www.Nypl.orlafricanage/essays-colonized, p. 1.
[88] V. B. Khapoya, 2012, "Colonialism and the African Experience" available online at:
//www.Pearsoncustomlibrary.com/ISBN/0205851711.

argued, Europe justified its "forceful entry into Africa" on this premise. This Eurocentric social rationale for African colonization has however been faulted by African scholars over the years. For instance, the South-African pan-African scholar Motsoko Pheko, once asked a question that exposed the fallacy of this Eurocentric thought when he queried, "How do you civilize people through slavery, colonialism and racism"[89] In a nutshell, African colonization by European countries was primarily motivated by economic considerations under the guise of civilizing the uncivilized continent.

4.3.   The Berlin Conference and the Consolidation of European Colonialism in Africa

At the Berlin Conference which was held between November 1884 and February 1885, the fate of the African continent was sealed, at least in the colonial sense. It was at this imperialist Conference that European powers bestowed on themselves the legitimate rights to lay claim to African territories without the consent of the indigenous peoples of the continent. The Berlin experience was so humiliating to African peoples not just because their territories were geographically partitioned by European colonialists but also because of the contemptuous way in which it was planned and executed by the colonizing powers. According to Marika Sherwood "the countries of Africa were created in Berlin by Europeans who ignored existing empires/kingdoms/polities, languages, traditions, religions, culture".[90] Summing up the essence of the Berlin Conference, George Padmore argued, that the African continent was by virtue of the imperialist Conference turned into "…a mere pawn in European diplomacy, and her people, the defenceless victims of unregulated exploitation".[91]

The Conference which was convened by the German chancellor Otto von Bismarck was born out of fears that the hot competition among the imperialists countries for African territories

---

[89]Motsoko P. (2011), "African History: Pan Africanism: Past, Present and the Future", available online at: www.pan.africanistscholarpheko.htm.
[90] Sherwood M. (2012), Pan – African Conferences 1900-1953: What Did Pan-Africanism Mean? The Journal of Pan African Studies, vol. 4, no. 10, January, p. 1.
[91]Padmore G, (1956), Pan Africanism or Communism, Dennis Dobson, London, p. 76.

could degenerate into serious inter-imperial conflicts and even wars if a conference of that nature was not convened to partition the continent along imperial boundaries, with each imperial power recognizing their share of the continent. The objective of the Conference could not have been put better by the Belgian King Leopold at the opening of the Conference. He declared: "How we (European Colonizers) should divide among ourselves this magnificent African cake".[92] Thus, the motive of the Conference as expressly stated by King Leopold indeed proved that the scramble for African territories among a contingent of European countries was indeed driven by economic motives. The mere usage of the word "cake" proves further that the scramble for African territories and subsequent partitioning was rooted in economic considerations. However there were other issues which prompted the scramble and the eventual ratification of Western colonialism at the Berlin Conference of 1884-1885. Prominent among other factors which played a significant role in this regard was the huge impact of inter-European power game and competition for superiority within the European power politics.

Power politics at the time was characterized and defined in the context of acquiring territories abroad, especially in vulnerable continents such as Africa, South-America, Asia, etc. As noted earlier, Europe's economic hardship led to the scramble and eventual colonization of the African continent. The European continent having undergone the industrial revolution of the 1770s was faced with menacing social problems which the phenomenon generated. The industrial revolution – a technological breakthrough which replaced manual means of production with machine means of production, although a milestone in global technological advancement nonetheless had its consequences which were evidenced in the mass loss of jobs, displacement from rural areas, and destitution across Europe. It is important to note that these problems surfaced owing to the fact that the new capitalist system had laid off a significant percentage of the labour population of Europe. Thus the only solution to Europe's crisis at the

---

[92] MotsokoPheko, (2011), "African History: Pan Africanism: Past, Present and the Future", available online at: www.pan.africanistscholarpheko.htm.

time was to acquire territories where they could transfer the so-called "surplus population". This development later culminated into the establishment of what historians, researchers, and other scholars called settler-colonialism in African countries such as South Africa, Tunisia, Algeria, Namibia, Angola, Mozambique, Zambia, Kenya and Zimbabwe. At the end of the three month Berlin Conference in February 1885, the colonizing powers came up with a treaty known as the Berlin Act, which contained provisions which were to guide the imperial activities of the European powers in Africa. Below are some of its major articles:

1. The Principle of Notification (Notifying) other powers of a territorial annexation
2. The Principle of Effective Occupation to validate the annexations
3. Freedom of Trade in the Congo Basin
4. Freedom of Navigation on the Niger and Congo Rivers
5. Freedom of Trade to all nations
6. Suppression of the Slave Trade by land and sea.[93]

As aforesaid, Africa was not a signatory to the Berlin Act as it was drawn up without the input of Africans.

4.4. African Resistance to European Colonization

The resistance of African societies to European geographical distortion of their continent at the Berlin Conference, and eventual occupation was largely confrontational and repulsive. Across the continent towards the late 19th century, African societies engaged the European colonialists militarily in an attempt to safeguard their homelands from the invading alien forces. Africa's military resistance to the forces of colonization assumed two major dimensions: first was by guerrilla warfare. Second was through direct military engagement with the European forces.

---

[93]Ehiedu E.G. Iweriebor, The Colonization of Africa, Hunter College, Africana Age, African and African Diaspora Transformations in the 20th Century, (2001), available at: www.Nypl.orlafricanage/essays-colonized.

Suffice to say that each African society at the time employed different approaches to repel the European incursion.

This was largely due to the fact that each African society's resistance to European colonial action was a function of their political structure, social institutions, and military organizations. For instance, the small African societies, that is, the decentralized societies known as "stateless societies" in Eurocentric parlance, adopted the guerrilla warfare approaches due to their size and the lack of standing or professional armies. The guerrilla groups were made up of native fighters that engaged European forces (not on the battle field) but through the use of the traditional guerrilla tactic of hit-and-run raids against the stationary enemy forces.[94] This guerrilla approach was deployed by the Igbo people of South-eastern Nigeria albeit unsuccessfully against the British. Despite the resistance of the Igbo of South-eastern Nigeria, the British imperial forces still emerged victorious as the entire region was covered and subjugated between 1900 and 1903. The second form of resistance was through open military combat with the Europeans forces. This approach was deployed by the centralized African states. These states, unlike the decentralized African societies of the time, had state structures which allowed for the effective running of these traditional institutions such as empires, kingdoms, chiefdoms, and city-states. Consequently, they had standing armies at their disposal that could fight the European invaders. This form of resistance was used by a couple of African societies in an attempt to repel European incursion into their domain. Prominent among these African societies were the gallant Ethiopian army, the Zulus of present-day South Africa and a host of other African pre-colonial states across Africa. The case of Ethiopia was particularly unique as it successfully repelled Italian imperial onslaught on its territory.

The Italian invaders faced a resolute and astute military leader in the Ethiopian emperor Menelik II who galvanized his troops against Italian imperial aggression. Undaunted by the resistance of the Ethiopians, the Italians intensified pressure on the Ethiopian territory in an

---

[94] Ibid.

attempt to impose its rule. This, then, forced the Ethiopians to roll out its military arsenals to fend off the imperialist attack. Thus this situation prepared the stage for the historic battle of Adwa in 1896 when one hundred thousand Ethiopian troops engaged the Italian forces and inflicted a heavy and decisive defeat. Afterward, Ethiopia was able to preserve its territorial integrity for the better part of the colonial age, except for a brief interlude of Italian oversight between 1936 and 1941.

There are other examples of resistance led by Samory Touré of the emergent Mandinka Empire in West Africa. The leader of the empire - Touré had in an attempt to expand the frontiers of his empire and put in place a new political system encountered the French imperialists that were also pushing to extend their colonial territories from their operational base in Dakar, Senegal. This situation ushered in a protracted period of intense armed conflict between the two parties as Touré engaged the French fiercely between 1882 and 1898. During this period, he deployed various strategies against the French such as guerrilla warfare tactics, scorched-earth programs and open military engagement. Touré's resistance was however subdued by the French forces that captured him in 1898, and subsequently threw him into exile where he died in 1990. In conclusion, while it can be said those African societies fought gallantly and appreciably to safeguard their homelands from imperial aggression, these societies however lost out eventually. The failure of African resistance was due largely to technological factors. While Europeans fought with sophisticated and modernized weapons, Africans on the other hand fought with their indigenously made weapons such as spears, swords, traditional rifles, and cavalries; which were highly inferior when compared to the weapons wielded by their opponent – the Europeans. At the dawn of the 20th century precisely by 1900 a greater part of African boundaries had been colonized by European powers.

Having colonized much of the continent, European powers began to put in place colonial state systems which would serve as the tool for the political domination, and the material exploitation of their African colonies.[95] The colonial state systems were operated based on the colonial policies adopted by the colonizing countries. Prominent among these policies of colonial administration was the "indirect rule" policy in British colonial Africa and the policy of "assimilation" in French colonial Africa. The most extreme of them all was arguably the apartheid policy which came into force in South-Africa in 1948 following the coming into power of the National Party. Consequently the foregoing scenarios prompted a nucleus of Black leaders in the Diaspora towards the end of the 19th century to form a movement known as Pan-Africanism.

4.5.   The Advent of the Pan-African Movement and the Challenge of Colonial Rule

The entrenchment of colonialism and its attendant consequences such as enslavement, economic exploitation, institutionalized racism, and the political domination of Africans and the people of African descent in the diaspora by Western colonial powers led to the conception and subsequent birth of the pan-Africanist movement. The pan-African concept evolved out of the agonizing experience of former slaves in the Caribbean. J. H. Clarke pointed out: "By the end of the nineteenth century the former slaves began to understand what had happened to them and from the Caribbean the concept of Pan-Africanism was born".[96] As a movement that sought to reawaken the consciousness of Blacks the world over, the pan-African movement became the platform under which intellectuals of African descents challenged the European imposed colonial order, and more importantly engaged the forces of colonialism in the protracted battle for emancipation and self-governance. The Pan-African movement nonetheless had to wait till the early 20th century to launch its ideological campaign into existence - initially among African descendants in the Diaspora and subsequently across the entire black world.

---

[95]Ibid.
[96] Clarke, J. H. 1991. New Dimensions in African History, African World Press, New Jersey, p. 100.

Thus, it was against this background that Henry Sylvester Williams then resident in London where he was working towards qualifying as a barrister took the initiative to convene the 1900 conference which was held in London. Henry Sylvester Williams was a Trinidadian son of immigrant parents from Barbados. Prior to the time of the conference he had met Africans who came for studying and visiting in the United Kingdom – and obtained first-hand information about the extreme racist attitude of the White population towards Blacks in South Africa based on the account given by a victim of racial discrimination and isolation. This later culminated into his forming the African Association.[97] After its emergence, the African Association unveiled plans to organize a Conference which would investigate and sensitize the largely uninformed public about the grave conditions of Blacks in the British colonized territories. In an attempt to advance this cause – its arrowhead Sylvester Williams met Benito Sylvain, a Haitian national domiciled in Paris for consultations on the planned conference. Sylvain had earlier on his part, met Emperor Menelik of Abyssinia with regards to the conference, thus they were able to come up with an agenda which articulated and later broadened the scope of issues which were to come up for discussion at the 1900 conference. Other issues such as the treatment of "native races" under European and American rule was later added to the conference agenda.[98]

Against the rising tide of colonial domination the African Association was formally launched in England on 24 September 1897. As the Imperial nerve-centre and missionary interests Britain became the natural choice for an anti-colonial movement of this kind. The African Association's objective at inception as Olisanwuche Esedebe noted was to "encourage a feeling of unity among men of African blood and protect their interests by circulating accurate information on matters affecting their rights and direct appeals to the metropolitan government."[99] The leading figures of the (AA) were of the conviction that the time had come for the Black race to

---

[97]Marika Sherwood, Pan-African Conferences, 1900 -1953: What Did "Pan-African Mean? The Journal of Pan-African Studies, vol. 4, no. 10, January 2012, p. 2. www.jpanafrican.com/docs/vol4no10/4.10 Pan-African.pdf.
[98] Ibid.
[99]P, OlisanwucheEsedebe. The Growth of the Pan-African Movement 1893 -1927, Tarikh Vol. 6 No. 3, Pan-Africanism, Published for the Historical Society of Nigeria by (Longman Group Limited London) 1980. p. 19.

speak loudest as an independent race on issues that directly infringed upon their rights, human dignity, and socio-political and economic well-being. Thus the founders believed this could be attained effectively through the instrumentality of Blacks - driven movement headquartered in London, the imperial capital. The founding members of the AA were: J. Otonba Payne, Dr.Mojola Agbebi, and D. Augustus Straker. Others include Sylvester Williams – (the convener of the conference) Rev. H. Mason Joseph, Moses da Rocha E.A Gibson etc.[100] In July 1900, the AA held its first conference in the city of London. The following was the agenda for the three days conference which had speakers from various British colonies.

• To secure civil and political rights for Africans and their descendants throughout the world;

• To encourage friendly relations between the Caucasian and African races;

• To encourage African people everywhere in educational, industrial and commercial enterprise;

• To approach Governments and influence legislation in the interests of the black races; and

   To ameliorate the condition of the oppressed Negro in all parts of the world.[101]

The above constituted the agenda of the July 1900 conference in London, which was attended by an array of Black leaders from Africa and the Diaspora. The conference which had Alexander Walters as chair was attended by 32 delegates from across the Black world, including W.E. B. DuBois, Benito Sylvain, then a close aide to Emperor Menelik 11 of Ethiopia. Others included: the Trinidadian medical practitioner John Alcindor, J.R. Archer, a prominent West Indian resident in Battersea district of London, and H. Sylvester Williams. The delegates from Africa at the conference included: F.R.S. Johnson, a Liberian, G. W. Gove, a Sierra Leonean Councillor, and J. Otonba from Lagos Nigeria. At the end of the conference, a statement entitled "To the

---

[100] Ibid.
[101]Marika Sherwood, Pan-African Conferences, 1900 -1953: What Did "Pan-African Mean? The Journal of Pan-African Studies, vol. 4, no. 10, January 2012, p.. 2. www.jpanafrican.com/docs/vol4no10/4.10 Pan-African.pdf.

Nations of the World" was issued and circulated to territories in which persons of African descents lived. Other resolutions of the 1900 conference included a written petition directly sent to the British monarch Queen Victoria which protested and condemned in the strongest terms the large scale injustices suffered by Africans and peoples of African descents in the British colonial empire. The conference also resolved to establish a permanent Pan-African Association with a secretariat that would replace the African Association with offices at 61-62 Chancery Lane, London. The 1900 conference ended its proceedings with an election into the key posts of the organization. This led to the emergence of the organization's officers for a fixed term of two years each.[102] In conclusion, it is important to note that while the African Association did not succeed entirely in its attempt to halt the trend of injustices that bedevilled the Black peoples across the world, it did however give an appreciable showing by being the first Black – led organization to have cohesively challenged the excesses of European colonialism. This help laid the foundation upon which subsequent conferences of this kind drew their inspiration from. Thus the 1900 conference was a propelling force against the established order of colonial servitude, racism, and economic exploitation.

4.6.   The Pan-African Conferences (1919-1950s)

Spurred by the success recorded earlier, Du Bois (1863-1963) a frontline Pan-Africanist leader of the 20th century and a delegate to the 1900 London African Association conference which later metamorphosed into the Pan-African movement organized four Pan-African conferences between 1919 and 1927.These conferences made a significant impact on the decolonization process in Africa and the entire Black world. In the words of Nnamdi Azikwe, Nigeria's first president (1960-1966) the founding of the Pan-African congress in 1919, in Paris, "was a signal for the historic struggle for African nationalists which led to the political emancipation of the

---

[102] P, OlisanwucheEsedebe. The Growth of the Pan-African Movement 1893 -1927, Tarikh Vol. 6 No. 3, Pan-Africanism, Published for the Historical Society of Nigeria by (Longman Group Limited London) 1980. pp. 19-20.

continent".[103] The 1919 Pan-African congress was held in Paris-the French capital from 19 and 21 February 1919. At the conference, far- reaching resolutions were made which further protested the degradation of Blacks across the world. The 1919 edition of the Pan-African conference demanded "in the interest of justice and humanity and for strengthening the forces of civilization that immediate steps be taken to develop the 200, 000, of Negros" world over. Delegates at the conference thus resolved as follows:

- That the allied and associated Powers establish a code of laws for the international Protection of the natives of Africa similar to the proposed international code for Labour;

- That the League of Nations establish a permanent Bureau charged with the special Duty of overseeing the application of these laws to the political social and

   Economic welfare of the natives[104]

The concluding part of the 1919 Pan-African conference resolution demanded that peoples of African descent the world over be given their inalienable rights to be governed according to the principles listed below.

The Land:

The land and its natural resources shall be held in trust for the natives and at all times they shall have effective ownership of as much land as they can profitably develop.

Capital:

---

[103] Cited in Clarence Cottee, Du Bois, the NAACP, and the Pan-African Congress of 1919, The Journal of Negro History, vol. 57, No.1 (Jan, 1972). p. 28, Published by Association for the study of African American Life and History, Inc. available online at: http//www.jstor.org/stable/2717070, accessed: 8/11/ 2014.
[104] The 1919 Pan-African conference resolutions can be accessed online at: www.youthcouncil-namibia.org/docs/1stPanc.Pdf.

The investment of capital and granting of concessions shall be so regulated as to prevent the exploitation of the natives and the exhaustion of the natural wealth of the country; Concessions shall always be limited in time and subject to state control; the growing social needs of the natives must be regarded and the profits taxed for the social and material benefit of the natives.

Labour:

Slavery and corporal punishment shall be abolished and forced labour except in punishment for crime; and the general conditions of labour shall be prescribed and regulated by the State.

Education:

It shall be the right of every native child to learn to read and write his own language, and the language of the trustee nation, at public expense, and to be given technical instruction in some branch of industry. The State shall also educate as large a number of natives as possible in higher technical and cultural training and maintain a corps of native teachers.

Medicine and Hygiene:

It shall be recognized that human existence in the tropics calls for special safeguards and a scientific system of public hygiene. The State shall be responsible for medical care and sanitary conditions without discouraging collective and individual initiative. A service created by the State shall provide physicians and hospitals, and shall spread the rules of hygiene by written and spoken word. As fast as possible the State will establish a native medical staff.

The State:

The natives of Africa must have the right to participate in the government as fast as their development permits in conformity with the principle that the government exists for the natives, and not the natives for the government.

They shall at once be allowed to participate in local and tribal government according to ancient usage, and this participation shall gradually extend, as education and experience proceeds, to the higher offices of State, to the end that, in time, Africa be ruled by consent of the Africans.

Culture and Religion:

No particular religion shall be imposed and no particular form of human culture. There shall be liberty of conscience. The uplift of the natives shall take into consideration their present condition and shall allow the utmost scope to racial genius, social inheritance and individual bent so long as these are not contrary to the best established principles of civilization.

Civilized Negroes:

Wherever persons of African descent are civilized and able to meet the tests of surrounding culture, they shall be accorded the same rights as their fellow citizens; they shall not be denied on account of race or colour a voice in their own government, justice before the courts and economic and social equality according to ability and desert.

The League of Nations:

Greater security of life and property shall be guaranteed the natives international labour legislation shall cover the native workers as well as whites they shall have equitable representation in all the international institutions of the League of Nations, and the participation of the blacks themselves in every domain of endeavour shall be encouraged in accordance with the declared object of article 19 of the League of Nations, to wit: "The well-being and the development of these people constitute a sacred mission of civilization and it is

proper in the League of Nations to incorporate therein pledges for the accomplishment of this mission.[105]

The 1919 edition of the Pan-African conference ended with a call on the League of Nations to ensure that the interest of African descents are well protected by ensuring that it brings to the attention of the world the unjust treatment of Blacks across the colonial world. There was noticeable improvement in the number of attendees at the conference as it was attended by 57 delegates from Africa and the diaspora, unlike the 1900 conference which had 37 delegates in attendance. The second Pan African Conference took place in August 1921, and a month later it reconvened in Brussels, Belgium. At these two conferences leading Black figures from Africa, the Americas, the Caribbean, and Europe reiterated their resentment of the colonial system and its manifest features.

The speakers at the conference expressed their disapproval of racism against the Black peoples and other discriminatory tendencies unleashed by the white colonial authorities. In addition, the delegates called for domestic self-governance for the colonially traumatized peoples. The convener of the conference, Du Bois, underscored the importance of intensifying cross racial synergy between members of the black intelligentsia and those sympathetic to the parlous socio-political and economic political state of the colonial subjects. The conference ended with a resolve by delegates to work toward the pursuit of justice for peoples of African descents. The cities of London and Lisbon (in England and Portugal) respectively played host to the third Pan-African conference in 1923. The conference deliberations were in two sessions, one in London and the other in Lisbon. Both sessions of the 1923 edition of the Pan-African conference had in attendance prominent European intellectuals such as H.G. Wells and Harold Laski. The conference also paraded leading figures of the Pan-African movement who participated in previous conferences. The conference delegates called for the immediate termination of all discriminatory tendencies against the Blacks community across the colonial world.

---

[105] Ibid.

Therefore, the 1923 conference like others before it played an important role in the decolonization of the African continent and the Black world.

Next in the succession of Pan-African conferences of the 20th century was the 1927 conference held in New-York, United States. In an attempt to intensify pressure on the colonial masters, delegates met for the fifth time to assess the socio-political and economic status of the Black man in the colonies. The 1927 conference had an impressive attendance of 208 delegates from across twenty-two American states and ten foreign countries. Africa, the motherland continent of Black people was unimpressively represented at the conference; not by its own making but because of the travel restrictions imposed by the British and French colonial powers on the interested delegates. The colonial powers apparently worried by the rising tide of Pan-Africanist activities and the huge threat it posed to their imperialist activities on the continent, decided to frustrate further Pan-African meetings. Consequently, the African continent could only muster few delegates from Gold Coast, (Ghana) Sierra Leone, Liberia, and Nigeria as representatives of the continent at the conference. Participants at the 1927 conference were mostly Black Americans.

The bulk of the conference's finance came from Addie W. Hunton a trained nurse and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom - across racial organization established in 1919 by the antagonists of World War I. Like the previous conferences, the conditions of Black peoples in the colonies formed the core of the discussion at the 1927 Pan-African conference. The conference ended with a call on the colonial authorities to stop all forms of discriminatory policies against Black people across the globe. This was in line with the demands made at prior Pan-African conferences. Due largely to the great depression of the 1920s, and its socio-economic impact on the global economy, the Pan-African conferences could not hold for a period of 18 years. However, this hiatus did not in any way weaken the spirit of the Pan-Africanists. It rather gave them the impetus to further galvanize their people world over against the colonial system. The long period was used to spread the Pan-African gospel across the entire Black world.

After a long absence, Pan-Africanists converged in Manchester, England in 1945. The 1945 Pan-African conference was a milestone in the decolonization of Africa and the Black race for few reasons. First, it was at the conference that Africans would be leaders and their African diaspora brothers demanded without equivocation an end to European colonization. Secondly, the participation of Africans in World War 1 gave the impression that the time was ripe for political independence. The 1945 conference held between 15 and 21 October 1945 was considered by many as the most important of all the Pan-African conferences due to its impact on the decolonization process. It had in attendance frontline leaders from the Diaspora such George Padmore. Du Bois was deservedly named by delegates to the conference as president of the 1945 meeting. This was in appreciation of his historic role in the development of the Pan-African movement. Others were Trinidadian pan-Africanist George Padmore and Prominent Jamaican lawyer Dudley Thompson.

The Manchester Conference was attended by over 200 delegates from the coloured world. For the first time Africa was not only represented impressively at the Conference but Africans participated actively in its deliberations and proceedings. Also for the first time Pan Africanism and African Nationalism became synonymous and equally significant, and the necessity for a well-organized firmly-knit movements, as a primary condition for the success of the national liberation struggle in Africa, was sufficiently articulated.[106] The 1945 Conference was attended by African nationalist such as Ghana's Kwame Nkrumah, Kenya's Jomo Kenyatta, Malawi's Hastings Banda, Nigeria's Nnamdi Azikwe, Obafemi Awolowo, Jaja Wachukwu among other African nationalist leaders of the time. The participants at the Conference were largely made up of intellectuals, political activists and scholars. There were 33 delegates from the West Indies while 35 others came from different organizations in Britain. This included the West African Students Union.

---

[106] P, OlisanwucheEsedebe. The Growth of the Pan-African Movement 1893 -1927, Tarikh Vol. 6 No. 3, Pan-Africanism, Published for the Historical Society of Nigeria by (Longman Group Limited London) 1980. p. 40.

The presence of Du Bois – the convener of the 1919 Pan-African conference, then 77-year old was symbolic as it helped to stimulate the new generation of Pan-Africanist that later took over the leadership of the movement from the pioneer generation of Pan-African leaders. The conference was under-reported by the British Press obviously because of the threat it posed to their imperial activities in the colonies. Other resolutions passed at the conference included the criminalization of racial discrimination and denunciation of imperialism and capitalism. As part of strategies to end colonialism, delegates resolved that colonial subjects should employ industrial actions such as strikes, boycotts and other mutinous acts to free themselves from economic, social and political subjugation imposed on them by the imperial forces.

The 1945 Pan-African conference had a tremendous impact on the decolonization of continental Africa as it aroused the consciousness of future African leaders who took the indoctrination received at the conference to their respective domain for prompt implementation. Thus the post-1945 era witnessed popular anti-colonial sentiments across Africa. For instance, between 1945 and 1960, Ghana's Kwame Nkrumah took the initiative to domesticate the pan-African ideals on the African continent, a move which started yielding results in December 1945, with the coming together of Wallace Johnson, Bankole Akpata Kojo Botsio, Bankole Awoonor Renner, Ashie Nikoi, and Kwame Nkrumah himself to form the West African National Secretariat in England. The association intended to propagate the ideals of Pan-Africanism and foster the spirit of unity and solidarity initially among students of West African extraction in England and subsequently among Africans in general. More importantly, the association used its platform to sensitize Africans on the need to claim back their inheritance territorially, economically, socially, and politically from their European subjugators. The activities of this association gathered momentum from the time of its emergence in late

1945 to the late 1950s. It was largely as a result of this that Ghana became the first Sub-Saharan African country to obtain political independence in March 1957.[107]

The independence of Ghana acted as a catalyst for the independence of 17 African countries 13 years later as: Cameroon, Togo, Senegal, Madagascar, Democratic Republic of Congo, Benin, Somalia, Niger, Nigeria, Burkina Faso, Ivory Coast, Chad, Central African Republic, Gabon, Congo and Mauritania all became independent.[108] Prior to the independence of these countries in 1960, Dr Kwame Nkrumah – Africa's foremost Pan-Africanist – hosted two Accra Conferences in 1958. According to Tondi, "the first two Pan-African conferences to be held on the African soil were held in Accra, Ghana in April and December 1958".[109] As noted above, these Conferences had profound impact on the decolonization of Africa as they helped galvanize African nationalists who, having drawn inspiration from Ghana's independence breakthrough, intensified pressure on the existing colonial regimes on the continent.

In conclusion, from the brief episode presented above on the Pan-African movement and its activities vis-à-vis its challenge of the colonial order across the Black world, it is evident that the movement succeeded in its founding mission which was to put an end to colonialism and its accompanying effects across the entire black world. The mere fact that the European colonial powers such as the British and the French attempted to stop Africans from attending the Pan-African gatherings shows that the movement's activities not only challenged their imperialistic actions on the continent but also posed a huge threat to their continued domination of the peoples in the colonies they administered. Thus the Pan-African ideology undoubtedly played a pivotal role in the transition of Africa and the entire Black world from colonially dependent states to a state of responsible independence. The next section will historically examine the role

---

[107]Marika Sherwood, Pan-African Conferences, 1900 -1953: What Did "Pan-African Mean? The Journal of Pan-African Studies, vol. 4, no. 10, January 2012, p. 2. www.jpanafrican.com/docs/vol4no10/4.10 Pan-African.pdf
[108] Hodgkin, T. 1957 "Nationalism in Colonial Africa" New York: New York University, p. 1.

[109]PakisoTondi. Pan-African Thought and Practice, Alternation Special Edition 2 (2005), pp. 322-324 ISSN 1023-1757. www.alternation.ukzn.ac.za/Files/docs/12.3.

of Nigeria in African decolonization politics in the United Nations from 1960 upwards within the context of the title of this dissertation.

SECTION TWO: A FOCUS ON NIGERIA

4.7.   The Role of Nigeria in African Decolonization Politics in the United Nations, 1960-1994

This section analyses the role of the Nigerian state in African decolonization politics in the UN between the periods aforementioned. To accomplish this task, the section will be examined periodically in order to be able to convey the historical significance of the issues which will be the focus of discussion. As noted in the introduction to this chapter, there were key events of historical significance that presaged the era of the politicization of the issues of decolonization – these form an integral part of the discussion in this section. Between the mid-1940s and the late 1980s issues of international importance were mostly viewed from the angle of a phenomenon which polarized the international political space - the Cold War. As Kay (1970:102) argued, "…the Cold War has for twenty years been the most pervasive force affecting contemporary international relations…" therefore, the issues that will be discussed here had their roots firmly entrenched in this history shaping elements of the 20th century world politics. The crux of the author's argument here is that issues of African decolonization from the year 1960 onwards assumed a political dimension in the UN due largely to the existence of this ideological battle cum Cold War between the Soviet Union led eastern bloc and the United States led western bloc and their allies respectively.

The fifteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) meeting opened on September 20, 1960. This, suffice to say, was prior to Nigeria's admission into the world body as the country was not formally admitted until 7, October 1960. However, proceedings had commenced on the aforesaid date on the floor of the GA where delegates from member states had converged to address issues of global interests which had been scheduled for discussion and debate at the session. Among the range of issues that were deliberated upon was colonialism which eventually and understandably dominated proceedings at the session due to

the precarious state of affairs in the colonies especially on the African continent. We commence with a reflection on the historical background to decolonization politics. This will then lead us to the general analysis of the theme under study. A study of this kind as implied above, demands that one begins by historicizing the very origins of decolonization politics in the U.N before zooming in on the different roles played by various actors (Nigeria included in the process). In light of this, the following questions will be provided with detailed answers under this section: Why were the issues of decolonization politicized in the UN and what were the roles played by Nigeria and other actors in this regard?

By the end of World War 11 in 1945, the international system metamorphosed into a bipolar one with the emergence of two major superpowers which wielded military and political power in an antagonistic fashion. These countries were the United States of America in the western hemisphere and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the Eastern orbit. This situation, suffices to say, was occasioned by the compelling realities at the time. First, among these was the defeats inflicted on both Germany and Japan by the allied forces. Second, was the significant loss of influence by France and China - although considered as major powers, but were, in fact minor ones. Great Britain, on the other hand, having undergone a gruelling and devastating six years of war, could not muster the strength required to support its superpower status(Baker, 1968).The post-World War 11 period triggered a new dimension in international politics as new political and military camps surfaced shortly after the laying down of arms by the warring parties. Consequently, the wartime synergy among the allied powers which had become the foundation upon which the new world organization was erected, paved way to a deep-rooted competition between the United States and the Soviet Union and their allies respectively.

To the American nation and its predominantly western allies, the expansionist activities of the Soviet bloc and its communist ideology posed a huge menace which, if allowed to flourish could have grave implications for their national interests which included economic, political and

military aspects. In Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union sought to exert its influence in the entire region. Having been spurred by the desires for security, it demonstrated that the states of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, Yugoslavia, and Finland had governments that were friendly to the USSR. It was against this background that communists in these countries, with the aid of the USSR authorities, formed a coalition of governments with the socialists and other parties which showed interests (Baker 1968).The Soviet's idea of forming a coalition government with these states was strategic for two reasons. First, the Soviets believed that such an arrangement would prevent the west from making ideological incursions into the region.

Second, they also believed that a fully integrated communist Eastern Europe could act as a springboard for their ideological expansionism across the world. In other words, the Soviet's plan was to use its sphere of influence as a platform for the spread of communism to other parts of the globe. From the standpoint of the Western world, Eastern Europe under the dominant control of communists portended danger if not contained; as the threat of communist expansion assumed a frightening dimension because the communist had exported their ideology to other parts of the world. For instance, the Soviets had attempted to establish a foothold in the Middle East and in the Turkish Straits. In the Middle East for instance, Soviets delayed the withdrawal of its troops from Iran to obtain economic and political concessions from the Iranian government (Baker, 1968).

The Soviets also attempted to bring the Turkish Straits under its ideological influence during the Cold War era territorial conflict between the Soviet Union and Turkey. Turkey, a neutral European state throughout most of the World War 11 period, came under pressure from the Soviet government which requested that Russian ships be allowed freely through the Turkish Straits, which linked the Black Sea to the Mediterranean. According to Baker (1968:7) the Soviets also proposed to "participate with Turkey in the organization of the defence of the Straits". The Turkish government in a swift response rejected the Soviet's requests. This, then,

aroused tensions in the region as the Soviets could not swallow the humiliation it suffered as a consequence of the rejection of its request with regard to the Straits. This later culminated into a show of naval force by the Soviet Union which was targeted at forcing its way through.

The crisis would later serve as a decider in the invocation of the Truman Doctrine by the United States government due to the fact that Turkey was looking potentially vulnerable to Soviet naval superiority. The Turkish government apparently worried by the situation was left with no other option than to turn to the United States and NATO for protection and membership respectively. This development from the Cold War perspective was a triumph for the United States and its allies as they added another European state -Turkey to their camp having pushed back their arch-rival – the Soviets away from the Turkish straits.[110] In Korea, which was jointly occupied by the American and Soviet forces, negotiations to put in place an independent government failed due to the scheming of the superpowers for influence in the region. The American and Soviet governments both demanded that the government of Korea when constituted would not fall under each other's influence. In addition, the collapse of the American – sponsored talks in China aimed at settling the differences between the nationalists and Communists in that country brightened the prospects of a Communist triumph, as the situation eventually culminated into the addition of a major state to the Socialist camp.

In a nutshell, the above scenario can be summarized as follows: Turkey joined the American led Western bloc while the Soviet Union outsmarted America in the race for global influence with the recruitment of Korea into the Socialist camp. This intense competition between the Soviet Union and the United States could not have been explained better than by President John Kennedy of the United States in 1963 who described the acrimonious relations as the global competition between the communist bloc and the non-communists. He submitted that the African continent was regarded by his country as the manipulative field in the contest.

---

[110] "Turkish Straits Crisis" Teaching American History, www.teachingamericanhistory.org/static/neh/interactives/Coldwareurope/map/data/info_10.html (Not Dated)

According to Meredith (2006) this was the situation which pervaded the world for fifteen years prior to the emergence of Nigeria as an independent country. Thus Nigeria was born into it. Two years into hostilities, the United States leveraged on its foreign policy resource to determine the doctrine of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin - this, from the American perspective, would help formulate a sound foreign policy toward the Soviet Union. Consequently, by March 1947, American foreign policymakers had produced a strategic response when they initiated a new foreign policy architecture which would guild the United States Cold War behaviour.

The Cold War policy of the United States was captured by George Kennan as follows: "…the main element of any United States policy toward the Soviet Union must be that of a long-term, patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expansive tendencies".[111] The foregoing thus became the basis of the United States engagement with the Soviet Union vis-à-vis the Cold War struggle. While the United States lacked the clout to completely halt the ascendancy of the communist movement, American policy makers and strategists were however convinced that they could employ their policy of containment effectively against their bitter rivals and thereby force the Soviets to demonstrate a far greater level of moderation and decency in its ideological campaign and expansionist agenda. The American calculation was that this would culminate into a collapse or at least in the immediate time a softening of Soviet power. The Cold War policy of containment of the United States was initiated and made public in March 1947 by President Truman. This subsequently became known as the Truman Doctrine.

President Truman had in an address to the United States Congress stressed the importance of providing economic and military assistance to Greece and Turkey following Britain's decision to curtail its assistance to these countries. In his speech to the Congress, the President argued that the United States must act promptly to rescue the countries from Soviet vulnerability. The

---

[111] Kennan, G." The Sources of Soviet Conduct," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 25, No. 4 cited in (Baker 1968) "The United States and Africa in the United Nations: A Case Study in American Foreign Policy," Imprimerie Offset Composition Services, INC, Washington D.C. p. 8.

President said, "The very existence of the Greek state is today threatened by terrorist activities of several thousand armed men, led by Communists, who defy the Government's authority…"[112] The foregoing is indicative of the fact that the Cold War was basically a struggle about ideologies between the Soviet Communist bloc and the capitalist Western countries led by America. As a phenomenon that is rooted in tangible conflicts of interest between the Soviet Union and the United States blocs who viewed each other's military and political actions with a high degree of suspicion, the Cold War led to the exacerbation of tensions across the world thus making it difficult to reach an agreement that could bring about peaceful settlement.

As a matter of fact, many countries in Europe and other parts of the world remained divided along ideological lines for an upward of 40 years. The Soviet Union also came up with their Cold War policy toward Africa through what became known as the Soviet Africanist Coordinating Conference, which was held at the Ethnographical Institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences in February, 1957, in Moscow. By 1961, a definite Soviet policy toward Africa had emerged. As Alexander Dallin opined, the sole objective of Soviet policy was to ". . . deny Africa to the West, and especially to deprive the United States and its allies of political influence, economic opportunities, and strategic bases in Africa.[113] The foregoing is instructive given that the realist power theory which was used in framing this study argues that state actors that make up the international system are driven primarily by their national interests which they pursue under moral concerns. The African policy and the vehement manner in which colonialism was attacked by the Soviet Union later in the course of the debates on the question at the UN further affirms the relevance of the realist theory to this study. During this period, the ideologically belligerent blocs – the East and West scrambled for recruits from the then existing countries and the newly emerging ones. The conflict was dubbed the "Cold War" because it was a non-physically combative crisis. Troops of the Soviet Union and the United States never came

---

[112] Ibid, p. 8.
[113] See Dallin. A. (1963), "The Soviet Union: Political Activity" in Zbigniew Brzezinki's Africa and the Communist World (Stanford: Hoover Institution), p. 13.

into direct military combat because of the fear that such direct contact would have had the potential to escalate into nuclear conflict. The Cold War, for the period it lasted, remained essentially a fierce battle between the major power blocs who struggled against each other for influence throughout the world (Steans and Pettiford, 2001).

In summary, it has been demonstrated thus far that the Cold War was ideologically driven. To put it simply, the quest for relevance and influence across the globe propelled it; while the necessity of preserving the national interests of both camps sustained the war until it ended in 1989. The question now becomes: how did the Cold War influence the course of African decolonization in the post-1960 decades especially in the United Nations which became the most powerful platform where the struggle against colonialism was fought with genuine interests by the forces of liberation on one hand, and the colonial forces and their tactical supporters on the other? The answer to this lies in the fact that both the Soviets and the American blocs, as argued above, were motivated by their national interests which they sought to advance at each other's expense thereby making the war even fiercer.

This, suffice to say, was what later influenced the dispositions of both blocs to issues of decolonization, especially from the Soviet and American perspectives – the major and the most powerful blocs of the 20th century. The foregoing therefore provides the historical basis for the discussions and analyses of events from the year 1960 upwards which will be considered next. In light of the above synopsis, the post-1960 analysis will fall under two major historical periods given that the study spans a period of 34 years. The first, 1960-1971, will examine the attempt to politicize the issues of decolonization, the debates it generated, the responses and counter responses of the discordant blocs and other member states and, finally, the voting pattern on colonial issues. It will also consider the attempt by the West to frustrate the implementation of UNGA anti-colonial resolutions. The second period, 1971-1994, will examine Nigeria's political roles in its capacity as the Chair of the UN Anti-Apartheid Committee.

4.8.   The Colonial Declaration and Politicization of African Decolonization

The fifteenth session of the UN General Assembly opened on September 20, 1960 barely seventeen days before Nigeria's admission into the World body. The 1960 UNGA session was attended by the prominent world leaders among who was the Prime Minister of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republic – Nikita Khrushchev. The fifteenth session of the UNGA meeting of 1960 was a milestone in the history of African decolonization due to the unprecedented number of African territories that obtained their independence in that single year. The year was also significant in the life of the UN itself as the organization admitted a record sixteen new African countries into its fold. In total, seventeen countries were admitted in that session of which only Cyprus was the non –African country; the remaining being African countries which included Nigeria. The newly independent countries had been scheduled for admission into the UN prior to the UNGA meeting.

The unprecedented upsurge in African representation at the UN did not go unnoticed. In fact as early as the opening day of the fifteenth session of the UNGA meeting of 1960, the Soviets had begun to strategize on how to win their way into the hearts of the leadership of the emerging countries at the expense of their old ideological foe – the United States and its colonialist allies. To the Soviets, a hard anti-colonial stance meant winning the sympathies of these newly independent countries thus providing the grounds for their subsequent recruitment into the communist camp. In an era of bitter rivalries, characterized by the arms race and desperate competition for influence throughout the planet, the Soviet Union leadership believed that one of the ways through which they could contain their rivals was to penetrate Africa - not through the traditional pattern of forceful invasion but by tactically aligning themselves with the predicament of Africans many of whom at the time languished under western colonialism.

Suffice to say at this point that the United States never owned a colonial empire in Africa in the same sense as its European colonial powers. Its relation with Africa in the 19th century came

through Liberia a West African country which was "established by Americans for Americans".[114] The American Colonization Society which was established by an Act of Congress in 1816, was empowered to facilitate a program of sending freed slaves of African descent back to the continent due to the growing fears by a leading section of white Americans that African descent population would become too numerous if the government failed to take action that was expected to reduce the numerical strength of people of African descent.[115]

However, the American nation had many of its Cold War allies having colonial possessions in Africa. Britain, France, Portugal, Netherlands, Spain, Belgium, and Germany at some point all had colonial territories which they administered in Africa. These countries were staunch allies of the United States in the Cold War years; a situation that tied America's hands as far as the struggle against colonialism in Africa was concerned. America thus became a mere anti-colonial country in rhetoric and a tactical supporter of colonialism in its actions. This will be considered in due course. As the 1960 UNGA meeting was about to get under way, Nikita S. Khrushchev - the leader of the Soviet delegation having arrived very early on the opening day, was full of confidence that his county would tower above its arch-rival the United States in every respects. He then went ahead to utter a statement that showed the deep-rooted rivalries between the two Superpowers. This subsequently influenced proceedings on the floor of the General Assembly throughout the period of the session. The Soviet Leader had on September 20, the opening day of the fifteenth sessions while taking his breakfast, according to Boris Piadyshev, claimed that his country would outclass the United States in every human. Khrushchev then wondered what time it could be in Moscow. As it happened, it was about 3pm. The Soviet

---

[114] Liberia: America's Impoverished Orphan in Africa, www.media.washingtonpost.com/wp-adv/specials/sales/inernational/spotlight/article2.htmlpg 1. (Undated).

[115] Ibid. p. 1.

leader then said, "You see Mother Nature itself put Russia ahead of America in time. We will get ahead of America in all other respects as well".[116]

The intensity of the rivalry between the Soviet Union and the United States could not have been pictured better by the Soviet leader – Nikita Khrushchev who afterwards in the words of Boris Piadyshev, became a "volcano" waiting to "erupt". He reckoned that Nikita Khrushchev was "boiling over, looking for a vent".[117] It later became known to the Soviet leader that the fifteenth session was not going to open until 3pm. Thus there was still plenty of time before he could unleash his venomous attack on the United States and its colonialist cronies. The Soviet Union's leader finally had his turn to take to the floor of the UNGA on September 23, 1960 following the Ghanaian President Kwame Nkrumah's address at the morning session. The Ghanaian leader's presentation was greeted with tremendous applause which earned him a handshake from Nikita Khrushchev who was apparently delighted with the forcefulness of the Ghanaian leader's address.

As the leader of the Soviet Union delegation to the fifteenth session of the UNGA meeting of 1960, the onus fell on Nikita Khrushchev to express his country's disapproval of western colonialism with preconceived mind-set of laying wreckage to western interests and influence on the African continent. Thus on 23 September 1960, the Soviet Union Leader delivered a speech which aroused tensions in the UN for the better part of the fifteenth session. Khrushchev began his remarks thus: "The Soviet government believes that the time has come to raise the question of complete and final abolition of colonial rule, putting an end to this disgrace, barbarity, and savagery''.[118] His opening remarks received a huge applause not from the western blocs but from the representatives of the newly independent countries including

---

[116] For an account of Nikita Khrushchev's Presentation at the Fifteen Session of the UNGA meeting, September-October 1960, see B. Piadyshev, "Khrushchev Stuns the UN". p. 163. www.mconway.net/page1/page6/.../Khrushchev, viewed August 10, 2014.

[117] Ibid, 164. NB Is this a page?

[118] Ibid. 170 NB I is this a page?

those that had just joined the fifteenth session of the UNGA few days before. The Soviet Union leader took time to remind the UNGA gathering that his country had the moral uprightness to denounce and call for the elimination of colonialism when he quickly made reference to the "spectacular achievements"[119] which had been recorded by Russia's former Central Asian colonies since 1926. He mentioned among other things that there were an appreciable number of scientists and research associates which had increased to 74 times. Khrushchev also claimed that the countries had also grown tremendously in terms of agriculture. In a nutshell, the Soviet's idea was to inform the UNGA delegates present at the session that the country practiced what it preached.

However, this argument was strategic in the sense that it sought to provide a moral basis for the Soviet's actions at the session. Thus it was simply a case of promoting national interests under the pretext of morality or better put moral concerns. As noted earlier in this section, the large number of independent countries which joined the UN in 1960 had a profound impact on the UN machinery. In terms of the alteration it generated in the "…voting balance in the Assembly…" (Kay, 1970: 151). In fact, from 1945 to1960, over one-third of the Assembly was composed of nations which had attained their political independence in the post 1945 era(Kay 1970).This reality thus became an instrument of leverage for the Soviet bloc during the 1960 session. In addition to this, there were other issues of global dimension that attracted widespread indignation across Africa and the world and gave African problems a special attention in the UN in the years which followed beginning from 1960. These issues were the Sharpeville incident in South Africa which led to the killing of 69 unarmed protesters by the apartheid police in March 1960 and the Congolese crisis which was triggered by the Cold War animosity and its divisive consequences which later claimed the life of the country's first post-independence political leader in the person of Patrice Lumumba.

---

[119] Ibid, 170.

All these events contributed towards the emergence of Soviet's anti-colonial initiative. This was the political contexts in which Nikita Khrushchev having earlier made his position known on the colonial question, later in the course of his "2 hours and 20 minutes" speech"[120], formally made a request to the Assembly that an additional item, which was titled a "declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples"[121], be included on the agenda of the fifteenth session meeting. The draft which followed the request was extremely radical in content and in tone. Even the newly independent countries could not have presented something more radical than the one presented by the Soviet. The Soviet anti-colonial draft proclaimed that in the colonial territories controlled by European allies of the United States, "the swish of the overseer's lash is heard; their heads fall under the executioner's axe".[122] The Soviet Union's anti-colonial onslaught did not end there; it went on to demand an immediate abolition of colonial practice. This, the Soviet delegation believed would dry up the ocean of injustices which the colonialist had thrown Africa and its peoples into.

To save the colonized peoples from getting drowned in this ocean of injustices, the Soviet declaration proceeded with the proclamation that all countries under colonial rule "must be granted forthwith complete independence".[123] In addition to this, the Soviets also demanded the all foreign colonial plantations be demolished. The General Committee on September 28, 1960, sequel to the Soviet declaration recommended that the item be enclosed in the agenda of the fifteenth sessions for a debate on the draft. With this success, the Soviet Union secured a major victory in its anti-colonial initiative. In accordance with the tradition of the Assembly, the General Committee recommendation that the Soviet item be passed first to the Political and Security Committee for its preliminary consideration.

---

[120] Ibid.
[121] United Nations Document A/4502, Sept. 23, 1960.
[122] Ibid.
[123] Ibid.

Nigeria Enters the Scene

As the 15th session of the UNGA meeting progressed, Nigeria was officially admitted into the UN fold as the organization's 99th member state on Friday 7th October, 1960 in New York, United States of America. As a fresh product of British colonialism having secured its independence from the latter a week earlier on 1st October 1960, the newly independent country, had "…in accordance with international practice put in her application for membership of the United Nations Organization…"[124] The UNGA resolution 1492 (XV), which admitted the country after considering its application to the membership of the world body read thus:

> Having received the recommendation of the Security Council of 7 October 1960 that the Federation of Nigeria should be admitted to membership in the United Nations, Having considered the application for membership of the Federation of Nigeria, Decides to admit the Federation to membership in the United Nations.[125]

The resolution for Nigeria's admission into the UN was thereafter sponsored by Tunisia representing the then independent African States and the ten Commonwealth nations which were already members of the UN. These nations were: Australia, Canada, Ceylon (Now Sri-Lanka), the Gold Coast (Now Ghana), India, Malaya (now Malaysia), New Zealand, Pakistan, the United Kingdom and, the strangest of them all being the Union of South-Africa which was at the time oblivious of the tenacious anti-apartheid role the country was poised to play in Africa and on the global stage.[126] All the statements welcoming Nigeria to the membership of the United Nations extolled and took cognizance of its potential to play an important role in the organization judging from the size of its territory, the mass of its human population and the extent of its natural resources.[127]

---

[124]Adebo. S.O (1988), "Our International Years" (Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited), p. 48.
[125] United Nations Document 1492 (XV) fifteen Session 893rd Plenary meeting, 7 October 1960.
[126] Nigeria at the United Nations: A Partnership for Better World," A Ministry of External Affairs, Federal Republic of Nigeria Production, (Third Press Publishers, Lagos, Nigeria 1991), p. 4.
[127] Ibid, p. 4.

According to the Tunisian delegation at the session, Nigeria was destined "to become a catalytic element of liberty for the less favoured African peoples and a stabilizing factor in Africa".[128] Soon after the confirmation of its UN membership, Nigeria immediately got involved in the agenda of the 15th session. On October 10, 1960, three days after Nigeria made its debut appearance at the UN, the Assembly sequel to the General Committee's recommendation of September 28, 1960, approved that the Soviet's item be placed on the agenda for debate. But the Soviet Union delegation sensing danger, acted swiftly to thwart any potential move by the west to kill its anti-colonial initiative when it proposed that this item be deliberated upon directly in the plenary session instead of allowing it to follow the traditional procedural pattern of addressing issues in the Assembly.[129] The Soviet's fears in this regard can be attributed to two key factors: first, was the fact that the Soviet delegation at the fifteen sessions was aware of the potency of the plenary session of the General Assembly to deliver on a keen subject like colonialism because of its wide coverage by the world media. The mere fact that proceedings at the session would be disseminated across the globe prompted the Soviets to insist on having its draft proposal considered in a debate at the floor of the Assembly. The second factor, was due to the voluminous nature of the fifteenth session agenda which had close to a century of issues scheduled for discussion by the Assembly, the Soviets due to the existing rivalry between them and the West, were firmly convinced that the West, being the architects of the colonial crisis and the colonial system would scheme to bury its anti-colonial initiative under the guise of the tight agenda of the session. The Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev thus made an appeal to the Assembly session that the issue be allowed to be discussed in plenary. He stated the following:

> The USSR delegation has submitted this question for consideration by the most representative organ of the United Nations, the General Assembly in plenary meeting. It is quite clearly essential to hold the debate in this forum and no other, and at the highest level with the participation of the Heads of Government. Discussion of the

[128] Ibid.
[129] United Nations Document A/L.312/Rev.1, Oct. 12, 1960.

problem of elimination of the colonial system directly in the plenary with the participation of the Heads of Government and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Member States of the United Nations will invest the debate with the most authoritative character and secure the most favourable conditions for the successful solution of the problem within the framework of the United Nations (Kay, 1970:152).

The above elucidation by the Soviet leader Khrushchev was received by members of the GA present at the session with mixed reactions. The western stance and those of the majority of Latin American countries- many of whom were ex-colonies of western colonial powers such as Portugal, Spain and France was intriguing. They were of the opinion that regardless of the Soviet argument the procedural order for the consideration of issues at the GA should not be altered adding that the procedural skip which the Soviets advocated for would potentially in the long-run lead into propaganda warfare between the two major blocs.[130] Britain, the colonial power with the largest existing colonial territories at the time repudiated the Soviet's request that the issue of colonialism be tabled for consideration at the plenary. As arguments for and against the presentation of the Soviet anti-colonial initiative at the plenary raged, the Soviet request to have the issue of colonialism discussed by the GA plenary got a boost from the newly emergent countries of Africa – Nigeria included.

These groups of countries having recently emerged from the shackles of colonialism were understandably more desirous of stamping out colonialism from their continent having experienced the phenomenon for decades and centuries. Thus the Soviet request to have its anti-colonial declaration debated on the floor of the GA was enthusiastically welcomed by the new countries. The Nigerian state fired by its desire to play a dominant leadership role in African affairs, especially in the areas of African decolonization and in other pan-African issues, without hesitation, threw its weight behind the Soviet proposal despite being seen as

---

[130] United Nations Official Records, 15th Session, 902d meeting (Oct. 12. 1960) para, 208 and 249.

"relatively pro-Western".[131] With the support of the African contingent at the plenary secured by the Soviets, it was then the turn of the new countries from Asia to make their own contribution as to whether to support the Soviet request or not. The position of the Asian countries at the plenary was subsequently made known on the issue. To the Asian group, both the First Committee and the plenary sessions of the GA carried the same weight of importance in the consideration of issues at the GA hence, they resolved that they would align themselves with the Soviet request in deference and solidarity with their new comrades from Africa and not on the basis of the Soviet's argument which they considered unconvincing. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto of Pakistan speaking on behalf of the Asian group at the session stressed:

> We feel that the First Committee is as important a forum as the Assembly in plenary session. However, the consensus of opinion, and especially those of our new comrades who have recently joined us from Africa, seems to be that this issue be discussed here in plenary and in recognition of their wishes, we shall support the Soviet amendment that this issue, this very vital issue, be discussed in plenary.[132]

Having provided the rationale for its position, the Asian group joined forces with the Soviet bloc and the new African states in the quest to have the anti-colonial declaration discussed at the plenary. As noted above, many of the Latin American countries and the west had prior to this time opposed the Soviet request on the basis that it could result into a propaganda battle between the East and West. Thus GA was set for the first round of debate which in any case was just a prelude to the voting which was to come later. The question that should be asked at this point is: what were the factors that forced the United States led western bloc to support the request put forward by the Soviet bloc? The answer to this question is deeply entrenched in the reality of the Cold War aims and the objectives of the rival blocs. Suffice to note here that

---

[131] See Kay D. 1970. The New Nations in the United Nations, 1960-1967, Columbia University Press, New York and London Essex CM20 2JE United Kingdom, p. 152.

[132] Ibid, p 153.

the Cold War as it were, had economic, political and ideological motives which both sides pursued with varying degree of desperation and tactics. From the Soviet Union angle, for instance, its anti-colonial temperament was in tandem with the bloc's grand plan to prevent its non-communist rivals from having a foothold on the African continent. As William G. Baker noted, "In the short run, Soviet leadership has encouraged the African states to pursue…and cultivate increasingly close economic, political, and cultural ties with the Soviet bloc"[133] The United States led western bloc on the other hand was apprehensive of losing the newly independent countries (ideologically) to their Eastern rivals - hence the need to reverse their prior decision on the issue due to the prevailing realities at the session and in the world which portended that they would be on the losing side if the voting were to take place on that particular subject of debate at that stage. Following days of debate fireworks on the consideration of the Soviet request that the anti-colonial declaration be considered in plenary, the GA finally on October 13, 1960, adopted by acclamation that the issue be discussed in the plenary. [134] The Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev thereafter explained the philosophical underpinnings of their draft declaration on colonialism thus:

> I very much like the words of August Babel, the social – democrat and leader of the German workers, who said, more or less, this: if the bourgeoisie praises you, Babel think, in that case, what a stupid thing you must have done. If the bourgeoisie reviles you, it means that you are truly serving the working class, the proletariat! If the colonialists now revile me, I am proud of it, because it means that I am truly serving the peoples which are struggling for their independence, for their freedom.[135]

 Khrushchev's submission was a direct verbal missile against the Western colonialists who were portrayed as antagonists of freedom for the colonized African peoples by the Soviet leader. The

---

[133]Baker, W.G. 1968 "The United States and Africa in the United Nations: A Case Study in American Foreign Policy," Imprimerie Offset Composition Services, INC, Washington D.C. p. 32.

[134] United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session 902d meeting (Oct. 12, 1960) para 218.
[135] Ibid.

Soviet strategy was simply to incite the new countries against the western colonial powers with the principal goal of establishing itself as the foremost anti-colonial superpower advocate thus preparing the ground for its preconceived plan to hoodwink them into the Socialist Camp. Whether these new counties felled to this tactic or not was just a matter of time at the session. The Soviet draft raised some fundamental questions, for instance it sought to know:

> For what purposes do those who refuse to renounce colonial rule wage murderous war against peoples? Why are the freedom-loving aspirations of the enslaved peoples suppressed? Sometimes it is said that this is done in the interest of the "civilization" of the less developed countries to prepare them for self-government. But this is a lie given the guise of truth.[136]

Again, the letters of the Soviet draft were not just anti-colonial but also anti-western in content. The draft further espoused the economic motivations of the colonizers. The Soviet draft put it to the colonial powers that:

> The main object of the colonial regime is in fact to secure enormous profits for big foreign monopolies, which have seized the key economic positions in the colonies and to extort their wealth by every possible means. Therefore, the entire economy of a colony is one of exploitation.[137]

The Soviet draft thus proclaimed on the floor of the GA as follows:

(a) All colonial countries and Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories must be granted forthwith complete independence and freedom to build their own national States in accordance with the freely expressed will and desire of their peoples. The colonial system and colonial administration in all their forms must be completely abolished in

---

[136] United Nations Document A/4502, Sept. 23, 1960, p. 5.
[137] Ibid, p. 6.

order to offer the people of the territories concerned an opportunity to determine their own destiny and form of government.

(b) Similarly, all strongholds of colonialism in forms of possessions and leased areas in the territory of other States must be eliminated.

(c) The Governments of all countries are urged to observe strictly and steadfastly the provisions of the United Nations Charter and of this Declaration concerning the equality and respect for the sovereign rights and territorial integrity of all states without exception, allowing no manifestation of colonialism or any special rights or advantages for some States to the detriment of other States.[138]

With the decision having been taken in favour of the Soviet's request that its draft be debated in plenary, the various groupings, having studied the trend at the Assembly, began to hold talks on whether to support the draft or not. The Afro-Asian group which at the time included all the new countries in the United Nations with the exception of the state of Israel took the lead when they came up with a consensus arrangement which favoured formulating a draft of their own that would be in tune with the realities of the time and not just be swayed by that of the Soviet which many of the North Africans and Arab states considered to be "intemperate in its language and too extreme in its demands that all leased areas and bases be removed from foreign soil". This, suffice to say, was quite understandable given that the Soviet delegation set out to achieve a Cold War objective. The only way in which they could get this done was to attack the colonial system and its controllers in a vicious fashion.

The Afro-Asians were also conscious of the fact that going by the prevailing realities at that time; and given the extreme contents of Soviet "demands", chances are that the draft would encounter difficulties in getting the required number of votes needed for its adoption by the GA. The general belief among the Afro-Asian countries was that Soviet sponsorship of the draft

---

[138] Ibid, Pg. 13

could result into a "Cold War"[139]vote in the plenary, the effect of which would be that the Latin Americans would align with the West to defeat the draft in the Assembly plenary. As noted earlier in this section, many of the Latin American countries were ex-colonies of European powers had at the session aligned themselves with the Western colonial countries. For instance, they questioned the penchant of their Afro-Asian counterparts for condemning the philosophy and the practice of colonialism. To the Latin-Americans, colonialism was beneficial to the colonized hence they were of the view that it shouldn't be condemned in its entirety.[140]

The Afro-Asians, having decided earlier to formulate their own draft on the colonial problem which was expected to accommodate and harmonize the views of their members, afterwards swung into action. The fifteenth session had a strong Afro-Asian membership presence of 45 countries, 33 of which were new countries in the world body given that they had obtained their independence in the post-1945 era (Kay 1970). To achieve their target, the Afro-Asian delegation quickly set up a committee that would prepare a draft which would be representative of the group's views. To this end, a six member drafting committee which comprised Nigeria, India, Indonesia, Guinea, Iran, and Senegal was instituted and saddled with the task. Worthy of note is the fact that four of the members of the drafting committee - Nigeria, Indonesia, Senegal and Guinea were new members - with Nigeria being the newest member.

In the case of Nigeria, the country's participation in the drafting committee was motivated by its desire to play a leading role in the struggle against colonialism in Africa. The country's participation in that committee marked the beginning of its political involvement in the protracted anti-colonial race. Having been saddled with the assignment, the Afro-Asian group drew up a time-table for itself indicating that it would commence work towards the end of October 1960 beginning with the consideration of the two proposed drafts which it had received from the Guinean and Iranian delegations. These two proposed drafts before the

---

[139] Ibid, p. 13.
[140] United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 931st meeting (Dec. 13, 1960), para 27-28.

committee reflected two extremes within the Afro-Asian group. That of Iran was a temperate anti-colonial declaration in the sense that it was devoid of any element of radicalism in dealing with the colonial problem. Unlike the Soviet version, the Iranian draft was silent on what should be the appropriate deadline for the ending of colonial rule and it avoided making the issues personal like the Soviet Union did.

The Guinean proposal on the other hand was much closer to that of the Soviet. It proposed that there should be an immediate end to colonialism. Proposals were also received by the committee from other member countries of the Afro-Asian group like the Indian and Indonesian delegations. The drafting committee in an attempt to ensure that an acceptable outcome which would integrate the views of its membership in the final report is presented jettisoned the voting option for extensive discussion and consensus arrangement in the preparation of its report. In November 2, after series of discussions and consultations by the drafting committee, a provisional draft was prepared for consideration by a larger working group before the final presentation to the Afro-Asian group for adoption.

The provisional text was altered after intensive scrutiny by the working group and the entire Afro-Asian group at the end of this exercise, all elements of radicalism as contained in the Soviet - like the Guinean proposal had been removed to pave the way for a realizable and non-controversial anti-colonial proposal for the Afro-Asian group. The temperance nature of the draft was explained by Iran's delegate Mr. Vakil thus:

> There is no doubt, for example, that many of the co-sponsors of this draft declaration who have suffered greatly from the ravages of colonialism would have preferred a more expressive text, including clauses condemning colonialism in its most culpable aspects. However, in order to rally all currents of opinion in the Assembly in favor of a text

acceptable to all the members of the United Nations, they have, in a spirit of conciliation, accepted certain phrases of a much more moderate nature.[141]

The Afro-Asian draft going by its temperate nature was quite different from that of the Soviets in contents and demands. While the Soviet draft was strictly anti-colonial and viciously anti-western, the Afro-Asian version which was subsequently adopted by the group distanced itself from such. The Afro-Asian group in the supreme quest to get the UNGA pass their anti-colonial resolution was cautious in the choice of words in the making of what later became the final draft of the group. For instance, while the Soviet draft used the word "demands"[142] in its draft, the Afro-Asians chose the word "declares".[143] Other notable areas of comparison in both drafts included the Soviet's demand that all colonial territories "be granted forthwith complete independence and freedom"[144], and the Afro-Asian group's call for "immediate steps"[145], be taken to decolonize the colonies, which implied that a gradualist approach could be employed in attaining this goal. The sharp difference in both drafts wasn't accidental; it was conditioned by a combination of ideological animosity on one hand, and realism on the other. The Afro-Asian draft was finally adopted and sponsored by 43 member countries of the Afro-Asian group in the UN toward the end of November 1960.[146] The stage was then set for the eagerly anticipated debate on both drafts which was scheduled to commence on November 28, 1960.

Before the commencement of the debates on the various drafts, the West, having been at the receiving end of acidic criticism from the Soviets bloc since the opening week of the fifteenth sessions for the alleged ill-manner in which the colonial situation was being handled, responded by launching an attack against the Soviet's domination of Eastern Europe and its suppression of nationalist agitations for independence. The British delegate to the session, Mr. Ormsby Gore in an apparent counter-attacking move responded to the Soviet's anti-colonial declaration thus:

---

[141] United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 926th meeting (Nov. 28, 1960), para 75.
[142] United Nations Draft Resolution A/L323, No. 28, 1960.
[143] Ibid.
[144] Ibid.
[145] Ibid.
[146] United Nations Document A/L.323, Nov. 28, 1960.

The representative of the Soviet Union appears to wish to use this debate simply as another occasion for vilifying my country and other Administering Powers and for carrying the Cold War into Africa…I must warn him that if I chose to follow suit, I would have much better ammunition than he has. Since 1939, some 500 million people, formerly under British rule, have achieved freedom and independence, and their representatives sit here. In that same period, the whole or part of six countries, with a population of 22 million, has been forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union; they include the world's three newest colonies: Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia…Countless efforts have been made by national movements in countries under Russia control to gain independence. All have been suppressed. In Central Asia, we have seen examples of a colonial policy, which as Mr Khrushchev himself told us at great length earlier in the session {869[th] meeting}, has in material terms been an outstanding success. He did not tell us of the mass deportations of populations and the ruthless suppression of nationalities which went with it. I shall not harrow the feeling of this Assembly by reciting the whole grisly catalogue; one or two examples must suffice…[147]

The importance of the above statement is illuminating in the following ways: first, it showed that the Cold War was a leveraging force on the question of colonialism at the session. Second, the above response was a diversionary ploy by the Western Colonial powers on whose behalf the British delegate spoke to divert attention from the extremely radical nature of the Soviet version of anti-colonial declaration. The long speech given by the British delegate was aimed at turning the tide against what they considered as the immoderate and unrealistic anti-colonial draft which the Soviets presented. Thus, the case was simply that of self-preservation of national interests by both camps. From the British perspective, the tactic was simply to galvanize the newly admitted countries (the Afro-Asians) against the Soviet system of colonialism which was painted as being more suppressive, oppressive and averse to the yearnings of the peoples under its control for independence. This sole aim of this strategy was

---

[147] United Nations General Assembly Official Records 15th Session 925th meeting (Nov. 28, 1960), para 19.

to rubbish the Soviet's draft resolution on colonialism; and also to restrain the Soviet bloc from further attacks against Western colonialism. The British action later backfired as the new countries especially those from Africa deplored the obvious attempt to trivialize the colonial problem through what was described as "Cold War Propaganda"[148]. The new countries expressed their dissatisfaction with the attempt by the East and West to use the colonial situation to score cheap points in the Cold War contest.[149]

In an effort to appease the new countries which felt unhappy with the manner in which the debate was being hijacked by forces of the Cold War and possibly give the impression that Western colonialism was after all not a bad experience in its entirety as the Soviets would want everyone to believe, the West immediately discontinued its attack on Soviet colonialism and instead focused on showcasing the achievements which had been recorded in former western colonies. The New Zealand delegate at the session apparently echoing the sentiments of the British delegate Mr.Ormsby – Gore who responded earlier to Soviet anti-colonial declaration, argued:

> It is a fact worth recalling that the States which have borne the heaviest responsibilities for the administration of Trust and Non-Self Governing Territories were among the founding Members of this Organization, and that they freely and voluntarily assumed the obligations which the charter created. Their record of performance is symbolized by the presence among us of the representatives of many new states, which have been brought to independence by the United Kingdom, France, and other countries.[150]

As mentioned in the foregoing, the above statement was aimed at letting the new countries (especially the African contingents) realize that the West, despite being the main beneficiaries of the colonial enterprise, was nonetheless supportive of their agitations for political

---

[148] United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session 903d meeting (Oct. 13, 1960} paras. 7-9.
[149] United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 926th meeting (Nov. 28, 1960) para. 115.
[150] The New Zealand Delegate jumped in Defense of the West to dispel the Notion that Colonialism was out-rightly bad, see, Mr. Shanahan (New Zealand), United Nations General Assembly Official records, 15th Session, 932d meeting (Dec. 2. 1960), paras. 4-5.

independence. This position was premised on the fact that several countries which were formerly under Western control had since obtained their independence. The West also got support from the Latin American countries many of whom as mentioned earlier were former colonies of the western colonial powers. They joined the New Zealand delegates in admonishing the new countries to reflect on the advantages of colonialism and not just condemn it totally. They argued that colonialism brought both cultural and educational benefits to the colonized and went on to cite the languages of conquest such as English, Spanish, French, and Portuguese as the unifying factor among countries of the world.[151] Both the West and the Latin Americans however failed in their concerted efforts to convince the new countries in the Assembly on the need to acknowledge the beneficial aspects of colonialism and not only dwell on its negative side alone. The new countries, in a swift reaction, repudiated these theories when they insisted that colonialism was nothing short of exploitation, chaos, and destabilization. Leading the charge against what was considered as an erroneous assertion, the Moroccan delegation at the session said:

> The history of colonial conquests, far from being a peak achievement, confronts us with quite different realities. It is nothing other than a stormy succession of wars and expeditions waged by Powers intoxicated by their economic and military potential, seeking to gain strategic positions and hankering for wealth and prestige. The struggles for power between these opposing powers…and their intrigues to partition whole continents reflects little credit on the Powers involved and are certainly not a glorious page in the history of mankind.[152]

As noted earlier the Latin American countries, having obtained their independence in the mid-19th and early 20[th]centuries, were very much unperturbed about the colonial problem and its biting consequences on its mostly African victims. This was clearly demonstrated when they

---

[151] United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 927th meeting (Nov. 29, 1960) paras. 15-16.
[152] United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 945th meeting (Dec. 13, 1960, para. 33.

claimed that colonialism had its merits which they believe the Afro-Asian group should acknowledge. In a swift reaction, the Malian delegation, based on the reality of history and their experience as colonial subjects, said:

> The delegations which speak in this Assembly of their colonial experience or proclaim the benefits of colonialism can unfortunately only speak of the empire of their father's day; they speak of it as a heritage. If their countries were colonized at some time in history, they know it from history books. Therein lies the fundamental differences between those delegations and ours, who have personal experience of colonial rule. Our knowledge is not based on hearsay or on what we learnt in school; we were for decades the living embodiment of that system. Ours was a generation which, on coming age, did not have the right to vote in its own country.[153]

The United States on its part aligned itself with the position of the British and the Latin American countries with its preference for a draft which would accommodate the positive roles played by the colonial powers in the colonies and a viable framework that would prepare the colonial subjects and territories for independence. In other words, the United States just like its allies was not favourably disposed to the draft version presented by the Soviets due to its malicious and vindictive textual nature. During the debates on the draft proposals, the Afro-Asian countries agreed unanimously before going into voting on the need to rapidly end colonial rule. This was reflected in their draft resolution even though there was a slight division among its membership about what should be the appropriate time for ending colonialism. Nevertheless, the prevailing opinion among the Afro-Asians was that regardless of the time-frame question, the group would rally around its draft for possible adoption by the UNGA due to the fact that the text was non-controversial unlike the Soviet version. In a bid to garner support for its draft, the Afro-Asians appealed to their Western and Latin American

---

[153] United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 931st meeting (Dec. 1, 1960) paras. 27-28.

counterparts at the session to give support to their draft proposal in order to prevent the Soviet's draft from sailing through the voting. At this point, the paramount objective of the Afro-Asians was to get the GA pass and adopt its draft resolution when it was subjected to voting at the plenary. It is important to also note that the Afro-Asian decision to appeal for support in this regard did not in any way compromise the contents of their draft given the fact that they earlier had issues with these delegations. The group's plan was simply to secure the passage and adoption of their draft by the GA as the official position of the UN on colonialism.

Thus, it was a win - win situation for both groups – the Western, Latin American group on one hand, and the Afro-Asians on the other. The message from the Afro-Asians to the Western and Latin American group was that failure to support the Afro-Asian draft would culminate into the success of the extremely anti-western and anti-colonial draft of the Soviet Union which the Western and Latin American groups had not only criticized but also labelled as an instrument of Cold War vendetta. Suffice it to say that it was the influence of the Cold War that necessitated the change of decision by the Afro-Asians to withdraw their initial support given to the Soviet draft. They were apprehensive of being the eventual ultimate losers if they failed to present a realistic draft resolution devoid of every element of Cold War bad-blood.

In the course of the debate, the Soviets weren't desirous to shift grounds as far as the contents and letters of their own draft was concerned because they were confident of getting their proposal voted for and adopted by the GA. However, the Soviet Union representative Mr Zorin, lauded "the desire shown by the overwhelming majority of African and Asian delegations that measures should be taken…to advance the realization of that lofty goal-the complete liberation of the peoples of all colonies and dependent colonies[154]" At this stage, with the voting on both the Soviet and the Afro-Asian drafts only a matter of days away, it still remained obscured whether the Soviet Union would withdraw its draft to pave way for a non-partial draft which

---

[154]Mr.Zorin address to the United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 939th meeting (Dec. 7, 1960), paras. 19-74.

the Afro-Asian version represented. The Afro-Asian draft prior to the voting on the drafts received support from the Scandinavian countries and the Netherlands.

The support given by the Netherlands to the Afro-Asian draft proposal was strategic in the sense that it was taken to avoid squandering any potential support among the new countries in the country's dispute with Indonesia over Western Iran. Ironically, the Netherlands had in 1962 accused the United States for attempting to curry the support of the new countries by tacitly giving its support for Indonesia in the same dispute. With France's hands soiled in the Algerian War, only Britain and the United States emerged as the two key most influential Western countries which the Afro-Asians could leverage on going into the voting on the drafts. Suffice to say that the emergence of the Afro-Asian group in the UN forced the United States and its allies to give premium to Africa's problems at the World body. For instance, the United States was compelled by virtue of the forceful presence of Afro-Asians to reconsider its age-long strong support for the policies of administering colonial powers in Africa even though their response proved subsequently to be hypocritical (Kay, 1970; Baker, 1968).

The British in the course of the debates on the draft indicated that they would support the Afro-Asian draft.[155] The United States also hinted that it would support the Afro-Asian draft declaration while still not foreclosing the possibility of working on the draft's imperfections. The hope of a United States support for the Afro-Asian draft was expressed by Mr Wadsworth when he said:

> It is equally fitting that…an effort should be made to state the sense of the General Assembly in a new declaration which accords with the circumstances of 1960. For that task no one among us is as well qualified as the nations of Africa and Asia, to most of whom this question is a matter of first-hand experience and who are the sponsors of the draft resolution before the Assembly. We of the United States wish to be in a position to

---

[155] United Nations General Assembly Official Records 15th Session 925th meeting (Nov.28, 1960), para. 32.

support their declaration. We hope that whatever questions of language might remain can still be worked out. We applaud their initiative and the spirit which animates it.[156]

The Latin Americans on their part following the appeal for their support by the Afro-Asian group for their draft resolution expressed their resolve to support the agitations of the Afro-Asian group despite being initially critical of the group for its non-admittance of the beneficial aspects of colonialism. The Latin American delegations however declared that they were not against the call for the termination of colonialism but were only interested and concerned about the process of achieving this objective. They claimed that it was "no longer a question of discussing whether or not colonialism must be brought to an end, but of determining the methods, time limits, and procedures by which the process of liquidation is to be effected[157]."

There was a late twist in the build-up to the GA voting on the two proposed drafts on the colonial question. This happened on December 13, 1960 the day preceding the commencement of voting when the Soviets in a desperate last minute scheming attempted to tacitly give its own draft and that of the Afro-Asian a semblance of resemblance just to create an impression that they and the Afro-Asians were on the same page on this issue. Mr Zorin of the Soviet Union had argued that both drafts had "a common platform and identical views on a number of vital questions".[158] However, the Soviets claimed their amendment as they termed it was fashioned out of the need to eliminate the defective areas in the Afro-Asians draft.[159]

The Soviet amended draft suggested the end of 1961 as a target date for the elimination of all forms of colonialism. The Afro-Asian version on the other hand was silent on what should be the exact date for bringing colonialism to an end. The drafters of the proposal preferred to have this question and the implementation of this resolution reflected on the agenda of the sixteenth session. After weeks of debate fireworks, accusations and counter– accusations

---

[156] United Nations General Assembly Official Records 15th Session 937th meeting (Dec. 6. 1960), para. 17.
[157] United Nations General Assembly Official Records 15th Session 927th meeting (Nov. 29. 1960) para. 18.
[158] United Nations General Assembly Official Records 15th Session, 947th meeting (Dec. 13, 1960) para. 111.
[159] United Nations Document A/L.328, (Dec. 13, 1960).

especially by the rival blocs at the fifteenth session, the GA finally got down to the business of voting on the lingering and contentious question of colonialism. This vote, suffice to say, was to form the basis of the UN stance on colonialism hence the significance of the exercise and the interest attached to it by member states represented at the session. On December 14, 1960, voting on the two drafts began. The introductory paragraphs of the Soviet Union which called for immediate granting of independence to the colonial countries and peoples and the removal of existing foreign bases in colonies were the first items to be voted upon. This was defeated narrowly with 32 voting in favour, 35 against, and 30 abstentions.[160] The voting trajectory on this particular item is reflective of the dichotomy which existed between the Eastern and Western blocs.

For instance, while all the communist states totalling eleven with the exception of China voted in favour of this item, the reverse was the case with respect to the voting response of the Western, Latin American and few Scandinavian countries to this item. Of particular interest is the fact that the United States and its colonialist allies voted against this item with France, Belgium, United Kingdom, Spain, Portugal and Netherlands all voting in rejection. These colonial powers were joined by most of the ex-colonies of the Western powers and their traditional friends to also vote against the item. Nigeria on its part preferred to stay aloof of voting due to the country's foreign policy declaration that it would not "align itself with any power bloc".[161] A vote for or against this item would have placed a question mark on that stance hence the decision to abstain.

At this point, it was quite clear that the West was in the ascendancy having won the first round of vote against the Soviet Union's vicious anti-colonial and anti- western draft resolution. With the first round of voting completed, the UNGA proceeded to vote on other controversial and

---

[160] United Nations General Assembly, Official Records, 15th Session 947th meeting (Dec. 14. 1960). Para. 29.

[161] See Mr. Prime Minister, Collected Speeches of Sir, AbubakarTafawa Balewa, Prime Minister of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1960-1966.

highly contentious issues contained in the Soviet Union draft resolution. The item which was considered in this regard was the venomous condemnation of colonialism and its operators - the Western colonial powers. This particular item was massively voted against with 25 voting in favour, 43 against, and 29 abstentions.[162] Unlike the prior voting, the outcome of this second voting presented a clearer picture about the impending comprehensive defeat which awaited the Soviet Union sponsored anti-colonial draft. The fact that the Soviet Union's draft resolution garnered lesser votes when compared to the results obtained earlier was a pointer in this direction. As noted earlier, the prime objective of the Afro-Asian group was to have an independent anti-colonial framework which would be devoid of any Cold War sentiments. The results from the voting indicate that some radical countries in the Afro-Asian group of African extraction like Ghana and Guinea voted in favour of the Soviet draft resolution, with few others following in that direction.

Nigeria on its part stuck to its pattern of voting on this issue by abstaining from voting for the second time. Many African countries also abstained from voting. From the Western and Latin American perspective, the voting pattern of these countries remained largely unchanged to the previous one. Again, all the colonial powers voted resoundingly against the Soviet Union draft for the second time. The communist states, with the exception of China, also maintained their voting pattern in the prior order. All these developments gave sound proof that the Cold War animosity took its toll on the entire process at the plenary. The third item to be voted upon was the Soviet Union's amendments to the Afro-Asian draft which was submitted prior to the start of the voting exercise. The Ghanaian delegate at the session Mr. Quaison-Sackey's appealed to the Soviet Union to withdraw its late amendment especially the one which proposed a 1961 date as the terminal date for bringing colonialism to an end.

---

[162] United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 947th meeting (Dec. 14, 1960), para.30.

Unfortunately, the Ghanaian delegation's efforts to get the country's representative to do so proved abortive as the Soviet Union delegate Mr Zorin insisted on having the item voted upon because according to him, "the voting should disclose the position of all countries and reveal who is interested in the speedy elimination of the colonial system".[163] At this juncture, it is important to state that the Soviet Union's action vis-à-vis its reluctance to withdraw its amendments to the Afro-Asian draft was as a result of its desire to seek redemption having suffered successive defeats. The country's representatives at the session realized that the only way they could still maintain relevance and influence was to insist on having colonialism and its manifest consequences abolished by 1961. In doing so, the Soviet Union believed that they could secure the overwhelming support of the Afro-Asian group which desirous to help shake off the remnant yoke of colonialism in their respective regions. Following the refusal of the Soviet Union delegation to withdraw its amendment, the GA proceeded to vote on the amendment which proposed the year 1961 as the end date of colonialism.

This amendment was again defeated by 29 in favour, 47 against and with 22 abstentions.[164] The second amendment to the Soviet Union draft which requested that the question of the implementation of the anti - colonial declaration be placed on the agenda of the next sixteenth session was thereafter voted upon. This garnered a simple majority but could not secure passage due to the absence of a required two-thirds majority with 41 voting in favour, 35 against, and 22 abstentions.[165] In summary, the end outcome of voting on all the items on the Soviet Union's draft resolution indicated that the country only got a partial victory with the accrual of that simple majority vote which nonetheless failed to secure passage. Also worthy of note here is the fact that the United States and its Western colonialist allies voted against all the items contained in the Soviet Union's draft resolution on colonialism. Even the well-reasoned amendment suggesting that the implementation of the declaration be inserted into

---

[163] United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 947th meeting (Dec. 14, 1960) para.25.
[164] Ibid, para.32.
[165] Ibid, para. 33.

the agenda of the sixteenth session could still not suffice to convince the West to vote in favour.

The question then becomes: why did the United States and its allies vote to reject this kind of suggestion having earlier rebuffed the accusations levelled against them by the Soviet Union that they were unwilling to dissolve their overseas colonial empires to pave way for independence? The answer to this lies in the fact that the Western colonial powers could not have given their support to a resolution sponsored by their arch-rival on the international scene – the Soviet Union – due to the Cold War crisis which had put enmity between them prior to the time of the debates and voting in the UNGA meeting of 1960. For instance, if the Western bloc had voted in support of this draft, they would have vindicated their rival's position on the colonial situation. This then would have been used as a tool for the Soviet Union to launch deadlier verbal attacks on the West drawing inspiration from its success. Consequently, the Western colonial powers' decision to vote against the Soviet Union's draft despite their claim to be favourably disposed to decolonizing Africa and their colonies was more of a rhetorical commitment than demonstrable commitment as events which followed suggest.

After the rout of the Soviet Union's draft resolution, the UNGA turned its attention to the Afro-Asian draft which was the remaining anti-colonial framework left for consideration by delegates at the session. When the draft was put to vote, 89 voted in favour, none against, and with only 9 abstentions. The Afro-Asian draft then became the United Nations General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) titled, a "Declaration on the granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples."[166] The Western colonialists this time around preferred to abstain than to vote either in favour or against the Afro-Asian resolution because of the fears that the Soviets would take advantage of their action to portray them as reactionaries of freedom. For instance, first, if the West had voted in favour, the Soviet Union would have undoubtedly claimed glory for initiating a colonial resolution that eventually brought down the pillars of

---

[166] Ibid, para. 34.

Western colonialism; and would have also considered itself vindicated as far as its hard line position on colonialism was concerned.

The Soviet Union then would have used these feats to win over the newly independent countries in Africa into the communist's camp. Second, a vote against this popular Afro-Asian resolution by the west would have been catastrophic for the colonial powers given the fact that the Soviet made communist ideology posed a serious threat to their political and economic interests on the African continent. Thus the west was left with no other option than to abstain. The colonial powers that abstained include: France, United Kingdom, Spain, Belgium, Portugal, Union of South Africa, (the apartheid enclave) and the United States – the leader of the western bloc. Others are: Australia and the Dominican Republic. The above instructively points to the fact that it was not just the temperance of those draft resolutions per se that was the uttermost concerns of the United States and the colonizing powers, but the desire to maintain the status-quo in their respective colonies.

The United States for instance as earlier noted could not express its disapproval of colonial practice for the fear of offending its allies especially at a time when "the Cold War was already in the process of being thoroughly globalized".[167]Thus the country rather chose to align itself, albeit subtlety, with the interest of its European colonial allies while still at the same time giving the impression that it was supportive of self-determination and the ending of colonialism particularly in Africa and the world in general. However, there was evidence which showed that the United States was prevailed upon by the British government of Prime Minister Macmillan to avoid putting Britain – the staunchest ally of America and a major colonial power

---

[167]Sullivan C.O. 2005. The United Nations, Decolonization, and Self-Determination in Cold War Sub-Saharan Africa, 1960-1994. *Journal of Third World Studies*, Vol. 2 2005 Association of Third World Studies, Inc, p. 105.

– in "an awkward position."[168] The final decision that the United States should abstain from voting on the Afro-Asian draft was passed across to the country's representatives at the fifteenth sessions by President Eisenhower.[169]

As the fifteenth sessions of the UNGA meeting came to a close, interest groups within the Assembly were confident that the next sixteenth session slated for 1961 offered another opportunity to advance the course of the national interests. From the Soviet Union standpoint, the sixteenth session presented the country with the prospect to re-launch itself into reckoning having endured successive defeats on its draft resolution and also having suffered tremendous setbacks in the pursuit of its Cold War objectives at the fifteenth sessions. The Western bloc countries on the other hand were confident of keeping the momentum going in their favour having contributed heavily towards the defeats of the Soviet Union draft resolution; while other groupings in the Assembly such as the Latin America group and the Afro-Asians maintained their positions on the colonial impasse going into the next session.

An Attempt to Implement the UN Colonial Declaration

For the second successive year, a resilient Soviet Union seized the initiative against colonialism at the sixteenth UNGA session. On 28 August 1961 the country's delegation requested that the General Assembly put on its agenda an item entitled "The Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples."[170] This request according to the Soviet Union delegation was necessitated by the discomforting reality that the colonial declaration had remained unimplemented since it was adopted at the fifteenth session. Thus they called for practical measures which would lead to the enforcement of the UNGA declaration on colonialism and a target date to bring this about. In addition to this, the Soviet Union also called on the U.N to put in place machinery that would

---

[168]Cited by Kay D. A. The New Nations in the United Nations, 1960-1967, Columbia University Press (New York and London 1970), p. 169.
[169] Ibid, p.169.
[170] United Nations Document A/4859, Sixteenth Session, August 28, 1961.

be saddled with the responsibility of ensuring the supervision and control of the implementation of the declaration.

The clouds of the Cold War which pervaded proceedings at the fifteenth session resurfaced at the sixteenth session when the United States and its colonialist allies for the second year running at the Assembly came under verbal attack from the Soviet Union, this time for failing to respond to the declaration as expected. A strong worded memorandum which followed its initial request condemned the West for continuing with a "policy of terror and repression" in their colonies.[171] The United States was principally targeted for attack in this regard with the accusations that the country was using the instrumentality of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Southeast Asia Organization, and the Central Treaty Organization (SAOCTO) to preserve the interests of its European colonial allies thereby frustrating the implementation of the UNGA resolutions with regard to colonialism. It is crucial to note here that the Soviet Union – the chief accuser in this case – was like the accused pursing its Cold War objectives albeit under the guise of moral concerns as earlier argued. Briefly put, if the United States had joined the Soviet and other countries to vote in favour of any of the draft resolutions on colonialism - Soviet/Afro-Asian, it would have been impossible for the country to still retain the support of its allies in the Cold War struggle against the Soviet Union bloc as no country however powerful would lose its support base in a battle against an adversary and still come out triumphant. A Cold War battle with the Soviet Union without the support of countries like France, Britain, Portugal, Spain, Belgium and the Union of South Africa (the leading colonial countries) would have left the United States vulnerable. Earlier at the session, Mr. Jaja Wachukwu, Nigeria's first foreign affairs minister (1960-1961) asserted that the apartheid Republic of South Africa "has shown she is not fit to associate with decent people."[172] This remark which won him an ovation was Nigeria's position at that session with regard to the apartheid problem in South Africa. Minister Wachukwu hinted on the possibility of expelling

---

[171] United Nations Document A/4889, Sixteenth Session, 27 September 1961.
[172] See "Wachukwu Attacks Big Powers, South Africa" Jet Magazine, Johnson Publishing Company, Chicago Illinois United States, 26 October 1961, p. 9, available online at: http:// www.jetmag.com.

South Africa from the United Nations if it failed to discontinue the practice of apartheid. He said,

> I want to warn South Africa once more. We have managed to get it out of the Commonwealth. If South Africa persists in this behaviour we may have to get it outside this world. Those who are interested in South Africa because of investments in the mineral resources of Africa should begin to think twice. South Africa cannot continue to behave as it is doing. . . We are opposed to everything that the present South African Government stands for in respect of the treatment of the black man in Africa.[173]

Thereafter, the Nigerian foreign minister shifted his attention to the lingering Cold War crisis which had taken its toll on the colonial debate. Mr Wachukwu lambasted the "great powers" for not showing good leadership, for plunging the world into chaos and unwilling to end their Cold War quarrels:

> I am losing confidence in the great powers. They are climbing from the pedestal of greatness to the pedestal of insanity. We expect leadership from them; they give us lack of knowledge. We expect objectivity from them; they present us with blurred vision. How do you expect us to follow such leadership?[174]

As deliberations progressed, the Soviets submitted a draft to the Assembly on October 9, 1961. The draft called for "the immediate implementation" of the UNGA colonial resolution of December 1960 and equally proposed a terminal date for achieving this goal when it forcefully declared, "that the final and unconditional liquidation of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations must be implemented not later than the end of 1962."[175] Moreover, the Soviet sponsored draft also urged the UNGA assembly to prevail on the administering powers to

---

[173] See Mr. Jaja Wachukwu (Nigeria), United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 16th Session, 1031st meeting (October. 10, 1961).
[174] See "Wachukwu Attacks Big Powers, South Africa" Jet Magazine, Johnson Publishing Company, Chicago Illinois United States, 26 October 1961, Pg. 9, available online at: http:// www.jetmag.com.
[175] United Nations Document A/L.355, Oct. 9, 1961.

withdraw their foreign military, political and economic presence from the dependent territories and put in place as a matter of urgency "a special committee commission to conduct a full and complete inquiry into the situation with respect to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples and of the measure for carrying it into effect."[176]

After making its case in respect to the call for "immediate" implementation of the colonial declaration, the leader of the Nigerian delegation at the session and the Permanent Representative to the UN Mr Ngileruma took to the floor to present his country's official position with regard to the target date for the attainment of independence for the colonized territories in Africa and the World over. He also responded on behalf of the Afro-Asian group to the Soviet Union's request on this same issue. With regard to the target date for the termination of colonialism, Nigeria's proposed date of 1 December 1970 having been considered to be realistic and workable was retained (Baker, 1968).

On the Soviet Union's call that prompt actions be taken to implement the colonial declaration, the Nigerian delegation, acting as the mouth-piece of the Afro-Asian group, expressed the mind-set of the group thus, "…my delegation feels compelled to add that we, and by "we" I mean the Africans and Asians who have worn the shoe of colonialism, know best how and when it pinches.[177] The "worn the shoe of colonialism" phrase is indicative of the desire of the Afro-Asian group to take the lead in the diplomatic struggle for the liberation of their peoples being a product of colonialism themselves. Thus it was a cautionary statement in the sense that it called for restraints in the Soviet approach to the issues of decolonization. However, the Nigerian delegation was thankful to the Soviet Union for its efforts toward finding a lasting solution to the colonial problem thus, "My delegation must express its appreciation to the

---

[176] Ibid.
[177] United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 16th Session, 1066th meeting (Nov. 27, 1961), para. 107.

delegation of the Soviet Union for the interest and initiative which they manifested in the problem of the speedy liquidation of the remnants of colonialism".[178]

The Afro-Asian group was subsequently confronted with a trend which was reminiscent of the UNGA's fifteenth session politicization of the colonial question. The group was discerning this time as they quickly instituted a process of crafting an independent draft resolution which would lead to the implementation of the 1960 declaration on colonialism. In the process of preparing this draft, the Afro-Asians engaged in wide consultations within the Assembly in order to accommodate the views of other interest groups at the session, this was to ensure that they secure a considerable number of votes when the draft was presented for voting and subsequent adoption in the session. The overriding objective of this group therefore was to have a resolution which would appeal to various groupings in the Assembly – the United States and its colonial allies included. In other words, the Afro-Asians this time around preferred to act as a balancing force in the Assembly. The group's thinking on this strategy was explained by Mr Subandrio of Indonesia thus:

> We believe, first of all, that this draft-the result of extensive consultations and discussions –reflects a spirit of give and take and, in this respect, represents the wildest possible area of agreement that can be obtained in this Assembly. For example, although my delegation believes it possible and desirable to end colonialism in two years…the authors of this draft resolution have taken into consideration the fact that a difference of opinion exists on this subject, not only within the African-Asian group itself but in this Assembly as a whole.[179]

The draft that later emerged from the consultations was sponsored by 38 Afro-Asian states which included Nigeria.[180] The initiators of the draft having reflected on the colonial crisis were

---

[178] Ibid.
[179] United Nations General Assembly Official Records, Sixteenth Session, 1065th meeting (Nov. 27, 1961), para. 151.
[180] United Nations Document A/L.366 and Add 1-3, Nov, 21 1961.

of the view that finding a solution to the problem could begin by the setting up of a special committee which would be vested with powers to suggest and recommend the realizable and appropriate ways of implementing the declaration. However, the signatories to the draft did not hesitate to call on the administering of colonial authorities to ensure compliance with the declaration. Referencing the UNGA 1960 resolution 1514 (XV) on colonialism, the draft asked the States concerned "to take action without further delay with a view to the faithful application and implementation of the declaration".[181] It concluded by also proposing the establishment of a 17 member state Special committee to be nominated by the President of the General Assembly. The Special committee was expected "to make suggestions and recommendations on the progress and extent of the implementation of the declaration."[182]

Interestingly, not many people at the sixteenth session of the UNGA would have predicted a quick shift in the United States' stance on the 1960 UNGA Colonial Declaration given the fact that the country abstained from voting on this question a year prior. But, the country did when it expressed its readiness to help advance the purposes of that declaration. This change of policy was summed up briefly by America's representative Mr Jonathan Bingham who notified the Assembly thus:

> . . . My country has associated itself with the principle of that historic Declaration. We shall be happy if, by our participation in this and future debates, as well as by our actions, both within and outside the United Nations, we can help to advance its great purposes.[183]

We shall consider, albeit briefly, the factors which necessitated this policy shift. First was the coming into power of President John F. Kennedy in 1961 which coincided with the debates on the implementation of the declaration on colonialism in the sixteenth session of UNGA. When

---

[181] United Nations Document A/ L.366 and Add. 1-3, Nov. 21, 1961.
[182] Ibid.
[183] United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 16ᵗʰ Session, 1061ˢᵗ meeting (Nov. 22, 1961), para. 100.

the Kennedy Presidency came on board, there was a shift in American African colonial policy due to his own antecedents in terms of public declarations on colonialism since the mid-1950s when he realized the growing significance of nationalism on the African continent.[184] According to Rodrigues, Kennedy's presidential ambitions had led him to criticize the record of the Eisenhower administration and to promise that in a future Democratic administration the United States would "no longer abstain in the United Nations from voting on colonial issues … no longer trade our vote on other such issues for other supposed gains . . . no longer seek to prevent subjugated peoples from being heard."[185]

However, despite this declared interest of Kennedy's presidency to help solve the colonial problem in Africa, there was evidence that the United States government under his leadership took that decision for strategic reasons and not necessarily because the American nation wanted to. For instance, President Kennedy stated repeatedly that the United States had "lost ground in Africa" because it had "neglected and ignored the needs and aspirations of the African people.[186] These sentiments, suffice to say are replete with elements of the realist theory because they demonstrated the pursuit of national interest under the guise of morality. After declaring its interest to assist in the implementation of the colonial declaration, the United States swung into action at the sixteenth session when the country expressed its desire to keep the "Cold War" out of the colonialism debate (Kay, 1970).This decision signalled a radical departure from the behaviour of the United States to these issues at the previous fifteenth session.

The Soviet Union, conscious of America's decision to back the Afro-Asian draft for the implementation of the colonial declaration, quickly agreed not to press its draft resolution for a vote. They decided instead to support the Afro-Asian group's draft version but, however,

---

[184] See Rodrigues L. N. About-Face: The United States and Portuguese Colonialism in 1961, e.JPH, vol. 2, number 1. Summer 2004, ISCTE-CEHCP, Lisbon, p. 1.

[185].Quoted in Rodrigues L. N. About-Face: The United States and Portuguese Colonialism in 1961, e.JPH, vol. 2, number 1 summer 2004, ISCTE-CEHCP, Lisbon, p. 1.

[186] Ibid, p. 2.

insisted on the addition of two amendments to the group's draft. The first amendment proposed the year 1962 as "the year of the elimination of colonialism."[187] The first amendment presented by the Soviets was antithetical to the outcome of the Afro-Asians draft resolution which was earlier made known at the Assembly. The second amendment proposed by the Soviets asked the Special Committee "to make suggestions and recommendations on the immediate application of the Declaration and the completion of its implementation…"[188]

Again, it is evident from the foregoing that the prime motive of the Soviet Union was to dislodge the Western colonial powers in Africa at the earliest possible time having realized that the former's continued presence on the continent posed a fundamental threat to their grand plans to make an inroad to Africa. By calling for immediate implementation of the colonial declaration, the Soviet led Eastern bloc failed to take into consideration the larger implications of these requests with regard to its viability and workability. All the appeals by the new nations in the Afro-Asian group (Nigeria included) to having the Soviets withdraw these first amendments fell on deaf ears. The stage was then set again for another round of voting in the Assembly. Prior to this, the leading colonial powers of the time Britain and France unequivocally maintained their earlier position on colonialism. For the British, a policy shift on colonialism would be tantamount to abdicating its responsibilities to its colonies and subjects. Thus, the response was put simply, "We cannot share or shift our responsibility."[189]

The French also indicated that they would not support the draft because it violated the letters and spirit of the UN Charter concerning the obligations of the administering powers to the non-self-governing territories.[190] With the debates on the implementation of the colonial declaration completed, the General Assembly proceeded to vote on the proposal before it. The first proposal to be voted on was the contentious preliminary paragraph of the Soviet Union's amendment that proposed the year 1962 as the terminal date for colonialism. The amendment

---

[187] United Nations Document A/L.370, Nov. 27, 1961, para. 1.
[188] Ibid. para. 2.
[189] United Nations General Assembly Official Records Sixteenth Session, 1056th meeting (Nov. 16, 1961), para. 137.
[190] Ibid., para. 24-26.

was routed by a vote of 46 against 19 for, and 35 abstentions.[191] The voting pattern on this particular Soviet amendment item had a Cold War overtone because all the Western colonial powers still voted against it, even the United States. This was despite its declared commitment to help solve the colonial crisis. It still found it extremely difficult to give support to a draft sponsored by its bitter rival – the Soviet Union. The communist states on the other hand all voted in support of the draft. The second amendment which was presented for voting was the Soviet's call for the committee to come up with a timetable which would serve as a guide for prompt implementation of colonial declaration.

This was also defeated albeit by mere show of hands in the plenary by a vote of 36 against 22 in favour, and 35 abstaining.[192] Suffice to note here that this latter amendment, despite its relative temperance, still suffered rejection not only from the West and its sympathizers alone but also from the Afro-Asian group which preferred to stay aloof for the fear of being entangled in the Cold War. Nigeria's appeal to the Soviet Union delegation earlier at the session that the country should thread with caution on the colonial issue coupled with the Soviet Union's refusal to withdraw its amendments, particularly the first one prior to voting, were proofs in this regard. With the comprehensive defeats of the Soviet's amendments at the GA, it was then time to consider the Afro-Asian draft which had been sponsored by 38 member states of the group.

The draft was passed with relative ease by a vote of 97 in favour (the highest accruable "yes" vote on colonial issue ever in the UN), none against, and a handful of 4 abstentions – Portugal not participating at all in the exercise.[193] The United States which had voted earlier against the Soviet's amendments threw its weight behind the Afro-Asian draft by voting in favour – thus marking a departure from its prior position on colonial matters. The country had joined its Western colonial allies at the fifteenth session in voting against all the drafts presented on

---

[191]United Nations General Assembly Official Records Sixteenth Session, 1066th meeting (Nov. 27, 1961), para. 147.
[192] Ibid., para. 148.
[193] Ibid. para. 149.

colonialism by both the Soviets and the Afro-Asian groups in deference to the imperial interest of its allies. Other countries that changed their voting behaviour on colonial matters also included Australia, Belgium, and the Dominican Republic. Those that abstained were South-Africa, United Kingdom, Spain, and France the main holders of the remaining colonial structures at the time. The UNGA Resolution 1654 (XVI) of November, 1961 was entitled "The Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples."[194]

The African Colonial Problem and the Quest for Political Solution: Analysis of Nigeria's Roles

In the desire to liquidate colonialism in Africa political strategies were adopted to bring this about. These strategies came in the form of international campaigns and actions against the white supremacist regimes in the Southern African region, particularly in South Africa which was the bastion of arguably the most extreme colonial policy of the 20th century - apartheid. As part of international efforts to halt this degradation of humanity by humanity, the United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid was established following the adoption of UNGA Resolution 1654 (XV1) of November 1961 which approved that a mechanism of this kind be put in place to checkmate the racial policies of the South-African white minority regime. Sequel to this decision, the UNGA under Resolution 1761 (XV11) of November 6, 1962 formerly established a committee and appointed eleven member states of the organization into the membership of the committee to put this resolution into effect.

These countries were: Algeria, Costa Rica, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Malaya (later known as Malaysia), Nepal, Nigeria, Philippines and Somalia. The Western Powers declined participation in the committee.[195] The Committee's work began in April 1963 with a mandate to press for effective international sanctions against the apartheid regime of South-Africa. This was followed by series of assistance to the victims of apartheid brutality and to the liberation

---

[194] Ibid., para. 149.
[195] United Nations Special Committee on Apartheid, Available (Online) at: www.un.org.

movements; to ensure constant publicity to the inhumanity of apartheid and the resistance of people in order to get widest possible support for action. The Special Committee was directly responsible to the UNGA and UNSC, the two main organs of the UN to which the Committee's activities were reported.[196] For all intents and purposes, the Special Committee was meant to act as apolitical pressure mechanism that would publicize internationally the monstrosity of the apartheid regime and garner support globally to oust it. As part of its political activities to help solve the apartheid crisis in South Africa in particular, the committee held meetings and hearings, international conferences, special sessions and seminars on apartheid and the monitoring of the implementation of resolutions of the UNGA and the UNSC promoting sports, cultural and other boycotts.[197]

The task here is to analyse the roles played by Nigeria as a member and subsequently as chair of the Special Committee against apartheid over two decades. The anti-colonial policy of the Nigerian state was one of the most consistently pursued policies in the country's international relations history. From the time of its own independence in 1960 to the demise of apartheid and colonialism on the African continent in 1994, Nigerian successive governments (military/civilian) fought the colonial problem with varying degree of vigour and temperaments although more on the diplomatic and political fronts. For a country whose key foreign policy goal at independence was to assume continental leadership in every respect, the existence of colonialism and racism in Africa presented Nigeria with an instrument of influence to lay claim to that status.

By 1962, following the first visit of Nelson Mandela to the country during which he solicited for the support of the ANC and South Africa's black population in the struggle against apartheid, Nigeria had begun to take practical measures which were aimed at ameliorating the socio-political and economic effects of the white minority regimes in Southern-Africa on the non-

[196]Kalley, J.A. Schoeman, E. &Andor, L.E. (eds) (1999), Southern Africa Political History: a chronology of key political events from independence to mid-1997, Westport: Greenword.
[197] Nigeria at the United Nations: A Partnership for Better World," A Ministry of External Affairs, Federal Republic of Nigeria Production, (Third Press Publishers, Lagos, Nigeria 1991).

whites populace of the region, particularly its black components.[198] Not only that, the country alongside other prominent actors made concerted efforts to push for political change in the region. Its non-hesitant disposition to the implementation of all the U.N resolutions passed against apartheid was second to none in Africa. At the continental level, in May 1963, the independent African states rose from a conference of Heads of States and Government meeting in Addis Ababa, the Ethiopian capital where they unanimously adopted the constituent charter of a new international organization which became known as the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

The conception and subsequent emergence of this continental organization was a product of ministerial conferences held throughout 1961-1962. A couple of factors were responsible for the coming into being of the OAU. First was the urgent quest to eliminate colonialism and racism from the African continent and to improve social, political and economic situations in Africa. Second was the popular agitation for the decolonization of Africa in the post-World War II era which gathered momentum in the 1960s thus catapulting Africa into global reckoning, especially in the UN where its presence was vociferously and actively felt in the debates and voting on colonial issues. Third were the less than satisfactory roles of foreign powers in the Congo crisis of 1960; and the burning desire of African political founding fathers to articulate the concerns of the continent to the World under the auspices of a pan-African organization. Fourth, was the need to preserve the ideals of pan-Africanism on the continent, a view which was owed dear by Ghana's Kwame Nkrumah one of the prominent African leaders that facilitated the process of the establishment of the organization into existence(Naldi,1999).

According to Wayas (1979), the OAU member states coordinated their anti-colonial strategies through the organization and leveraged on this regional platform at the UN to appeal to the international community so that the World body could understand the grave injustices which was dished out to the Black people in the Southern African region. On 7 August 1963 the United

---

[198] See D. Games (2013), Nigeria-South Africa Baseline Study, SAFPI Policy Brief No. 44, Open Society Foundation for South-Africa, South-African Foreign Policy Initiative.

Nations Security Council resolution 181 calling for a voluntary arms embargo against South Africa's apartheid government was passed following the consideration of the country's racial policies. That same year, the UNGA called on member states to severe diplomatic ties with the apartheid regime of South-Africa as part of efforts to force the country to abandon its discriminatory racial policies. To this end, states were required to close their ports to South-African flag vessels, boycott all South-African made/originated goods; ban all exports to that country and refuse landing and passage facilities to all aircraft belonging to or registered in the Union of South-Africa.[199]

Nigeria did not just comply with these resolutions seeking to impose sanctions but also called for a mandatory arms and economic sanctions against the unrepentant South African regime. Later in 1963, the apartheid regime apparently feeling the heat with the prompt compliance of the Nigerian government and a host of other member states of the UN, particularly the African states, accused Nigeria and African states of seeking to have the apartheid and the Portuguese regimes expelled from the UN. This accusation was denied by the Nigerian government through the country's Foreign Affairs Minister at the time, Jaja Wachukwu who in a statement to the eighteenth session of the UNGA said that his country would rather hold on to diplomatic and political strategies it had adopted in putting pressure on South-Africa to jettison apartheid than support or call for the country's expulsion. Nigeria believed doing so would be counter-productive. The Nigerian envoy said:

> …it has been stated that the African states want to expel South-Africa and Portugal from the United Nations. I think I can say categorically that, as far as I know, the African states are very reasonable states, they have reasonable representatives. Certainly the African states want to apply the strongest possible pressure on those two states to make them reasonable, but I do not know of any positive decision to expel those two members from this Organization. Their expulsion would serve no useful purpose at all. It would be

---

[199] Nigeria at the United Nations: A Partnership for Better World," A Ministry of External Affairs, Federal Republic of Nigeria Production, (Third Press Publishers, Lagos, Nigeria 1991).

a sheer waste of time. It is better to bring them here and keep on whipping them until they have learned their lesson. To throw them outside and have them in cold would just relieve them of this real burden. If members of an organization do not want to observe the rules of the organization, the only way you can teach them a lesson is to bring them up every time and expose them to a certain amount of humiliation and indignity and one day they will learn some sense. So I want to make it clear that my delegation does not know of any agreed plan to expel either Portugal or South-Africa from this organization, and I do not think my country would even support such a plan.[200]

In 1965, the committee of Trustees for the United Nations Trust Fund for Southern Africa was set-up to provide legal aid and relief to victims of the apartheid system on the basis of voluntary contributions. Nigeria later served on this committee in the Vice-Chairmanship capacity in the early 1990s. The country was also ably represented in a sister committee albeit an advisory one, the United Nations Education and Training Program which provided for Southern African and Namibian students to pursue their study abroad.[201] As indicated in chapter two, Nigeria was not consistent throughout at least actively in the pursuit of a colonial free Africa due to the prevailing situations on its domestic front. The country's internal political crisis of the mid-60s which culminated into a civil war ensured that it was kept temporarily away from the anti-apartheid and anti-colonial political and diplomatic struggles but right after the civil war in 1970, the Nigerian government resumed activism with the presentation of a new program of action on African decolonization at the UN. This plan of action centred on a time-table for bringing an end to colonialism and racial discrimination in Africa. The plan included a suggestion that a special UN fund should be established to support the liberation movements in Africa as well as other colonial territories world over.

In dealing with the sit-tight colonial regimes in Southern-Africa and in other African enclaves, the program called for the creation of a special African Task Force to support the liberation

---

[200] Ibid, pg. 65-66
[201] Ibid

movements.[202] To the Nigerian government, violence would be the most effective strategy to unseat the tyrannical colonial regimes on the continent. Despite being laudable, this program of action was repudiated by the colonially subjugated states of Africa like Guinea Bissau and Cape Verde who insisted on waging the anti-colonial insurgency on their own thus making it impossible for the UN to adopt the plan since the concerned states were not favourably disposed to the idea.[203] Regardless of the set-back, Nigeria forged ahead forcefully in the pursuit of the anti-colonial policy. This was clearly demonstrated in the country's chairmanship of the UN anti-apartheid committee for the better part of its existence. From the time of its emergence in 1963 and its scrapping in 1994 following the accomplishment of the task assigned to it, the UN Special Committee was chaired for upward of 20 years by Nigerian diplomats. In 1972, Nigeria took its anti – colonial activism to another level when it led the boycott of the Olympic Games in Munich Germany and the 1976 Olympics in Montreal Canada. The country also boycotted the 1978 Commonwealth Games in Alberta Canada.[204] The steps were taken to protest South Africa's participation in those tournaments.

From 1976 to 1994, Nigeria assumed the permanent chairmanship of the UN Special Committee against apartheid. Prior to that time, Nigeria had served as chair of the committee from 1972 – 1975. During these periods, Nigeria used the platform of the committee to intensify the campaign against colonialism and racism in the entire Southern African region. The most innovative demonstration of the Nigerian government's active commitment in the struggle against colonialism was the setting up of the Southern African Relief Fund (SARF) in 1976. According to Garba (1987) this initiative brought in the Nigerian domestic populace in the fight against colonialism as citizens were asked to make financial contributions toward the project.

---

[202] See H. A. Asobie, 2010. Nigeria's Foreign Policy, 1960-2010: An Overview in 50 Years Of Nigeria's Foreign Policy, Issues, Challenges and Prospects, C. E. Osita (ed) NIIA, Lagos, Nigeria. NB Book title in italics!

[203] Ibid.
[204] See D. Games (2013), Nigeria-South Africa Baseline Study, SAFPI Policy Brief No. 44, Open Society Foundation for South-Africa, South-African Foreign Policy Initiative.

The proceeds which accrued into the coffers of (SARF) were used to provide scholarships and other assistance to students of Southern Africa and the apartheid refuges.[205] Nigeria pursed this pivotal foreign policy objective with all its weight behind it to the extent that it is not only the foreign policy instruments that were available to Nigeria at the time but also domestically in its total fight against apartheid the population of Nigeria was involved. Nigerian civil servants were obliged at the time to donate a portion of their salaries to the fight against apartheid South-Africa. Even primary and secondary school students were asked to give a small percentage of their pocket money to the fight against apartheid South-Africa.

All these donations were deducted from various sources and channelled directly into the (SARF) account.[206] By 1978, the (SARF) fund had $28million in its coffers.[207] Early in 1977, Leslie Harriman, Nigeria's ambassador and permanent representative at the United Nations, and also the serving chairman of the United Nations Committee against Apartheid informed the country's external affairs commissioner Joseph Garba about the UNGA resolution 31/6 paragraph 4, which proposed the holding of a World Conference for Action against Apartheid. The UN plan was to hold the Conference at its headquarters either in New York or "in a country that was irrevocably committed to the eradication of this heinous crime against humanity" (Garba, 1987:104). According to Garba, the UN subsequently asked Nigeria to host the conference because of its commitment in the struggle. The Conference was designed to publicize the danger of apartheid regime's increasing militarization as a danger to global peace and security; to focus attention on the regime with a view to promoting firm African unity in support of the freedom fighters against the apartheid leadership; to document and condemn the collaboration with the apartheid regime, of all governments with vested interests in South-Africa; and finally to use the occasion as a pledging conference for national support to the liberation Movement (Garba,1987).

---

[205]Ibid.
[206] Interview with Professor Ogaba Oche, Director of Research and Studies, Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos, Nigeria (15/01/2014).
[207] See D. Games (2013), Nigeria-South Africa Baseline Study, SAFPI Policy Brief No. 44, Open Society Foundation for South-Africa, South-African Foreign Policy Initiative.

The first anti-apartheid conference was held in Lagos, Nigeria in 1977. At the conference, the Nigerian Head of State General Olusegun Obasanjo expressed his administration's commitment toward ensuring that colonialism became history in Africa. In attaining this goal, Obasanjo highlighted the bottlenecks which had hitherto prevented the victory of the anti-apartheid forces. He particularly singled out the western companies that were having business transactions with the apartheid regime for criticism and threatened to move against their economic interests in Nigeria if they failed to toll the path of honour by dissociating themselves from the repressive apartheid. The Lagos Conference of August 1977 succeeded in anticipating the ways to bring international pressure on the Pretoria regime especially coming after the Soweto massacres of school children in June 1976.

On December 16, 1977, Nigeria and other progressive states of the UN voted 113 to zero, with ten abstentions, to impose an oil embargo on South Africa at the thirty - second UNGA meeting. The United States and its allies especially the member states of NATO were among those that abstained from the exercise (Irogbe, 1997). The United States' action in this regard called to question the much trumpeted sympathies of the Carter administration for the oppressed black majority in South Africa and Southern Africa as a whole. In the same vein, the Security Council of the UN also adopted a mandatory arms embargo resolution against South Africa on November 4, 1977 of which the U.S Carter Administration was initially hesitant to vote in favour of but later did having come under pressure domestically and internationally. Earlier at the 1977 UNGA meeting, Nigeria reiterated its commitment to African decolonization. In his address to the Assembly, Obasanjo deployed the feckless economic sanctions against the apartheid regime which he believed was responsible for the racist regime guts to defy all appeals to it by the sympathizing states and organizations to end apartheid. He summed up his country's concern thus, "all our appeals have been met with half- hearted measures inventing superficial economic sanctions that are full of loopholes. Today therefore, the racist regime in rebellion could still boast of a more viable economy and high standard of living for the white

minority".[208] He went on to express Nigeria's desire of ensuring that justice was done with regard to the colonial problem, "...it is necessary to emphasize once again that the Nigeria government and people are totally committed to the cause of freedom and justice in that part of our continent. This we consider as a duty that must be performed and we are determined to restore the honour and dignity that belong to that continent and all its inhabitants at whatever cost".[209] Nigeria also played a significant role at the UN in wrestling the administration of Namibia from the grip of apartheid South Africa, and entrusting it to the UN Council for Namibia. Also in 1978, during Nigeria's membership of the UN Security Council, its political and diplomatic acumen contributed immensely toward the adoption of UN Security Council Resolution 435, which formed the basis on which Namibia's independence was attained in 1990. In monetary terms, Nigeria matched its actions with spending as it contributed $400, 000 to the OAU assessed contributions to help South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) to finance its 1989 campaign at the UN the Nigerian government also paid a staggering $162, 174 in assessed contributions to Namibia's UN Transition Assistance Group (UNITAG).This was followed by military assistance to Namibia which it gave by providing a 182 – man police contingent – the single largest to the U.N mission at the time(Uhomoibhi, 2008).

In 1979, Nigeria - Britain relations came under threat over the Rhodesian (now Zimbabwe) colonial situation. Nigeria's decision to nationalize Shell-British petroleum (BP) assets played a major role in Britain's Margaret Thatcher's policy U-turn on the Rhodesian crisis by convening the Lancaster House Conference which culminated into the independence of Zimbabwe in 1980 (Uhomoibhi, 2008). Prior to taking this decision, Nigeria was involved in the "crucial political drama in Lusaka at the Commonwealth summit" in July that same year, which finally bent Thatcher on the issue (Whiteman 2008:264). The Nigerian government provided explanatory notes as to why it took that decision. General Obasanjo was explicit in his defence of the rattling decision to nationalize the BP:

---

[208] See "A March Of Progress," Collected Speeches Of His Excellency General Olusegun Obasanjo, Nigeria's Head Of State, 1976-1979, Federal Ministry Of Information, Federal Military Government, Lagos, Nigeria (1979), p. 219.
[209] Ibid, p. 220.

The British press was referring to Nigeria as a toothless bulldog. We had to show them that we had teeth and we could bark and bite as hard as we barked and we did...We felt incensed, insulted and terribly disenchanted at the level of reactionary policies pursued by the British government, especially over the South-African situation. And we were prepared to reduce drastically the level of our importation and undertake other measures that will {sic} shake and force the British government to review and take a more enlightened and civilized posture in her position over the South African question. As a first step and a seizer, we took the decision to nationalize British Petroleum.[210]

The above implicitly showed that it was more convenient for the British government to pay lip service to the colonial problem other than take appropriate practical steps that would help solve the situation. The nationalization of BP served the purpose which Nigeria wanted. As Obasanjo himself put it, the decision "seemed to have such a biting effect on the British economy that it led to rapid change in official British position on the independence of Zimbabwe".[211]Addressing the UNGA in October 1979, Obasanjo declared that his country would not be a party to any deceitful solution to the Zimbabwean question. He told the Assembly: "I consider it imperative to sound a note of warning that Nigeria will never be party to any solution in Zimbabwe that could be remotely interpreted as a "sell - out" of the six million people of that land. Our objective is the unequivocal surrender of power by the minority of the population".[212]

This consistent policy assertiveness on the most politically and diplomatically powerful stage proved beyond the realm of doubt that Nigeria was indeed desirous of freedom for fellow African states. In the 1980s, Nigeria utilized its tenure as chairman of the anti – apartheid

---

[210] Quoted in K. Whiteman (2008) "The Switchback and the Fallback, Nigeria – Britain relations," in Gulliver Troubles, Nigeria's Foreign Policy after the Cold War, A. Adebajo and A. R. Mustapha (eds) University of KwaZulu Natal Press, Scottsville, South Africa, p. 264.
[211] Ibid, p. 264.
[212] Cited by M. I. Uhomoibhi (2008) "A Triple Web of Interdependence, The UN, the Commonwealth and the EU," in Gulliver Troubles, Nigeria's Foreign Policy after the Cold War, A. Adebajo and A. R. Mustapha (eds) University of KwaZulu Natal Press, Scottsville, South Africa, p. 229.

committee of the UN to seek the political support of the new French government, under the leadership of President Francois Mitterrand in resolving the apartheid problem. The Committee's decision in this regard stemmed from the conviction that the country had a vital role to play in the international effort for the elimination of apartheid in South Africa.[213] The leadership of the Special Committee was pleased with the progressive measures that were taken by France on the colonial problem. The committee noted with great satisfaction that France voted in the Security Council on 31 August 1981, for a resolution condemning South Africa's aggression against Angola and that it enabled the African National Congress of South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization to open offices in Paris. The committee led by its Nigerian chairman Maitama – Sule appealed to the French government to double its efforts in the struggle against apartheid and white rule. The French government applauded the committee for its visit and promised to implement the UN arms embargo against South Africa.[214]

The apartheid machinery came under fire in 1984 following the introduction of a "new constitution" which deprived the indigenous population of their rights to citizenship by the South African regime.[215] Both the UN Security Council and General Assembly declared the "new constitution" null and void. The UN Special Committee against Apartheid under the Chairmanship of Nigeria's Joseph Garba organized the International Seminar on the Legal Status of the Apartheid Regime held in Lagos, from 13-16 August 1984. The Seminar brought together jurists and social scientist from Africa, Europe, North America and Asia which represented the principal legal systems of the world. The Seminar appraised the situation in Southern Africa and called on the international community to understand the urgent necessity for prompt action through the invocation of international law to a situation which constituted one of the most

---

[213] See "The New France in the Campaign Against Apartheid, Report By His Excellency, Maitama – Sule (Nigeria), Chairman Of the Special Committee Against Apartheid, On the Mission to France (1-3 March 1982), Published by the U.N Centre Against Apartheid, p. 1.
[214] Ibid.
[215] See "Declaration Of the Seminar On the Legal Status Of Apartheid Regime and Other Legal Aspects Of the Struggle Against Apartheid," Held in Lagos, Nigeria, From 13-16 August 1984, Published by the U.N Centre Against Apartheid.

serious threats to international peace and security.[216] The Committee also expressed dismay at the magnitude of violence unleashed on the sovereign states of the region such as Angola and Mozambique by South African troops and police.

They condemned the killing and maiming of hapless citizens of these countries which also included Namibia. The displacement of persons and disappearance of persons after arrests was condemned by the attendees.[217] The UN Special Committee against Apartheid kept its political activities going from all through the mid 1980 as Nigeria continued to use its chairmanship of the committee to garner international support in the struggle to eliminate apartheid and colonialism in Africa.[218] Nigeria advanced in its political activities on colonialism at the UN when in 1986, in a statement to forty – one session of the UNGA, the Nigerian External Affairs Minister, Bolaji Akinyemi requested, to universal applause, that the President of the General Assembly sends an appeal to the President of the United States to endorse the action taken by the Congress to impose sanctions on South Africa. He said:

> Apartheid is not an internal affair of South Africa, but a universal affair. Witness the amount of time, energy and resources the international community devotes to it. Legitimately, therefore, this assembly can and should miss no opportunity to advance the universal effort to achieve the peaceful dismantling of apartheid. In that context, I propose that you, Mr President, address on our behalf an urgent appeal today, to the President of the United States to endorse the congressional action on sanction against South Africa.[219]

The President of the General Assembly acceded to this request by stating:

---

[216] Ibid.
[217] Ibid.
[218] See Special Meeting Of the Special Committee Against Apartheid For Consultations With the Ministers Of External Relations Of France, U.N Headquarters, 9 October 1984.
[219] "Nigeria at the United Nations: A Partnership For Better World," A Ministry of External Affairs, Federal Republic Of Nigeria Production, (Third Press Publishers, Lagos, Nigeria 1991), p. 67.

We have just heard an appeal to the President of the General Assembly by the Foreign Minister of Nigeria. The acclamation from members of the Assembly indicates widespread support from the floor. I take note of that appeal and shall find a suitable means to convey that sentiments to the appropriate quarters.[220]

This request was Nigeria's response to the American erroneous perception of the colonial problem in Africa. For instance, Former U.S President Reagan claimed that "The African problem is a Russian weapon aimed at the U.S The Soviet Union underlies all the unrest that is going on. If they weren't engaged in this game of dominoes there wouldn't be any hotspots in the world."[221] Reagan's charge proved further that African decolonization was a political tool used by both the Soviet Union and the United States within the period colonialism lasted to advance their Cold War agenda. In 1989, Nigeria's voice was again heard clearly at the UNGA's 44[th]session when the country expressed the positions of Liberation Movements in South Africa. The country's External Affairs Minister, Major-General Ike Nwachukwu in an address to the session expressed a sentiment which was to be echoed by the anti-apartheid forces in the months which followed.[222] He declared:

Action is what is required. Action to immediately release Nelson Mandela and other political detainees; action to lift the state of emergency and legitimize all anti-apartheid groups; and action to commence dialogue and negotiation with the authentic leaders of non-white majority, with a view to working out arrangements for a non-racial democracy. The South Africa regime must first seek acceptability at home among all South Africans before seeking respectability abroad. These are the basic requirements for taking seriously, any talk of changes in South Africa.[223]

---

[220] Ibid.
[221] Quoted in K. Irogbe (1997) "The Roots Of United States Foreign Policy Toward Apartheid South Africa, 1969-1985, the Edwin Mellen Press Ltd, Lampeter, Ceredigion, United Kingdom, p. 91.
[222]"Nigeria at the United Nations: A Partnership for Better World," A Ministry of External Affairs, Federal Republic of Nigeria Production, (Third Press Publishers, Lagos, Nigeria 1991), p. 68.
[223]Ibid.

Within the space of one year some of these demands had been met. Nelson Mandela was released unconditionally after spending close to three decades in prison. Nigeria however continued to caution against the premature lifting of sanctions until the pillars of apartheid had been uprooted.[224] The release of Mandela ushered in a series of reforms by the regime of the last apartheid leader F W De Klerk (1989-1994) who superintended the eventual transfer of power from the white minority to the indigenous black majority population. While these reforms were being carried out, Nigeria was on the side-lines watching to see if the entire process would produce the desired outcome. Fortunately it did as Nelson Mandela made history by becoming the first democratically elected black President of Post-apartheid South Africa in 1994. Interestingly, Nigeria, which had played a relentless role in the struggle against apartheid politically, economically and diplomatically for more than three decades, was the country which sponsored the UN Security Council resolution in 1994 which freed South Africa from sanctions and reintegrated the country into the international circuit (Uhomoibhi, 2008).

4.9.   Conclusion

This chapter could be concluded in three ways. First, it examined the historical evolution of African and indeed the Black world struggle against European colonialism since the early 1900s to the late 1950s. It argued that the African decolonization victory came in phases in the course of the 19th and 20th centuries. For instance, it was African resistance against Europe's invasion albeit unsuccessful that paved way for the emergence of the Pan-African movement in the early 1900s. Continental Africans and its diaspora components realized that the only way they could confront the colonial nemesis in Africa was through a Pan-Africanist movement hence its emergence. Second, the chapter argued based on archival and relevant governmental documents and other scholarly sources that African decolonization was politicized to achieve the Cold War aims of the feuding Western and Eastern powers as the leaders of both camps saw the African colonial predicament as an avenue which they could use to preserve and

---

[224] Ibid.

advance their national interests. Third, this chapter also analysed the role played by Nigeria politically and diplomatically in the UN on the issues of decolonization of the continent and also examined the roles of various actors in this regard. The present chapter has laid the foundation for the next chapter that will consider the implications of Nigeria's roles in the UN as presented above for the country's ambition for a UN Security Council Permanent seat should it become available as anticipated. This will address the second part of the topic of this dissertation.

CHAPTER 5

CONTEMPORARY IMPLICATIONS OF NIGERIA'S ROLE IN AFRICAN DECOLONIZATION FOR

THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL PERMANENT SEAT BID

> *Nigeria bid for a Permanent Seat on the UNSC is legitimate. It is the most credible and that can be truly representative of African and Black interests in the world…Nigeria's role in securing peace in the African continent through the dismantlement of apartheid is second to none in Africa* (Akinterinwa, 2005:70-71)

> *No country that is…reputed to be one of the most corrupt societies in the world has a moral basis to lead others. If it tries to, it will be resisted.*[225] (Adebayo Adedeji, Nigeria's Minister of Economic Development and Reconstruction, 1972-75)

5.1.   Introduction

The previous chapter above historically analyzed the politics of African decolonization in the United Nations (UN) during a 34 years period and the roles played by Nigeria and other state actors in the process. The present chapter will discursively establish a linkage between these roles and the country's contemporary quest to occupy a permanent membership seat on the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) should the seat become available as anticipated. The above statements by Bola Akinterinwa, the current Director General of the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA) and Adebayo Adedeji, one of Nigeria's revered public servants, former cabinet Minister, the architect of a landmark report on Nigeria's foreign policy review in 1976, and executive secretary of the United Nations (UN) Economic Commission for Africa

---

[225] Cited by Adebajo, A. (2008) "Hegemony on a Shoestring, Nigeria's Post-Cold War Foreign Policy," in Gulliver Troubles, Nigeria's Foreign Policy after the Cold War, A. Adebajo and A. R. Mustapha (eds.) University of KwaZulu Natal Press, Scottsville, South Africa, p. 1.

(ECA) 1975-1991, sums up the prospects and challenges facing Nigeria which will either mar or strengthen its case for the much coveted UNSC seat.**226**

Against the background of the foregoing, the present chapter will discuss the implications of Nigeria's roles in the African decolonization process in the UN for the country's quest for the UNSC permanent seat by analyzing the challenges and prospects. The chapter will critique Nigeria's attempt to tie its bid for the UNSC seat to its antecedents in order to establish whether a permanent seat for Nigeria on the UNSC is realizable and deserving based on its historical contribution to African emancipation from colonial rule or unrealizable and undeserving due to the country's prevailing domestic conditions. It seeks to examine the extent to which the country can rely on its record of service to the African cause in clinching the UNSC seat. To sell itself as Africa's most qualified candidate for the UNSC, Nigeria has brought to light what it has done for the rest of Africa in more ways than any of the country's formidable African co – contenders for the UNSC permanent seat.[227] Consequently, Nigeria's case for the UNSC permanent seat is generally believed to be rock solid because of the country's historical record of service to the African continent which many argued cannot be overlooked in the process of selecting African representatives on an enlarged UNSC. Scholars have argued confidently that while the country had shown leadership in advancing the African cause, Nigeria's co-contenders for the UN seats (in the African continent) have not done as much as the country in this respect thus they conclude that Nigeria's antecedents have a positive implication for its bid for the UNSC seat (Osuntokun, 2005; Akinterinwa, 2005; Fafowora, 2005).

How true are these postulations given that a country's prevailing domestic realities mirror to the outside world its competence and ability to function externally? Can Nigeria's UNSC bid succeed solely on the account of its roles in the decolonization of Africa as debates on the issue

---

[226] Ibid. p. 1.
[227]Personal Interview with Professor Ogaba Oche, Director of Research and Studies, Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA), Lagos, Nigeria, 15/1/2014.

suggest? Can Nigeria's case for the UN seat be strengthened on the basis of the sentiment that the country helped the cause of bringing down apartheid and colonialism in Africa hence should be accorded the seat? How does this conform to the realities on the country's domestic scene? In view of the questions raised, the present chapter will critique these postulations against the backdrop of what has been described as Nigeria's "domestic condition.[228]" Can the domestic condition cost Nigeria the UNSC seat?

Therefore the main question to which the present chapter seeks to provide answers is: can Nigeria rely on its anti-colonial records in getting the UN seat? To tackle this question deeply, the following issues will be addressed in the chapter: The United Nations Security Council Reform: an Overview; Can the United Nations Security Council be democratized? United Nations Security Council Reforms and the Permanent Five Albatross; the United Nations Security Council Permanent Seat Seekers: a General Overview; Contemporary Implications of Nigeria's Roles in African Decolonization for Security Council Permanent Membership Bid: Analysis of Prospects and Challenges; and Conclusion.

5.2.   The United Nations Security Council Reform: An Overview

The demand for the expansion of the UNSC Permanent membership is one of the most popular issues which have been a major challenge to the UN since its establishment in the mid-1940s. The representatively disadvantaged member states of the UNSC had for decades articulated the need to have the UN founding charter amended in order to accommodate the post-World War II and Cold War changes in the international system. The high premium placed on the UNSC permanent membership club stems from its prestigious status and the supremacy of its decision making authority on issues that pertain to international peace and security. The UNSC permanent membership seat is arguably one of the attractive and most sought after positions of power in the history of global diplomacy. This has catalyzed the world's emerging global and

---

[228] A Former Nigerian Ambassador to the United States Olu Sanu, claimed Nigeria's "Domestic condition" has the potential to deny the country a UNSC seat, *The Guardian Newspaper,* 22 September 1997.

regional heavyweights such as Japan, Germany, India, Brazil, Indonesia, Nigeria, South-Africa and Egypt to seek permanent seats on the UNSC in the past few decades (Guzzardi and Mullenbach, 2008).

In this section, we shall examine the quest for the reform of the UN system and the attempts made towards realizing the objective. The UN represents the most sophisticated and arguably the best machinery so far established for the promotion of international peace and security because it is vested with the powers to make far-reaching decisions on global affairs, especially those that bother on international peace and security.[229] The UN commenced its multilateral diplomatic activities in 1945 with 51 independent member states. Since then, the organization's membership has grown significantly to 193 at the time of writing this dissertation.[230] The enormous power the UN wields in international diplomacy is drawn from its founding charter.

At the termination of hostilities between the East and West following the end of arguably the most protracted ideological warfare ever known in human history – the Cold War, a new World order emerged due to the collapse of the old bipolar world. One of the immediate consequences of this was the popular quest of a group of member states of the UN which are mentioned above to seek permanent seats for themselves on the basis of their regional standing, economic credentials/potentials, huge financial, diplomatic and military contribution to UN activities and undertakings; as well as their historical contributions to the maintenance of peace and regional stability in their spheres of influence.

Since it came into existence in 1945, the bulk of the UN activities have been conducted in the Security Council (SC). The hegemonic control of the UN machinery by it SC component is considered by many observers to be at par with that of an upper house of a legislature in

---

[229] See Akindele R.A. (2005) "Nigeria at the United Nations: An Overview", in Nigeria and the United Nations Security Council, Bola. A. Akinterinwa ed, (Vantage Publishers Ibadan, Nigeria).
[230] See "Growth in United Nations membership, 1945 – present", available at www.un.org/en/members/growth.Shtml.

national politics.[231] While the General Assembly (GA) is recognized in the UN charter as the main deliberative organ of the UN that provides a unique forum for multilateral discussion of issues of global importance among its 193 member states, the unsatisfactory realities which had prompted member states over the years to demand for reform is that the GA has had to play a second fiddle to the SC in authoritative and power sense despite being the most representative organ of the world body. For instance, the GA decisions are considered to be advisory and unbinding on member states unless such decisions receive the ratification of the permanent five members who may decide to ratify such decisions provided they do not infringe on their national interests. If they do, then they are empowered by the UN charter to veto them thus placing the P5 members in the driving seat and also in a position of unchallengeable supremacy as far as the UN architecture is concerned. This has made it possible for the veto holding permanent members of the SC to control the destiny of the UN since its inception. What this implies therefore is that the SC is the soul of the UN system while other organs and agencies represent the component parts of it body.

The exclusive veto powers enjoyed by the permanent 5 had on several occasions been recklessly used more as a vindictive instrument and for the preservation, and the perpetuation of great powers' interests. As Akindele and Akinterinwa noted in 2011: ". . . the manifestation of the strength and prestige of the Security Council, which is the veto power of its permanent members, has paradoxically also been the source of the Council's political paralysis." The authors advanced their argument thus: "The veto power had often been recklessly used and was usually put in the service of parochial national interests. It had, to that extent, often been exercised detrimentally to the collective interests of the United Nations."[232]

---

[231]H. A. Saliu and J. S. Omotola (2008) "Can Nigeria Get a UN Security Council Seat?" *South African Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 15, No. 1, June.

[232] Akindele R.A. and B. A. Akinterinwa (2011) "Reform of the United Nations: Towards Greater Effectiveness, Enhanced Legitimacy Profile and Equitable Regionally - Balanced Membership in An Enlarged UN Security Council" in Africa and the UN System: The First Fifty Years, G. A. Obiozor and Adekunle Ajaja (eds.), Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA), Publishers, Lagos, Nigeria, p. 204.

This submission can safely be justified on the basis of what transpired during the protracted struggle against apartheid when the United States and other key western countries like Britain and France vetoed several resolutions which sought to impose stiffer sanctions on the defunct apartheid regime of South Africa. As a matter of fact, the main reason why it took such a long time to bring down the apartheid edifice in South Africa was due to the reckless use of the veto power by these P5 member countries particularly the Western trio of United States, France and Britain which considered their national interests to be superior to issues of global concern however grave they might be. The SC thus serves to "keep the big players in the game, and there is no game without them."[233]

Moreover, the call for the SC reform is further reinforced by the fact that it is the only organ of the UN system whose decisions are binding on all members regardless of whether the decisions are favorable to them or not – members are obliged to observe compliance. The popular saying in representative democratic parlance that the minority will have their say while the majority will have their way is a sharp contrast to what obtains at the UN as the majority in this case – the GA usually have their say while the power laden minority - the SC P5 always have their way. This enviable towering status, coupled with the changing terrain of the UN and international politics in general, has intensified calls for its reform[234]. The call for the reform of the UN especially the SC permanent membership veto club has lingered for decades without success perhaps due to the perception that "the UN has never taken happily to internal reform, that it is an inflexible institution set in its ways and unwilling to change."[235] Implicitly, the slow attempt to reform the UN system particularly the SC has been tortuous because of its configuration from the very beginning which makes it "inflexible" to structural alteration.

---

[233] Cited by H. A. Saliu and J. S. Omotola (2008) "Can Nigeria Get a UN Security Council Seat?" *South African Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 15, No. 1, June 2008, p. 72.
[234] See H. A. Saliu and J. S. Omotola (2008) "Can Nigeria get a UN Security Council Seat?" South African Journal of International Affairs, Vol. 15, No. 1, June.

[235] S. Schlesinger "Can the United Nations Reform?", *World Policy Journal*, 14.3, Fall 1997, p. 3.

The attempt to reform the UN has hitherto exhibited symptoms that suggest the possibility of preserving the power status quo, as Saliu and Omotola argues, "the superficiality of the attempt to reform the UN so far may be connected to the elevation of power over justice in the internal workings of the organization, especially in the Security Council where the power of the veto takes precedence.[236] Despite this dilemma, the call for a fundamental reform of the SC still persists. Nigeria, one of the aspiring African countries for the SC permanent seat has been supportive of the reform because of the potential advantage it will offer the country to represent Africa at the highest diplomatic level of them all. Historically, the UNSC had undergone restructuring only once although several attempts have been made to attain this much desired goal over the years beginning from the late 1940s to the early 1950s.

The emergence of several countries from colonial subjection and subsequent admission into the UN necessitated the call for an expansion of the non-permanent seats on the UNSC from six to eight. The campaign to bring this about was spearheaded by Spain and a nucleus of Latin American countries who proposed an amendment to the UN charter in 1956 seeking to expand the number of non-permanent seats on the UNSC from 6 to 8. It however took years to achieve this objective due mainly to the intense debates and inter- great powers disagreement, which included the Soviet Union's insistence on tying the issue of UNSC restructuring to the issue of mainland China's membership in the UN, a stalemate later ensued on this issue until an agreement was reached in 1963 when the GA approved the amendments that increased the non-permanent seats membership from six to ten – the amendments was later ratified by the SC (Bourantonis, 2005). This was two seats more than the originally anticipated number 8.

The wave of decolonization which blew away the colonial structures and their controllers in its wake had a corresponding significant effect on the UN system as its membership rank swelled from the mid-1960s to the late 1970s. During this period, developing countries were increasingly discontented with the reckless abuse of the veto power by the so – called

---

[236] See H. A. Saliu and J. S. Omotola (2008) "Can Nigeria get a UN Security Council Seat?" *South African Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 15, No. 1, June, p. 73.

permanent five members; they were also seriously concerned about the lack of "equitable representation" for the continents of Asia and Africa on the UN councils. To address the seeming imbalance, in 1979 and 1980 respectively India and a host of other countries from Africa, Asia, and Latin America proposed an increase of the non-permanent membership seats of the SC from 10 to 16.[237]

Suffice to say that unlike the successful attempt to restructure the SC in the early 1960s the latter efforts to achieve the earlier success failed to produce the desired results because of the Cold War battles between the U.S, the Soviet Union and their respective allies.[238] The impact of the Cold War on global affairs foreclosed the possibility of having the UN consider any request for the expansion of the SC in the 1980s but with the end of the Cold War in the early 1990s, there was a rekindled interest in restructuring the SC to reflect the changes which had occurred in the international political space. Thus in December 1992, the GA approved an Indian sponsored resolution which called upon the UN Secretary General to invite member – states to submit proposals for SC reforms, this later culminated into the harvest of proposals from 80 countries. In 1993, the GA established an "Open-Ended Working Group" to consider the various proposals for reforms; several options were subsequently canvassed in the various proposals submitted to the working group for the restructuring of the SC. This included a proposal by the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) – a group of countries which stood aloof of the Cold War ideological crisis calling for an increase in permanent membership seats from 5 to 9. As for the non-permanent seats, the group proposed an increase in representation from 10 to 17 because the UN had not as at the time responded accordingly with regard to the proposals submitted by

---

[237] See J. E. Guzzardi and M. J. Mullenbach (2007-2008) "The Politics of Seeking a Permanent Seat on the United Nations Security Council: An Analysis of the Case of Japan," *Midsouth Political Science Review*, Vol. 9.
[238] See D. Archibugi (1993) "The Reform of the UN and Cosmopolitan Democracy: A Critical Review," *Journal of Peace Research*, 30 (3). NB Pages?

India and other member states in 1979 and 1980 which suggested the expansion of the non-permanent seats.[239]

At the commemoration of its 50th anniversary in 1995, the UNGA approved the *Declaration of the United Nations,* stating expressly that the SC should be "expanded and its working methods continue to be reviewed in a way that will further strengthen its capacity and effectiveness, enhance its representative character, and approve its working efficacy and transparency."[240] Two years after, the Malaysian UN Ambassador Ismael Razali, who also was the President of the GA 1996-1997; and the then Chair of the Open-Ended Working Group presented a proposal suggesting the addition of a non – veto holding five permanent seats and four non-permanent seats to the SC. The Malaysian envoy's proposal which allowed the UNGA to pick the countries it deemed eligible to take up the proposed seats was later blocked by members of the NAM and a host of other member states of the UN such as Egypt, Italy, Mexico, and Pakistan (Bourantonis, 2005). Razali's proposal was blocked by the NAM group which saw the plan as a threat to their internal cohesion, along with Italy, who sought to block the permanent membership bid of Germany and Japan.[241] The Italian opposition to Germany and Japan's SC permanent membership bids is historically ironic given the fact that the trio of Italy, Japan, and Germany were allies during the World War 11. The enviable economic and technological successes which have been recorded by Germany and Japan might have played a major role in Italy's continued opposition to its ex-allies bids for SC permanency. Tokyo and Berlin occupy the third and fourth positions respectively in the global ranking of the World's most powerful economics.[242]

Following a decade of intensive agitations and debates for the SC reform, the UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan in 2003 set up a 16 – member high level panel to consider and recommend

---

[239] See J. E. Guzzardi and M. J. Mullenbach (2007-2008) "The Politics of Seeking a Permanent Seat on the United Nations Security Council: An Analysis of the Case of Japan" *Midsouth Political Science Review*, Vol. 9.
[240] Ibid., p. 38.
[241] See Gordon N. "Pathways To Security Council Reform", Center On International Cooperation, New York University, United States, May 2014, available online at: www.cic.nyu.edu.
[242] "GDP Current US$" World Development Indicators World Bank, 2013.

the appropriate options for the restructuring of the SC. In 2004, the panel came up with recommendations which proposed two different options for the SC restructuring which are as follows: Option (A) six new permanent seats without veto power and three additional non-permanent seats; Option (B) eight four year renewable seats and one additional non – permanent seat (Blum, 2005, Price, 2005). The UNGA debated these options and others passionately for the better part of year 2005; they were, however, unable to reach a consensus on how to restructure the SC. The African Union (AU) on its part responded to these proposed options by choosing the first option following the decision of the Heads of States and Governments of Africa in their mid-term submit in Abuja, Nigeria in January 2005.[243] This position was subsequently ratified and adopted by the African continental organization on 8 March 2005, in Addis Ababa, and became the African continent official position with regard to the reform of the SC.[244]

The outcome of the ill-fated attempt at restructuring the SC in 2005 was a frustrating experience. In the words of Brazilian Ambassador Ronaldo Mota Sardenberg whose country nurses a permanent seat ambition for the SC, the debates on the reform of the SC hit the rock because a "few countries, seeking to avoid any decision on this matter, take refuge on claims for consensus and on allegations on the disruptive nature of the issue."[245] Implicitly, some states were non-assertive on the issue perhaps due to their naivety or acting under the influence of some powerful states that might have dissuaded them from taking part actively in the process of the SC reform debates. According to Ambassador Sardenberg, the actions and disposition of these countries with regard to the issue of the SC reform "only contribute to the perpetuation of current inequalities in the structure of the organization, and to the frustrations

---

[243] See H. A. Saliu and J. S. Omotola (2008) "Can Nigeria get a UN Security Council Seat?" *South African Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 15, No. 1, June.
[244] Ibid.
[245] Cited by J. E. Guzzardi and M. J. Mullenbach (2007-2008) "The Politics of Seeking a Permanent Seat on the United Nations Security Council: An Analysis of the Case of Japan," *Midsouth Political Science Review*, Vol. 9, p. 38.

of the aspirations of all members, for a more balanced distribution of power in the work of the Security Council."[246]

The proposed UN reform had since 2005 when the High Power Panel (HPP) submitted its report mellowed. The implication of this is that the UN itself seems not to be favourably disposed to carrying out the much needed SC reforms. As enshrined in its Charter, the requirements for the expansion of the SC permanent seats entails aspiring permanent membership seeking countries to first secure the nod of not less than two-third of the entire membership of the UN, which includes the Permanent five members, to ratify an amendment to the UN Charter. In addition, aspiring countries must also do a thorough diplomatic homework at the regional and continental level in order to win the much needed support required to strengthen their case for the SC seat. However the stark reality here is that the UNSC permanent five members will be the ultimate decider when the time finally arrives for the Council's seats to be expanded. The remainder of the chapter will examine other issues which are outlined above.

5.3. Can the United Nations Security Council be democratized?

The above heading represents one of the most frequently asked questions across academic and diplomatic circles with regard to the proposed reform of the UN system. A world that is plagued by war will undoubtedly need a truly representative SC to advance international peace and security and defend international law without nationalistic sentiment and bias. Since the SC plays a decisive and much more active role in the maintenance of international peace and security, its past failures are glaring. Thus, the clamour for its reform is more urgently sought than ever. Nonetheless, the path to reform has been full of difficulties down the years. While countries have agreed on the Council's representative deficiencies, they have differed on what should be the solution to the problem identified.[247]

---

[246]Ibid, p. 38.
[247] See J. Paul and C. Nahory (2005) "Towards a Democratic Reform of the UNSC." *Global Policy Forum*, July 13, available online at: https://www.globalpolicy.org/security/41131.html.

As earlier discussed in this chapter, the popular sentiment among the UN member states is that the SC membership composition and its institutional apparatus is reflective of the old geopolitical realities and political thoughts of which the 1945 world played a defining role. The five permanent veto power holders of the SC who enjoy many exclusive privileges have come under a barrage of criticism – which earned them the titles of a "self-appointed" and self-enthroned oligarchy in the process.[248]

Despite decades of debates on the SC reform in the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA), the anticipated change in the Council's configuration still remains elusive.[249] Proposals have been presented on many occasions by member states of the UN who are desirous of reform but no membership plan has yet secured the support required to actualize a major institutional structural change in the UN system. Although the calls for SC reform had, as mentioned earlier, been in existence since the late 1940s, these calls intensified in the early 1990s, following the SC's controversial action and inaction in (Iraq and Rwanda).[250] While the SC's 1990 decision on Iraq was widely believed to be appropriate and in accordance with its Charter role, its failure to act rapidly to save the Rwandan humanity from extinction was colossal. It was described as "the failure of the UNSC to organize effective action to prevent the Rwandan genocide…"[251]

As a consequence of the above scenarios, the SC's increasing activities, especially after the Cold War, have forced critics to be more vociferous in their demand for reform. According to Nahory (2005), the apostles of reform have demanded that the SC be: (a) more representative, (b) more accountable, (c) more legitimate, (d) more democratic (e) more transparent, (f) more effective and, (g) more fair and even-handed (that is, no double standards in the discharge of responsibility).[252] These demands are no doubt reasonable and well - articulated. However, the

---

[248] Ibid.
[249] Ibid.
[250] Ibid.
[251] See Martin E. Ridley (2009) "Have the Problems Leading to the Failure of the UN Security Council to organize Effective Action to Prevent the Rwandan Genocide Now Been Rectified?" available online at: www.academia.edu.
[252] J. Paul and C. Nahory (2005) "Towards a Democratic Reform of the UNSC." *Global Policy Forum*, July 13, available online at: https://www.globalpolicy.org/security/41131.html, p. 1.

structural make - up of the UN system seems not to have been factored in while preparing these demands. It will take a radical amendment of the UN Charter for these demands to be met – a possibility that exists only perhaps in the minds of those advocating for reform. A SC membership of 30, 40, or even 50 undoubtedly harbours the possibility of being more representative across the regional and continental spectrums.

The main desire of the proponents of UN reform is to weaken the enormous powers of the permanent five members – the "oligarchs" and create a more diverse and representative system. But, to start with, the reform advocates have got to first and foremost contend with this question: How does a system that was not founded on democratic principles allow for democratization? The question posed shows that the quest for reform of the SC and the founding Charter of the UN is replete with contradictions. Proffering answer to the above question will begin with a brief historical reflection so as to ascertain whether the UN was from its inception designed to be democratically oriented. Prior to the emergence of the UN in 1945, the drafters of, and the signatories to its Charter were not oblivious to the factors that contributed to the collapse of the League of Nations, the precursor to the UN. According to Fred Aja Agwu, the UN system was not designed from the onset to be democratic (especially its SC organ). In his words: "You cannot have democracy in the international system because that system as we have it today was birth on the axis of war. It was the booty of the victorious powers."[253] He stated further that one of the contributory factors to the failure of the League of Nations that preceded the UN was the attempt to democratize it.

Although it was a passive democratization in the sense that the decision to respond to any breach of peace or act of aggression at that time was reserved to individual nations to decide not for a collective body such as the UNSC - that was why Italy invaded Ethiopia and Japan invaded China's north - eastern region of Manchuria and the league of Nations did not do anything. The formation of the UN was instructed by those unfortunate experiences that was

---

[253]Personal Interview with Associate Professor Fred Aja Agwu, Senior Research Fellow at the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, NIIA, Lagos, Nigeria, 14-01-16

why there is a central organ in which the SC under article 39 of the Charter is bestowed with the responsibility to determine the breach of peace, threat to peace and act of aggression and decide on what decision to take should any of these situations occur. Article 25 obligates member states to support the SC in this regard.[254]

So, democratizing the SC will be anarchical in the sense that the veto powers hitherto enjoyed by the P5 to enable them forestall any possibility of confrontation with one another will be expanded and when this happens, there will be confusion. That explains why the High Level Panel (HLP) did not recommend that additional seats should carry veto power - the veto issue was totally not within the picture. The configuration of the international system is averse to democratization because it is "built on power politics and not on democratic principles."[255] If it is democratized, it will not work. The democratic principle is working in the GA where member states are allowed to articulate their views but the SC is where the action lies. So the SC is not an organ created on democratic principles hence the recommendation of the HLP.

In light of the foregoing, the advocates of SC reform face a stern test in their quest for democratization of this UN organ which, as mentioned above, will take an unprecedented amendment of the UN Charter to attain. This is what prompts SC reform seekers to often ask: how can even the best – organized Council perform effectively and fairly bearing in mind that we live in a world where great powers use the instrumentality of their power status to the disadvantage of the less powerful?[256] Over the years, powerful governments that pride themselves as champions and apostles of "freedom", "democracy," and "good governance", have acted at variance with what they preach so much more that they have been known to behave despotically in the international realm, bending states to their will and caprice; and acting in clear violation of international law which they are obligated to uphold and protect. Ironically such powers sit in the SC and cannot expect to solve problems that they themselves

---

[254] Ibid.
[255] Ibid.
[256] See J. Paul and C. Nahory (2005) "Towards a Democratic Reform of the UNSC." *Global Policy Forum*, July 13, available online at: https://www.globalpolicy.org/security/41131.html.

birthed. This has been described as the "foxes guarding the chicken coop" problem.[257] Consequently, the call for democratic reform of the SC has the potential to multiply this problem; and if this is allowed to happen, the resultant effect might be unpalatable.

A wider SC permanent membership (with or without veto) will undoubtedly culminate into a conglomeration of powerful egoistic countries that will be there to pursue their national interests at each other's expense. For instance, should Japan emerge as a veto holding permanent member, it will definitely usher in a period of intense rivalry between the country and its Asian neighbor – China. This perhaps informed China's decision to announce to the world that it will block permanent membership seat for Japan using its SC veto power as the instrument. Since the SC P-5 will ultimately decide whether to expand the Council's membership or not, aspiring countries (Japan included) definitely have a tough task ahead of them.

As earlier said, enlarging the SC to allow for democratization may be counterproductive. As Paul and Nahory noted in 2005: "enlarging the oligarchy by adding five or six other powerful governments, more permanent members would scarcely make the Council more representative, accountable, transparent, legitimate or even-handed."[258] The authors argued further that the real force pushing the aspirant countries is self-interest and not the quest for democratization as they would want the international community to believe. They said, "Self-interest, not democracy, motivates these membership claims and a Council loaded with more permanent members would suffer from gridlock and political sclerosis."[259] Sean Murphy corroborated this view by pointing out the potential problems that will befall the SC if it is enlarged. He said: ". . . widespread participation . . . makes political consensus more difficult to achieve and political cohesion more difficult to maintain; faced with the complex problems regarding whether aggression has occurred, and whether and how to respond, widespread

---

[257] Ibid.
[258] Ibid.
[259] Ibid.

participation jeopardizes the ability of the system to work at all."[260] One fact that does not support the democratization of the SC is that even with the present composition of the P5 "oligarchy" club, decisions are sometimes very difficult to reach due largely to conflicting great power interests; thus it will be potentially dangerous if the P5 club is expanded to allow for democratization.

Secondly, advocates of a representatively balanced UNSC should also take cognizance of the fact that the UNSC permanent membership club was design principally as a check and balance mechanism by the P5 and for the P5 hence democratizing the club will put global peace and security in jeopardy as decisions will become more difficult to reach. As an organ whose decisions (particularly those that bother on international peace and security) are sacrosanct and impactful on the humanity concern, entrenching democratic principles into its body politic will instill confusion and systemic disorder into the organization because the UN system itself was not erected on democratic pillars and is thus simply a case of you can't build something on nothing. As indicated above, the only thing that can be done to bring about the much desired democratization will be a complete reconstruction of the UN Charter which seems very unlikely given that the P5 members themselves must give their consent for such plans to materialize. Next to be considered is the Permanent 5 (P5) albatross to the new UNSC permanent seats seekers. How have they responded to these issues over the years? The next section will seek to find out.

5.4. United Nations Security Council Reforms and the Permanent Five Albatross

The manner in which the UN system is presently constituted potentially remains the greatest albatross to the unquenchable appetite of the UNSC permanent seat seekers. For the highly influential economic giants better known as the "middle powers"- Japan, India, Brazil, and

---

[260] Cited by Akindele R.A. and B. A. Akinterinwa (2011) "Reform of the United Nations: Towards Greater Effectiveness, Enhanced Legitimacy Profile and Equitable Regionally - Balanced Membership in An Enlarged UN Security Council" in Africa and the UN System: The First Fifty Years, G. A. Obiozor and Adekunle Ajaja (eds), Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA), Publishers, Lagos, Nigeria, p. 209. Book title in italics!

Germany; and African leading contenders such as Nigeria, South-Africa and Egypt ambitions to yield the desired result, they must mandatorily secure the support of the UNSC P5 veto holding members. This section briefly examines the attempts to review the UN Charter since the late 1960s and the roles played by the UNSC permanent 5 – the P5, the Nigerian state; and other member state of the UN in this regard.

The current structure of the UNSC permanent membership consists of China, France, Russia, Britain, and the United States. Each enjoys the right to veto any proposal or decision that negates their national interests regardless of the popularity of the proposal. Apart from its P5 membership, the UNSC also comprises of 10 non-permanent members elected by the General Assembly for 2 year terms. Under the UN Charter, the Security Council (SC) has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and as discussed earlier in the chapter, it is the only UN organ that can take decisions that will be binding to all UN members. For the desired reforms to take effect, the UNSC permanent members mentioned above must ratify any changes or structural alteration to the UN Charter, including changes to the Council's size or powers.[261] The question then arises, what have been the responses of the P5 members to issues of the SC reform over the years?

The above question is instructive and engaging. First of all, it is important to stress that the nature of international politics ordinarily compels sovereign states which make up the international system to act in the pursuit of their national interests. In doing so, states maximize and even monopolize power to their own advantage whenever they are in a position to do so. In the process, they often ride on the less powerful states to have their way. According to the realists' proponents, international politics is principally driven by states national interests thus states actors uses all the available instruments at their disposal to ensure that their state's interests are secured even if it means doing so at the expense of another state - which invariably is the case.

---

[261] See Bureau of International Organization Affairs, U.S Department of State, January 2000, available online at: https://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/200/32924.

Against this background, this section will examine the efforts that have been made since the late 1960s towards amending the UN Charter. The section also discusses the attempt by the UN P5 members to preserve the status quo with regard to the structure of the UN. The roles played by Nigeria (as mentioned above) and other African and UN member states in the process of reviewing the UN founding Charter also come under focus. On 21 November 1969, Columbia, in a memorandum to the President of the General Assembly, (GA) made a request for the "establishment of a Special Committee to consider suggestions for revising the Charter of the UN".[262]

Nigeria and Ghana, the most outspoken African states at the UN at the time, made amendments to the Columbian "suggestion" to read "need to consider suggestions regarding the review of the Charter."[263] This was accepted, placed on the agenda of the session, and subsequently discussed by the GA. In light of this, Columbia, Chile, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Trinidad and Tobago strengthened the initiative further by requesting in the operative paragraph of their draft resolution, that the GA "decide to include an item entitled "need to consider suggestions regarding the review of the Charter of the UN."[264] The request was to be inscribed on the provisional agenda of the GA 25th regular session of 1970. In the operative part of another draft sponsored solely by Ghana, the Secretary General was requested to invite all member states to "submit to him prior to 30 June 1970, any suggestions they considered appropriate concerning the review of the Charter."[265]

The Ghanaian draft also requested the Secretary General to make suggestions available to the Committee for the 25th Anniversary of the UN and to invite that Committee to make report to the GA at the 25th regular session.[266] The suggestion by Ghana that the Committee for the 25th Anniversary be mandated to consider suggestions for the review of the Charter won

---

[262] Cited by Akinterinwa B. A. (2005) "Nigeria and the Permanent Membership of the United Nations Security Council: Dynamics and Definienda," Vantage Publishers Ltd, Ibadan, Nigeria, p. 41. NB book title in italics!
[263] Ibid.
[264] Ibid.
[265] Ibid.
[266] Ibid.

considerable support albeit temporarily as event that ensued years later suggest a reversal of the support initially given by great powers such as Britain, United States and countries such as Italy. The Ghanaian initiative on the review of the Charter was opposed by countries such as Brazil, Iraq, Japan, Mexico, and Venezuela.

Ironically the duo of Brazil and Japan that joined in opposing the Ghanaian suggestions for reforms are now among the global economic powerhouses campaigning vigorously for permanent membership seats on the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). With regard to the Ghanaian suggestion, the communist states of USSR and Hungary argued that "it was less important to make changes in the Charter than to induce those countries that shunned the provisions of the Charter to observe them scrupulously."[267] Implicitly, the USSR and its satellite state of Hungary prefer that members states of the organization act in accordance with the dictates of the Charter rather than canvass for its review. France on it part held the view that subjecting the Charter to a review had the potential of weakening or even destroy its balance. At the end of deliberations, the Ghanaian delegation had to withdraw its draft resolution, following the rejection of the draft by the Sixth Committee.

Consequently, the expectation that the UN Charter would be allowed to undergo a reform was thwarted. The GA decided afterwards to postpone the discussion of the item until its 25th session scheduled for 1970.[268]

The need for a review of the Charter was considered during the debate in 1970 and the P5 members of the SC kicked against it. Leading the Western bloc in opposing a reform were the United States and France who both cautioned against tampering with the Charter. The Eastern bloc opposition to a reform/review was led by the USSR who maintained its previous stance on the issue. This time around, it stated unequivocally that the problem was non-observance of the purposes and principles of the Charter and that there was no problem with the UN Charter

---

[267] See United Nations General Assembly Resolution 2552 (xxiv), A/7870, 12 December, 1969.
[268] Ibid.

as it was. Voting later ensued on the issue, on the basis of a roll-call vote of 69 to 12, with 12 abstentions; a draft resolution was later adopted by the Sixth Committee and also by the plenary.[269]

The import of the resolution which followed requested that the Secretary General invite Member States to send in a report indicating their views and suggestions on the item of review before July 1972, and that the item be placed on the agenda of the 27th session of the GA scheduled for 1972.[270] At the 27th session of the GA, comments from the 32 member states were reproduced in line with the request made by the Assembly at the previous session on 11 December 1970; this was followed by an intensive debate but prior to that, it became known to delegates at the session that the reform matter would be debated under three definitive headings. To this end, three groups of opinion emerged on the matter. The first group, were the opponents of review, whether general or partial, the second, were the proponents of general review; and third was the proponents of case by case approach to the review.[271]

The thoughts of the opponents of a general review stemmed from their conviction that a reform/review of the Charter could threaten the efficiency of the organization hence they called on all members to respect the Charter provisions and act accordingly to its letters. Interestingly, most of the countries that supported this position were communist states. This is instructive given that it was during a Cold War period. These countries were: USSR, Bulgaria, Byelorussian, SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, and Ukrainian SSR, etc[272] The countries which were in favour of General review of the Charter were: Brazil, China, Columbia, El Salvador, Ghana, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Philippines, Tunisia, etc. Those in favour of a case-by-case approach to the review were: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Mexico, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States, and

---

[269]Ibid.
[270]See the Yearbook of the United Nations, Vol. 24, 1970, p. 299.
[271]See the yearbook of the United Nations, Vol. 26, 1972, p. 221.
[272] See the Yearbook of the United Nations, Vol. 24, 1970. Page?

Syria.[273]Two facts can be deduced from the above. First was the inability of the so-called third world countries at the time to unite and form a formidable opinion on the issue which would have gone a long way to advance and strengthen the agitations for a review. The Member States of the UN from the third world countries at the time felt less concerned about the review of the Charter perhaps due to the fact that the eventual success of the exercise would be of no benefit to their countries hence their lukewarm attitude to the issue.

As Bola Akinterinwa puts it, "Even when the issue was tabled for discussion, many . . . countries have not been very forthcoming."[274] Second was the apparent inability or lack of proper articulation on the part of the Nigerian state for a review of the Charter at that session. For a country whose foreign policy ambition is driven by the desire to lead Africa in every respect, (see chapters two and three) many would have expected such a country to strongly make a case for the African continent in this regard. Again, Akinterinwa corroborated this view when he noted that ". . . Nigeria's position was not good enough. Nigeria supported an ad hoc approach to the discussion of the issue. It is difficult to imagine how an ad hoc review of the Charter, when considered necessary, could be in Africa's long term future."[275] This points to the fact that Nigeria's sterling record and reputation in the UN (especially on African decolonization issues) and other issues were not without blemishes or low moments. Another hurdle the advocates of review of the Charter faced during this time was the crisis of over politicization and conflict of interests.

However, they pursued their objective with unyielding tenacity at the session to the extent that they gave their support to the establishment of a Special Committee to consider the comments and proposals presented by Member States; however, their plan to have the Charter reviewed was thwarted when it became known that a handful of responses were received from countries

---

[273]Ibid.
[274] See Akinterinwa B. A. (2005) "Nigeria and the Permanent Membership of the United Nations Security Council: Dynamics and Definienda," Vantage Publishers Ltd, Ibadan, Nigeria, p. 42. NB Book title in italics, NOT inverted commas!
[275]Ibid.

that had been asked to make comments and present proposals on the Charter (Akinterinwa, 2005). With this stalemate, the three draft resolutions submitted to the Sixth Committee (Legal) noted expressly that the Secretary General inquiry into the review of the Charter which was pursuant to resolution 2697 (XXV) of 1970 have been observed to have received replies from less than quarter of the governments of Member States and that no general trend of opinion in the United Nations can be deduced from these replies, recognizing that a review of the Charter which suffers from popular support would militate against the desired results, that is, the strengthening of the effectiveness of the United Nations itself.[276]

The GA therefore requested the Secretary General to invite Member States that had not already made their position known on the issue to do so and communicate to him, before 1 July 1974, their views with regard to the desirability of a review of the Charter of the UN and their actual suggestions in this respect[277]. The GA further requested the Secretary General to submit to the Assembly at its 29th session scheduled for 1974 a report setting out the views and suggestions of the Member States which have been communicated to him as directed. The GA sitting ended with the decision to include in the provisional agenda of the 29th session an item entitled, "Need to consider suggestions regarding the review of the Charter of the United Nations."[278] Implicit from the above is the fact that the absence of political will on the part of both the great powers and the huge contingent of third world Members states contributed to the failure to review the Charter.

The issue of the Charter review/reform was not considered by the GA at the 1974 session. It had earlier indicated that the issue would be tabled for discussion at the session. Thus, the status quo remained until 1979 when Nigeria and nine fellow Member States of the UN took cognisance of the fact that since the 1963 amendment to the Charter which resulted into the expansion of only the non-permanent membership of the UNSC from 11 to 15, membership of

---

[276]See United Nations General Assembly Document, 2109th Plenary Meeting, 14 December 1972
[277]Ibid
[278]Ibid

the organization had increased significantly from 113 to 152 states. However, it regretted that these changes had not been reflected in the UNSC membership. As a result of the glaring reality, Nigeria and other nine countries consequently in a letter dated 14 November 1979, requested for the inclusion of the "Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council" on the agenda of that session which was at the time ongoing (Akinterinwa, 2005:43).

In the said letter, the statistical breakdown of the global average of one non-permanent seat representation on the UNSC was presented to drive home the point. As it turned out, the global average was put at 14.7 countries, the number of Asian countries represented by one non-permanent seat stood at 18.5 while that of African States was put at 16.3. The Latin American countries had 14, 11 went to Western Europe and other countries and finally 10 for Eastern Europe.[279] As the request was being considered by the General Committee, the United States proposed an amendment that sought to inscribe as part of an agenda item on the Special Committee on the Charter of the UN and on the strengthening of the role of the world body. The amendment suffered rejection afterwards as the General Committee decided the fate of the amendment by 13 votes against 7 in favour, with 3 abstentions on 27 November 1979.[280] The Committee later recommended the inclusion of the request made by Nigeria and others in the GA's current agenda by 19 votes in favour, 5 votes against and 2 abstentions.

This was followed by the GA's acceptance of the Committee's recommendation by a recorded vote of 83 to 14 with 9 countries abstaining on 28 November 1979.[281] In the letter of request, the quest to amend Article 23 of the UN Charter in order to accommodate an increase in membership was expressed in clear terms. Thus, the letter and its sponsors wanted the non-permanent membership seats to be increased from 10 to 14. In this regard, the 14 non-permanent members were to be elected as follows: 4 from Africa; 3 from Asia; 1 from Eastern

---

[279]Akinterinwa B. A. (2005) "Nigeria and the Permanent Membership of the United Nations Security Council: Dynamics and Definienda," Vantage Publishers Ltd, Ibadan, Nigeria, p. 44. Book title in italics!
[280]Ibid.
[281]Ibid.

Europe, 3 from Latin America, 2 from Western Europe and other countries; while 1 seat was to alternate between Africa and Asian States. This proposal was scheduled for ratification by all Member States by 1 September 1981.[282]

The Latin American countries were not left out in the advocacy for review/reform of the Charter as Bolivia, Chile, Columbia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Panama, Peru and Venezuela, submitted an amendment that sought to increase the membership of the UNSC non-permanent seat to 21. In this respect, the Latin American contingents proposed the reconstitution of the UNSC as follows: 16 non-permanent seats, and the retention of the existing 5 permanent seats. By supporting the retention of the P5 club, the Latin group erred in the sense that they further contributed to the hitherto failure of the third world countries to take a popular stance on the issue which as earlier argued, could have helped put pressure on the dominant forces that controls the UN – the P5 to recognize and act in accordance with their request. In order words, apart from the P5 members' albatross in the review/reform process, the role played by the third world countries during these periods was also a contributory factor which helped to retain the Status quo in favour of the P5 'oligarchs'.

The Latin group gave a breakdown of their recommendations as follows: 5 non-permanent seats for Africa, rather than the prior proposed 4; 1 non-permanent to alternate between Latin America and Asia; and another non-permanent seat was to alternate between Eastern, Western European countries and other countries. In any case, 13 affirmative votes would be needed for adoption of decisions. As deliberation progressed on this proposal, India gave a suggestion that the matter should be postponed until the 1980 regular session of the GA because in the words of country's delegation it could no longer be 'pressed' at the session.[283] The Indian suggestion was subsequently adopted by the GA in its decision 34/431 of 14 December, 1979.[284]

---

[282]Ibid.
[283]Ibid.
[284] United Nations General Assembly Official Records 34/431, 14 December, 1979.

From the early 1980s, the "Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters" became a routine subject of discourse on the agenda of the GA although; the matter was during this decade treated without concrete interest at the GA sessions. In 1981, no action was taken on the question of equitable representation on an increase in the membership of the UNSC as many would have expected it to be. Deliberations on this question were postponed until the 1982 GA annual session. Again at the 1982 session, the GA was not forthcoming on the issue of review/reform for the second successive year. The only thing the Assembly did in this respect was to put the item on its 1983 provisional agenda of the 38th annual session on the excuse that "no request for consideration of the matter had been made during the session."[285] Again, this goes to buttress the prior argument made in this chapter that the third world countries were non-enthusiastic about the issue of the review/reform of the Charter otherwise; they would have raised the issue for discussion at the 1981, 1982; and in other subsequent sessions of the GA which followed.

The presidency of the GA during that decade also failed spectacularly in this regard because of the fact that the issues of review/reform had been a pending issue before the GA since 1979 and 1980 hence the issue ought to have been raised for discussion and treated as issues arising from past sessions and not just act on the flimsiest of excuses that the issue was not raised for consideration by any member state hence the decision to table the issue in the plenary sessions. The grave - like silence maintained on the issue was symptomatic of a behind the scene machinations by the powers that be at the UN to kill the review/reform initiative - the fact that the issue was no longer raised at the GA for upward of 7 years; coupled with the general silence of the P5 members on the issue – who ordinarily would not have been silent if the issue concerned all serve as prove. As implied above, the issue was not discussed at the GA sessions from 1981 to 1985.

---

[285] Akinterinwa B. A. (2005) "Nigeria and the Permanent Membership of the United Nations Security Council: Dynamics and Definienda," Vantage Publishers Ltd, Ibadan, Nigeria, p. 45. Book title in italics!

For instance, at the 1983 and 1984 regular session of the GA the issue was not considered at all. However, at the 105th plenary session held on 18 December 1984, the GA in its decision 39/455 put the question of equitable representation on the provisional agenda of its 40th session scheduled for 1985. Even at the 1985 [session?], and subsequent sessions held before the 48th session in 1993, the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the UNSC was not presented for deliberations at the GA (Akinterinwa, 2005). The foregoing discourses show that the review/reform of the UNSC (particularly its permanent membership club) has been elusive over the years because of the institutional landmines which had been set by the unofficial P5 owners of the UN since 1945. Recent opinions on this issue suggests clearly that the composition of the UNSC permanent membership veto club remains the greatest albatross to the actualization of the dreams of those countries seeking the permanency of the SC. As JM Simon observed in 2011: "The UNSC was . . . designed for a very historical reality and is as such not prone to enlargements or democratizations. With the veto power as its main decision-making characteristic, the architecture of the SC doesn't provide any incentive for change. . ."[286] Next to be considered is a general overview of the leading UNSC permanent seats seekers. Who are they? How have they conducted their campaigns and what are their strengths and potential weaknesses as far as the race for permanent membership of the UNSC is concerned?

5.5.1. The G4 Countries and the Quest for the United Nations Security Council Permanent Membership Seat

As indicated above, this section will examine the leading contenders for the UNSC seats across the continents of Asia, Europe and Latin America. In light of this, the section discusses the ambitions of countries such as the Group of four G4: Brazil, Germany, India, and Japan. The

---

[286] See Simon J. M. (2011) "An EU Seat in the Security Council as First Step towards a Democratic Organization of World Security" available online at: http:www.simonlluma.eu/2011/06/an-eu-seat-in-the-security-council-as-first-step-towards-a-democratic-organization-of-world security, p. 2.

strengths and weaknesses that confront the ambitions of these countries will be the subject of our discussion under this section. The approach to the discussion in this section will be a case-by-case one; this is necessary given that the section seeks to provide a discourse of the candidacies of these aspiring countries. The campaign for admission into the permanent membership of the UNSC has been led by global economic powerhouses such as Brazil, Germany, India, and Japan that constitute the G4 countries which agreed mutually to support each other's bids for permanency of the UNSC.

Permanent members of the UNSC such as Britain, France and Russia had hinted that they would support the G4 membership quest for the UNSC however it remains to be seen if they would be able to deliver on their promises given their attitudes to the issue of reform over the years. For each of these G4 countries to succeed in their quest, they would have to ensure that their homework is done properly at the regional and continental levels because the kind of UN reforms they are disposed to have traditionally been opposed by the Uniting for Consensus group which is composed primarily of countries that are regional rivals and economic competitors of the G4 countries. The group is spearheaded by Spain and Italy (opposing Germany), Mexico, Columbia, and Argentina (opposing Brazil), Pakistan (opposing India), and South Korea, and China (opposing Japan). Since 1992, Italy and other members of the group have proposed semi-permanent seats or the expansion of the number of temporary seats rather than create new permanent seats.[287] We begin as earlier mentioned with the discourse of the cases of these countries for SC permanent seats. As mentioned above, each of the G4 countries is discussed below.

Brazil – Brazil is the most populous country in Latin America with a population total of 200.4 million people.[288] Brazil's population is also the fifth largest in the world.[289] In terms of Gross Domestic Product (GDP), Brazil is the 7th largest economy in the world and the largest of the

[287] De Nesnera Andre, "UN Security Council Reform May Shadow Annan's Legacy," *Voice of America*, 2 November 2006.
[288] See World Bank Country Profile on Brazil, available online at: www.worldbank.org/en/country/brazil.
[289] En.wikipedia.org/wiki/List of Countries _by population.

Latin American countries.[290] Brazil featured among the only five countries that rank among the top ten globally in terms of physical size, GDP, and human population – others were Russia, the United States, China, and India – all permanent members of the UNSC except for India, which is a member of the G4.

Moreover, just like Africa and the Oceania, South America is one of the three inhabited continents that lack permanent representation on the Security Council. Brazil has been elected ten times to the Security Council as a non-permanent member. It has an excellent record of troops' contribution to the UN peacekeeping efforts in crisis prone regions of the world such as the Middle East, the former Belgian Congo (now Democratic Republic of Congo), Mozambique, Angola, and Cyprus and more recently in East Timor the Haiti in the Caribbean.[291] Another factor that could work in Brazil's favour is the constant fulfilment of its financial obligations to the UN regular budget.[292]

The candidacy of Brazil has won support from notable world powers even prior to the emergence of the UN. For instance, U.S President Franklin D. Roosevelt lobbied for Brazil to be included in the Security Council, but Britain and the defunct Soviet Union – both veto holders in the UNSC, rejected the idea.[293] The United States government had given the Brazilian candidacy approval albeit without a veto power. This serves as a confirmation of the determination of P5 members to retain the status quo at all cost.[294] In June 2011, the Council on Foreign Relations gave a recommendation stating that the US government should fully endorse the candidacy of Brazil as a permanent member on an enlarged Security Council.[295] In addition to the American

---

[290] Is Brazil Economy Getting Too Hot? Forbes – www.forbes.com/fdc.

[291]"Brazil and the United Nations" Ministry of Foreign Relations of Brazil, www.mre.gov.br, 2009.

[292] See "Regular Budget Payments of Largest Payers," *Global Policy Forum*, 28 June 2009, www.globalpolicy.org.

[293] "Commentary: Brazil Seeking Security," *The National Interest*, 7 July 2010.

[294] Powell: "Brazil Not Developing Nukes" Fox News Channel, available online at: www.origin.foxnews.com, 2009.

[295] Global Brazil and US-Brazil Relations, Council on Foreign Relations, available online at: www.crf.org/brazil/global-brazil-us-brazil-relations/P255407.

endorsement, Brazil has also received the backing of other P5 members such as Britain[296], Russia[297], and France.[298] The British government's approval was unequivocally stated. As Gordon Brown, the then British Prime Minister put it:

> Back in 1946 when the United Nations first met, Brazil made the case for permanent membership of the Security Council of the United Nations. In the past 60 years, this case for permanent membership has grown steadily stronger. So I am proud to come here today to give the British Government's full support for Brazil's permanent membership of the United Nations Security Council.[299]

The fact about these endorsements is that they have hitherto not yielded the desirable results despite Brazil's appreciable credentials for the permanency of the UNSC. The country is however not without its own challenges. The greatest threats to its candidacy have come from the regional oppositions of both Mexico and Argentina, two important and influential countries in Latin America. The Mexican and Argentine opposition to Brazilian candidacy has been attributed to regional rivalries.[300]

Germany – Germany has been one of the most financially committed member states of the UN. It is the third largest contributor to the UN regular budgets next to Japan hence its claims for the Security Council Permanent seat. The country has been elected to the Security Council in a non-permanent membership capacity on three different occasions as a unified state, and also on three occasions when it was divided (twice for the West, and once for the East). The French government has supported the call by Germany for a seat on the UNSC for its fellow EU partner. Germany's bid for the UNSC has, like that of Brazil, also received endorsement from few great

---

[296] "UK Backs Brazil as Permanent Security Member" March 2009, available online at: www.webarchives.nationalarchives.gov.uk, March 2009.
[297] "Putin in Brazil" www.brazzilmag.com/content/view/832/41.
[298] "France and Brazil" Ministry of Foreign Affairs of France.
[299] "UK Backs Brazil as Permanent Security Member" March 2009, available online at: www.webarchives.nationalarchives.gov.uk, March 2009, p. 1.
[300] "Countries Welcome Work Plan as Security Council Reform Process Commences New Phase-Center for UN Reform Education." www.Centerforunreform.org.

powers like France. While delivering a speech in Berlin in 2000, former French President Jacques Chirac said, "Germany's engagement, it ranking as a great power, its international influence – France would like to see them recognized with a permanent seat on the Security Council.[301]" Apart from the French declared support for its bid, the former German Chancellor, Gerhard Schroder, once said that Russia – a veto holding member of the UNSC, was among other countries that have expressed their intention to back the country's bid. A former President of the Philippines Fidel V. Ramos, also expressed his country's support for the German bid, while at the same time lending support to the Japanese bid as well.[302]

However, Germany's bid had faced stiff opposition from European countries like Italy and Netherlands who both suggested a common European Union (EU) seat in the Council rather than Germany becoming the third European member after Britain and France. This proposal was rejected by Germany through its former Minister for foreign affairs Joscka Fischer who said that his country would accept the "common European seat" initiative provided France and Britain relinquished their positions. In the absence of this, the German envoy reckoned that Germany was not ready to shift ground on its demand for permanent representation in the Council. The campaign for Germany's UNSC bid intensified in 2004 with the declaration by Schroder in August 2004 that: "Germany has the right to a seat."[303] Germany's bid is widely supported by countries such as its fellow G4 members – Japan, Brazil; and India. Others are France, Britain, and Russia. The sitting German Chancellor Angela Merkel, who was initially passive about the bid, has since revived her country's campaign for the seat while delivering her address to the UN General Assembly in September 2007. This was followed by state visits by the German Chancellor's to African countries such as Angola, Kenya, and Nigeria in July 2011.

---

[301] "Chirac pushes two-speed Europe." www.news.bbc.co.uk, June 2000.
[302] See, Setsuho I. and Yu-Jose Lydai eds, (2003), Philippinese-Japan Relations. Atenco De Manila University Press. p. 588. NB book title in italics!
[303] "German Hopes for UN Security Council Seat Dampened, www.dw.de, 2004.

The visits were said to be partly motivated by the quest to further internationalize the campaign for Germany's bid for the permanency of the UNSC.[304]

India – India was a founding member of the United Nations in 1945. It is the second most populous country in the world and one of the leading troop contributing countries to UN Peacekeeping missions. The Indian bid like those of other G4 members has also received support from world powers. For instance, the United States President Barrack Obama in supporting India's bid for permanent SC seat opined that India's long history as a leading and regular contributor to the United Nations peacekeeping mission qualifies the country for a seat on the UNSC. India has been elected to the UN Security Council in non-permanent capacity on seven occasions. It most recent election into the UNSC was from 2011 to 2012 when it received a massive 188 votes out of the total 190 votes.[305] Apart from having the second largest concentration of human population on earth, India is also the world's largest liberal democracy; the world's tenth largest economy by nominal GDP and also the third largest purchasing power parity.

Other factors which could count in its favour with regard to the UNSC seat include its status as the world's third largest active armed force. It has emerged that India's bid for the UNSC seat is the first to receive the endorsement of all the P5 members of the SC. Apart from the American nod, India has also received support for its candidacy from Russia, France, Britain, and China. However, in a manner typical of international politics, the Chinese's support for Indian candidacy came with certain conditions. China has expressly stated that for India to secure Beijing's support for its SC bid, India must first revoke its support for Japan's bid for the seat.[306] Despite these massive supports it has garnered for the UNSC seat bid, India still faces major opposition from its neighbour Pakistan who has unrepentantly opposed India's candidacy. Like

---

[304]Allan Odhiambo, "Germany Shops for UN Seat, business in Africa Visit", www.businessdailyafrica.com, 2011.
[305] United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 65th Session, 28th Plenary Meeting, 12 October, 2010, A/65/PV.
[306] Krishman, A. "China Ready to Support Indian Bid for UNSC," Hindu (Chennai, India), www.thehindu.com, July 2011.

the case of fellow G4 member, the India's bid is also opposed on the account of regional rivalry[307]

Japan – Japan joined the United Nations in 1956 as a member; it is the second largest financial contributor to UN's regular budget after the United States.[308] The Japanese financial contribution to the UN outweighs that of 4 out of the P5 member of the SC - China, France, Russia and Britain combined for close to two decades prior to 2010. Japan has also been one of the largest Official Development Assistance donor countries for decades. Japan's meritorious service and support to the UN prompted many Scholars to consider the country to be among the "most obvious" candidates for a new permanent seat (Guzzardi and Mullenback, 2008:46). Despite its excellent credentials for the UNSC seat, China remain the greatest threat to the realization of Japan's ambition; China has stated as indicated above that it would only support India's permanent seat quest on the condition that India distanced itself from Japan's bid. (See the preceding section).

This unarguably is contrary to India's stance since both Japan and India are members of the G4 countries that are synergizing to attain success for their bids. Japan like its fellow G4 members' countries has been elected into the SC for ten terms in non-permanent membership capacity. The United States has shown interest in Japanese bid for the UNSC seat. Former U.S Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice said that the American government supports Japan's candidacy for a permanent seat on UNSC. However, Japan's bid was objected to by her predecessor, Collin Powell, because Article 9 of the Japanese constitution disallows the country from going to war unless in self-defense.[309] Like its fellow G4 members, Japan's bids also faces perhaps the stiffest opposition from its neighbours, notably South Korea and China. These oppositions are rooted in deep historical discord. In fact China has already announced that it will block permanent

---

[307] "Countries Welcome Work Plan as Security Council Reform Process Commences New Phase" Center For UN Reform, www.centerforunreform.org, February 2009.
[308] Assessed Contributions of Member States to the Regular Budget of the United Nations, www.nationsencyclopedia.com.
[309] Koizumi: No Shift in Article 9, Globalpolicy.org, August 2004.

membership for Japan using its veto power.**[310]** Having considered the leading contenders for the UNSC across the continents of Latin American, Asia and Europe, the next section will examine the African case for a UNSC permanent membership by looking at the individual contenders.

5.5.2. The African Case for the United Nations Security Council Permanent Seats

Although the calls for African representation on the Security Council (SC) in permanent capacity has gone on for 20 years, these calls have intensified significantly in the last five years at different diplomatic forums - the most important being at the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA). Beginning from the mid-2000s when the UN *"Report of the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change"* – submitted its report Africa as a continent had repeatedly and ceaselessly canvassed for permanent seats on an enlarged SC. On 24 September 2010, African leaders called on the United Nations (UN) to give the continent a permanent seat on the SC, regretting that 65 years after its creation, the world governing body remains entangled in the legacy of the past. At the 65th regular session of the General Assembly (GA) Nigeria's President Goodluck Jonathan whose country is also a contender, declared that the continued exclusion of Africa from the permanent membership category of the SC can no longer be justified in the 21st century, he told the GA on the second day of its annual debate.

The Nigerian leader urged the UN to expedite action on its reforms plans in order to heal the wounds of injustice meted out on the continent in this regard. He added that such reform should not only reflect the current global realities but that it should also ensure that it enjoys genuine legitimacy.[311] Suffice to say that Nigeria's support for African representation on the UNSC predates the period in question. According to Osuntokun (2005), Nigeria had since the early 1990s when the idea of an African country on the UNSC was first mooted thrown its

---

[310] See J. Paul and C. Nahory (2005) "Towards a Democratic Reform of the UNSC." Global Policy Forum, July 13, available online at: https://www.globalpolicy.org/security/41131.html.

[311] See African Leaders Call for Permanent Security Council Seat for the Continent, UN News Centre, available online at: www.un.org.

weight behind the proposed reform. As the 20th century winds up the Nigerian government reiterated its support for the SC restructuring. As General Abdulsalami Abubakar, Nigeria's Head of State (1998-99) noted at a lecture in 1999: "in particular, we have always stressed the need to reflect the global demand for democracy in the composition of the UN Security Council as the UN organ charged with the responsibility for the maintenance of global security."[312]

Thereafter, Abubakar made a case for African permanent representation on the SC, "we are equally firm in our conviction that Africa requires stronger representation in this important body.[313] Presidents Abdoulaye Wade of Senegal and Ali Bongo of Gabon also called for African representation on the SC at the 65th session of the GA in 2010. Mr. Wade Submitted: "To maintain at all costs the status quo is to turn ones' back on the radical changes in the state of the world and at the same time to expose the Council to more mistrust, more defiance and more criticism."[314] He berated the subservient role the GA continues to play to the SC noting that while the SC resolutions are legally binding on all member states, those of the GA are not thus making the GA less influential.

The then Senegalese President thereafter requested that prompt action be taken to address the imbalance. He said: "it is to end this anomaly and right a historical injustice that Senegal has propose, independent of current reforms that will take time, that our continent be granted a permanent seat with the veto right."[315] President Wade stated further that the SC permanent club as constituted is an expression of national interests rather than global interests. He put it thus, "if the numerous Council decisions are today questioned and their execution deficient, it is because they are perceived by the great majority of Members States more as the expression

---

[312] See "Nigeria's Foreign Policy in a Changing World" An Address delivered at the Annual Patron's Dinner by General Abdulsalami Abubakar, Nigeria's Head of State, December 12, 1998, Abuja, Nigeria, p. 8.
[313] Ibid
[314] Ibid., p. 3.
[315] Ibid.

of national interests than the transmission of a mandate in the name of the of the community of nations."[316] This was an honest statement by this African leader.

Similarly, Gabonese President Bongo called on the UN to adapt quickly to the changed international context and system. He echoed the sentiments expressed by his Senegalese counterpart by reaffirming the need for Africa to assume its rightful position among the comity of nations and on the biggest stage of them all – the SC. President Bongo said, "At a time when the democratization of world governance is a necessity, I wish to reaffirm from this tribune the aspirations of Africa to fully occupy its place in the concert of nations."[317] He added by saying, "it seems to me the time has come for Africa not only to have a permanent seat on the Security Council but also to assume the full breadth of its responsibilities as a fully recognized actor on the international scene."[318]

The Namibian President Hifikepunye Pohamba also lent his voice to the chorus of African leaders at the 65th session when he argued that a comprehensive reform of the UN would make it "more representative, democratic and accountable"[319] President Pohamba joined his African colleagues to lament the continued marginalization of the African continent on the SC. He continued: "It is unjust that Africa remains the only region in the world without permanent representation on the Security Council."[320] The Prime Minister of Togo Gilbert Fossoun Houngbo also added his voice to the call made by his fellow brothers.

At the 68th regular session of the United Nations General Assembly in 2013, the quest for the expansion of the Security Council which would reflect a more balanced and regionally equitable representation, especially regarding the continent of Africa, gained popular support among delegates as the General Assembly ended its debate session. Although this call had existed for upward of two decades, the African case for the SC was revived and featured prominently at

---

[316] Ibid, p. 3.
[317] Ibid. p. 4.
[318] Ibid.
[319] Ibid.
[320] Ibid.

the 68th regular General Assembly session debates. The Rwandan delegation opined that the responsibility to protect the world's citizen should not be held captive by the UNSC permanent five members. African negotiations for reform had lingered fruitlessly causing some to become doubtful about the possibility of attaining this reform in their lifetime as the issue of the UN reform had been left unattended to since the mid – 2000s; while implementation of the various proposals on the reforms remain unimplemented.

Speaking on behalf of his country, Eugune–Richard Gasana, Rwanda's permanent representative to the United Nations said that the monopolization of the responsibility to protect by the P5 contributed to the SC's failure to prevent the genocide in his country in 1994 adding that it was unfortunate to observe that the perpetrators of the genocide - which abundantly constitutes a crime against humanity were still moving freely in the Democratic Republic of Congo. The Rwandan UN ambassador observed with profuse regret that the SC had never thought it worthwhile to hold the UN missions which it had established to account for their roles in Rwanda. The Rwandan delegation thus held the view that reform should be implemented by 2015.[321]

The Botswana delegation led by Nkoloi Nkoloi, Botswana's Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations said it is simply illogical and indefensible that Africa continues to remain the only unrepresented region in a body whose legitimacy and strength must derive from the totality of its membership. The Botswana deputy representative to the UN observed that, "While all regions of the world are represented and have a footprint in the Council, Africa is still relegated to the back bench with no voice, no power and no presence to influence key decisions of this powerful institution."[322] The delegation canvassed for an all-inclusive reform that should accommodate the following: regional representation, membership categories, the size of the enlarged Council, its working methods and the veto question. Botswana aligned itself

---

[321] United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 68th Plenary Meetings 48th and 49th, GA/11451, 8 November 2013.
[322] Ibid.

with the statement presented on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and reiterated the African position, adding that the latter proposed expanding both categories of membership. Africa also considered the veto question as divisive, exclusive and subject to reckless abuse by the veto-holding powers. The delegation concluded by stating that a review of the Charter should consider the abolition of the veto power, warning that if this is not done, Africa and the new permanent members must also be accorded the veto right without exception.[323]

Equatorial Guinea's permanent representative to the UN, Anatolio Ngong Mba, said at the session that discussion on reform had gone on for decades and that the time had come to recognize the right of countries in all regions to be represented on the SC. He noted that Africa had more Member States than any region hence it had a right to a permanent membership seat. He further observed that today's world was clearly different from the one which existed at the founding of the United Nations in mid 1940s, adding that the present realities should be allowed to shape the Organization's organs – particularly the SC. He reckoned that it was inconceivable that a continent like Africa, with a huge human population of 1 billion continues to lack the much needed representation on the SC. He concluded stating that Africa's permanent membership must become a tangible reality.[324]

The Permanent Representative of Algeria to the UN, Mourad Benmehidi, aligned himself with the African Group by stating that it was time for the powers that be at the UN to allow for reform of the SC, calling on members to increase transparency and allow better interaction with the general UN membership. The South African delegation at the session emphasized that the need for reform had been made more urgent by the present international crises which called into question the SC's ability to deliver on its mandate to maintain international peace and security. Speaking on behalf of the delegation, the deputy permanent representative of the country to the UN Doctor Mashabane observed with regrets that over many years, the open dialogue on the SC reform had produced nothing concrete. He said it was ironic that those who

---

[323] Ibid.
[324] Ibid.

considered themselves to be leaders of the free world felt comfortable sitting in such an undemocratic and lopsided structure. He added that the status quo cannot be maintained, especially when African States wanted an expansion of both membership categories. He submitted that those that opposed reform were on the wrong side of history. Warning that failure to adopt a way forward would jeopardize the SC's credibility. He added that the SC reform would be beneficial to all regions.[325]

The Secretary of the permanent mission of the republic of Mauritius to the UN, Tarunjai Reetoo, spoke on behalf of the Mauritanian delegation at the session. He joined the African leaders and ambassadors to call for comprehensive reforms that would uphold the principles, ideals and objectives of the UN as enshrined in its Charter. Mauritius gave support to the "L. 69" group's proposal because it was in line with the African Ezulwini Consensus and the Sirte Declaration on the SC reforms. The "Ezulwini consensus" is a position on international relations and reform of the UN, agreed by several African governments. The consensus was made in Ezulwini Swaziland in 2005.[326] The "L. 69" group's membership is constituted by 41 countries from America, Africa, and the Latin America working with the shared belief that the expansion of both categories of the SC would be reflective of the realities of today world which would help attain a more "accountable, representative, and transparent Security Council."[327] The group proposed extending the SC to 25/26 seats, with permanent members enjoying the same status as the existing permanent members, including the power of Veto. The "L. 69" group's proposal is belief to be in line with the Ezulwini African consensus on the SC reforms.

The Mauritanian delegation also supported the call for the extension of the veto right to new permanent members as long as the P5 members had the right of veto. The Sudanese representative at the session Abuzied Shamseldim Ahmed noted with regret that the reform of the SC had continued for 20 years without appreciable progress in five agreed key areas. He

---

[325] Ibid.
[326] En.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ezulwini_Consensus#cite_note_11NOR-1.
[327] See Kirsten Schlosser. (2012). "The Report on Security Council Reform Meeting" 13 March 2012, available online at: www.centerforreform.org/?=node/480.

observed that the bulk of issues on the SC agenda involved Africa hence the continent deserved permanency on a Council where issues that affects the security of its people are discussed. The delegation gave support to the African position on the reform, which was the aspiration of the whole continent. There were also statements from representatives of Croatia, Dominican Republic, Malta, Slovenia, Algeria, Peru, Cyrus, New Zealand, Ireland, Cuba, Serbia, Bhutan, Solomon Islands, Finland, Jamaica, Latvia, Guatemala, Bulgaria, Montenegro, Georgia, Slovakia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Suriname, El Salvador, Iraq, Iran, Papua New Guinea spoke on (behalf of the Pacific Small Island Developing States) and Chile.[328] The African case for a place on the SC also got support from the Middle East as Saudi Arabia's representative requested more permanent seats for the Arab and African States and other representatively disadvantaged regions, while the representative of Trinidad and Tobago supported the position taken by African countries as outlined in the Ezulwini Consensus. (See the preceding paragraph). The Next sub-section examines the major contenders for the UNSC seat in Africa.

5.5.3. The African Contenders for the United Nations Security Council Permanent Seat

The preceding section examined the African case for the UNSC seat in the last five years and the intensity with which those calls were made. In this sub-section, we shall briefly examine the major contenders for the UNSC seats in Africa having earlier discussed the candidacies of other leading contenders across the world. Since Nigeria's case with regard to the country's bid for UNSC permanency cannot be considered in isolation, it behooves this study to conduct a discursive survey of the country's continental main challengers for the UNSC seat before moving on to examine the implications of Nigeria's past antecedents (as analyzed in the last chapter) for its contemporary political ambitions. A couple of African countries had since signaled their interest to contest for the proposed two slots which had been allotted to the continent. The criteria which had been set for the aspiring nations for the UNSC from Africa as contained in the Report on UN Reforms indicates that some of the African candidates put

---

[328] See African Leaders Call for Permanent Security Council Seat for the Continent, UN News Centre, available online at: www.un.org.

forward in the past decade are better qualified than others on the basis of what they have done for the continent. Although there are other factors which will count against some of them when the decision time comes on the issue, this makes the case of Nigeria interesting.

The Report on UN Reforms listed the following criteria for UNSC membership:

a) **Contribution to the promotion of peace, security and stability in Africa** – in the UN's assessments of present troop contributions for peacekeeping efforts, Nigeria is ranked 7th, South Africa 10th, Senegal 12th, Kenya 13th and Egypt 59th.[329] The demographic factor played a pivotal role in Nigeria being ranked ahead of other African countries in this regard. These countries have all played critical roles in advancing and maintaining peace and security in their respective regions. For South Africa, its record in promoting peace on the African continent has been impressive since its re-integration into the international system after decades of apartheid holocaust. Since 1994 the Southern African country has played leading roles to help restore peace in violence stricken African countries such as Burundi, Democratic Republic of the Congo, and most recently in Ivory Coast, Sudan and Central African Republic. Nigeria has also performed outstandingly well in this regard perhaps more than any of its rivals for the UNSC. It spent well over $12 billion and lost over 1,000 soldiers in 12 years of ECOWAS peacekeeping operations, particularly in the war-ravaged Liberia and Sierra Leone. The bulk of the ECOMOG troops which was put around 70% and funds used in carrying out the operations were provided by Nigeria.[330] Nigeria's role also helped to reverse a coup in Sao Tome in 2003 and its troops led the AU operations in Darfur to help restore peace to the troubled Sudanese region. Nigeria contributed the largest troops to the Darfur intervention, making it the largest troop contributor to the operations.[331] Kenya also

[329] See Wafula. O. Africa and the UN Security Council Permanent Seats, April 2005, available online at: http://pambazuka.org/en/category/aumonitor/27913.
[330] See the *Punch Nigerian Newspaper Editorial,* August 25, 2004, p. 16.
[331] Ajayi K. "Seeking Equality in an Equal World: Nigeria and the Permanent Security Council Seat Aspiration. 22nd Inaugural Lecture, University of Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria, 12 January, 2010.

has a good record because it's helped play a pivotal role in ending Sudan's 21-year north-south civil war, the longest running African conflict. The peace efforts in Somalia have been maintained through Kenya's support as host to the peace talks and negotiations that would help resolve the conflict amicably between the warring parties.

Kenya has called for these achievements it has recorded in the East Africa region to be recognized and adequately rewarded with a permanent seat on the UNSC. Chirau Ali Mwakwere, Foreign Minister of Kenya (2004-2005) said this, adding that his county has also contributed to the peacekeeping efforts worldwide under the auspices of the UN.[332] Egypt on its part has been a major stabilizing factor in the Arab world and the Middle East but it has not done as much for Africa when compared to other black African countries discussed above. Egypt is geographically located in Africa but racially and politically aligned with the Arab/Middle East. One factor that could count in its favour in the race for the African seat on the UNSC is its strategic interest to the west particularly to the United States – the most influential member of the UNSC P5. Although the current political crisis, disturbances and grave human rights infractions - as typified by the imprisonment of three Aljazeera journalists Mohammed Fahmy, Peter Greste and Baher Mohammed who had spent 341 days as at the time of writing this dissertation may have reduced the country's chances significantly to be a contender.[333]

All contenders have undoubtedly contributed positively to African causes particularly in promoting peace and stability on the African continent. Nigeria, South Africa and Kenya have performed brilliantly in this regard. These countries have also contributed impressively to the preservation of African values and Ideals. But the same cannot be said about the case of Egypt. In fact the Egyptian candidacy raises a lot of fundamental questions as to the country's suitability to truly represent Africa on a Council that shapes global affairs. As Wafula Okumu, an *African Affairs analyst* noted in 2005, ". . . were it not for Egypt's interests in the Security

---

[332] See Wafula. O. Africa and the UN Security Council Permanent Seats, April 2005, available online at: http://pambazuka.org/en/category/aumonitor/27913.

[333] www.aljazeera.com/news/middleeast.

Council permanent seat, President Hosni Mubarak would never have attended an AU Submit . . . many Africans recent how Egyptians regard themselves as being "non-Africans."[334] The implication of this statement is that Egypt will be more representative of the Arab/ Middle East than black Africa if given one of the African slots for the UNSC. On the other hand, Nigeria, South Africa and Libya have all played impressive roles in the promotion of pan-Africanist ideals, as enshrined in the Conference on Security, Stability, Development and Cooperation in Africa (CSSDCA), as well as in the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) and in the continental body itself – the African Union (AU). Libya has a good case to represent Africa going by it record in fostering continental unity. However, the current political situation following the assassination of Colonel Gaddafi raises some questions. Kenya has provided shelter to refuges from war-torn countries of Africa such as Somalia and even temporarily hosted the government of Somalia.[335]

 b) Financial Contributions to the UN – Fulfilment of financial obligations to the UN forms an integral part of the criteria/requirements which aspiring African countries must meet if they are to succeed in their quests for the UNSC permanent seat. The strength of membership is assessed against the background of the capacity to pay as and when the payment is due. Nonetheless, payments are often not made to time as a couple of African countries are known for late remittance of their dues to the UN. South Africa and Egypt rank among the regular payers of their dues to the UN. As established by the UN Financial Regulations Rule 5.4 since 1996, South Africa has impressively maintained consistency in the payment of its UN membership fees.[336] Libya, Senegal and Nigeria also pay their dues to the UN's regular budget albeit often late. Nigeria on its part has always paid late, while Kenya has been chronically

---

[334] Ibid, p. 5.
[335] Ibid.
[336] Ibid.

delinquent in the fulfilment of its financial obligations to the world body.[337] These are some of the factors that will either support or reduce support for the individual contenders.

c) Financial Capability – Although not listed amongst the UN criteria/requirement, financial capability will undoubtedly be a major factor in deciding the selection of new members for the permanency of the Security Council. In light of this, all the leading African Countries for the seats might find themselves in a dilemma because it is expected of a country to be active and productive as a permanent member of the SC. To this end, African contenders have a huge task ahead of them. The financial resources needed to run a full permanent representation on the SC to match the other P5 members are enormous.[338] As at present, no African country fits the bill as the continent still remain the highest aids/grants receiving continent on planet. In a 2010 study published by the UN, *Aid to Africa,* it was reported that Africa receives the highest aid grant of all the continents in the world, the report said, The report stated: "Africa receives a greater share, at 36%, of total global aid than any other part of the world, Over the past four decades, aid to Africa has quadrupled from around US$11 billion to US$ 44 billion, with a net worth of almost US$10 billion during the period 2005-2005 alone."[339] This speaks volumes about Africa's capacity to live up to expectation in financial terms should the continent secure representation on the SC. Conclusively, while African permanent representation on the SC is desirable and deserving, advocates of this ambition must come to terms with the prevailing realities in their respective domains and address them accordingly in order to brighten the continent's prospects. The three major contenders that have since emerged are Egypt, South Africa and Nigeria. Although the AU is yet to pick its candidates for the SC seat but going by popular consensus opinion, it is believed that two out of these countries will be selected to represent Africa. The next section will examine the implications of Nigeria's roles in African decolonization issues in the UN for its contemporary political ambitions.

---

[337] Ibid.
[338] Ibid.
[339] See "Aid to Africa" Policy Brief No. 1, October 2010, Published by the UN, available online at: www.un.org/africa/osaa/report/2010_Aidbrief. PDF.

5.6. Contemporary Implications of Nigeria's Roles in African Decolonization for Security Council Permanent Membership Bid: Prospects and Challenges

The present section critiques Nigeria's UNSC ambition within the context of the country's antecedents in the decolonization struggle in Africa as discussed above. The chapter seeks to establish a linkage in the contemporary sense between Nigeria's leadership roles in the decolonization of Africa and the country's desire to become one of Africa's permanent representatives on the SC. If the roles played by Nigeria during the course of the 20th century in the decolonization of Africa are truly a function of its leadership abilities as the Nigerian past and present leaders, diplomats and even authors have argued, the question then becomes: have these leadership abilities which Nigeria projects in order to secure regional, continental and global supports impacted positively on the socio-political and economic life of the country?

Have Nigerian leaders who continue to seek a permanent seat for the country on the SC been able to replicate the leadership virtues they are projecting to the world on the domestic front? On the other hand, what are the implications of Nigeria's roles in African decolonization for its contemporary quest to get a permanent seat for itself on an enlarged UNSC? Do these roles suggest Nigeria will be truly representative of Africa and Africans interests on the SC going by its antecedents? In the search for a UNSC permanent seat Nigeria has been moved by the conviction that "no single African nation has done as much as Nigeria for Africa and the Africans.[340]" Another conciction is that "Nigeria has more than paid its dues to Africa and Africans.[341]" These facts constitute the positive implications for Nigeria in its quest for glory in global politics. In view of the above, the next two sub sections will examine the prospects and challenges which Nigeria faces in respect to the issues enumerated above.

---

[340] See "The Search For A UN Security Council Permanent Seat – A Case For Nigeria," Text of a Speech by His Excellency, Dr. Abdullahi Adamu, Executive Governor of Nasarawa State, Nigeria at the Public Presentation of a Book on President Olusegun Obasanjo at Accra – Ghana, Saturday, August 13, 2005, p. 4.
[341] Ibid. p. 4.

5.6.1. Prospects

There are contemporary implications of Nigeria's roles in African decolonization issues for the country's quest for a permanent membership seat on the UNSC. In light of this, the present sub-section discusses the challenges and prospects for the country's political ambition. Suffice it to say that Nigeria's bid for the UNSC has drawn part of its strength from its unmatchable records at least by any African country in the struggle against colonialism and racism in Africa. If there is a major factor that puts Nigeria ahead of other African leading contenders for the UNSC seat, it will definitely be its undeniable accomplishments in the service to the Black component of humanity. The country played an outstanding leadership role on the colonial issues over a period of 30 years in the United Nations which justified its claim to continental leadership.

The consistencies of Nigeria's articulation of the colonial situation in Africa on the platform of the world body and the sacrifices which went with it will have positive implications for the country's ambition regarding global politics should the AU decide to ask contenders to present their scorecards in the service to Africa. It is simply a case of asking each aspiring African country for the permanent SC seat what they have done for Africa. As discussed in the previous chapters, after the attainment of political independence from Britain in 1960, Nigeria, motivated by the desire to play a dominant leadership role in African affairs (see chapters 3) swung into action to assert and to establish itself as Africa's most influential country throughout the colonial age.

As early as January 1960, ten months prior to its independence, Prime Minister Abubakar Tafawa Balewa had told the national parliament that the country would have a "wonderful opportunity to speak for Africa at the United Nations."[342] The role Nigeria played during the struggle against colonialism in Africa is indicative of the roles it will play if selected as one of Africa's representatives on an enlarged UNSC. Its assertiveness, boldness, unintimidating

---

[342] Cited by Aluko O. (1976) Ghana and Nigeria, 1957-1970, A Study In Inter-African Discord, Rex Collings Ltd, London, p. 74. NB book title in italics!

presence and the ability to stand up against extra - continental forces when the issue at stake revolves around the destiny and interests of black people is second to none in the annals of African history. There is supportive evidence to this claim and the sacrifices that went with Nigeria's roles during the struggle against the forces of colonialism on the continent. For instance, Joseph Garba, Nigeria's Foreign Affairs Minister (1975-1979) and the President of the UN General Assembly (1989-1990) once said: "Nigeria . . . made enemies of erstwhile friends – all on account of their attitude towards the South Africa question. We have formulated economic policies that have sometimes been detrimental to our own development because of our commitment to the eradication of apartheid."[343]

Minister Garba was also quoted to have authoritatively stated that "Nigeria had lost an estimated $45billion over 15 years for refusing to export oil to South Africa."[344] This was part of the measures taken to put pressure on the apartheid regime. The forgoing therefore attests to Nigeria's competence and political will to defend the interests of fellow Africans with unwavering commitment and unyielding tenacity when the occasion calls for it. This was the case during the decades - long struggle against colonial subjugation (See chapter 3). Thus, for Africa to have a robust representation on the UNSC, the AU member states should insist on having one of their own. Such a candidate must have distinguished itself in defending the cause of the black man even at the risk of nuclear attack threat from the defunct apartheid regime of South Africa's President P. W. Botha who felt that the only way to silence Nigeria's vehement voice against the apartheid system was to destabilize the country militarily.

As a matter of fact, the P.W. Botha's apartheid Presidency (1984-1989) attempted to execute this plan when he wooed Equatorial Guinea to provide South Africa with a strategic military location where it could launch attacks into the Nigerian territory. Nigeria's government

---

[343] Garba J. N. (1987) Diplomatic Soldering, The Conduct Of Nigerian Foreign Policy, 1975-1979, Spectrum Books Ltd, Ibadan, Nigeria, p. 101.
[344] See "Nigeria – South Africa Baseline Study," Brief No 44, September 2013, Open Society Foundation For Africa, South African Foreign Policy Initiative, (SAFPI), p. 11.

responded to this threat to its national security promptly without pulling out of the struggle against apartheid as Botha and his comrades would have loved. The Nigerian government exerted pressures on the government of Equatorial Guinea to severe the cozy relationship with South Africa. The pressure was sustained until it yielded the desired result that forced President Obiang Mbasogo to expel the South Africans from his country. With the apartheid military presence in Equatorial Guinea dismantled, the Nigerian Head of State General Ibrahim Babangida paid a two-day official visit to the Equatorial Guinea in June 1988 to signal the restoration of cordial bilateral relations (Fawole 2003:166). Nigeria under the Babangida regime (1985-19930 also gave financial assistance to the frontline states in Southern Africa to help them repair the damage inflicted on them by the South African apartheid security forces which invaded their territories in search of freedom fights and ANC sympathizers.[345]

The foregoing clearly shows that Nigeria has never shied away from defending and upholding the interests of fellow Africans even in the face of adversity. Thus, going by experience and its records, no other country in Africa is deserving of that seat than Nigeria. The mechanisms that the AU will leverage on to elect/select its representatives for the available two slots for Africa on the SC must consider this leadership virtue in the choice of candidates that will represent Africa. To restore the dignity of the black man, Nigeria left no stone unturned. According to Akinjide Osuntokun, Nigeria ". . . sacrificed the good will of the West and economic development in order to see to the total liberation of Africa."[346] The nationalization of the British Petroleum, the Barclays Bank and other British economic interests in Nigeria in the late 1970s (see chapter 4) shocked not only Britain – Nigeria's former colonial master but also a large population of Nigerians who considered it unthinkable that Nigeria would move against

---

[345] Sani S. (2012), "Nigeria's Foreign Policy, Globalization and National Security," in Review of Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Issues and Perspectives, E. Anyaoku (ed), Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos, Nigeria.
[346] See Osuntokun A. (2005) "Nigeria and the United Nations: Service Deserves Its Rewards," in Nigeria and the United Nations Security Council, B. A. Akinterinwa ed, Vantage Publishers, Ibadan, Nigeria, p.239. NB book titles in italics!

Britain with such venom just because Margret Thatcher led British government of the time delayed in granting independence to Rhodesia (Now Zimbabwe).

In the case of South Africa, Nigeria applied measures that were aimed at putting pressure on the apartheid regime of Pretoria to change its racial policies. As Bola Akinterinwa noted,

> Nigeria under General Obasanjo as Head of State, directed all Nigerian diplomatic missions abroad not to issue to any holder of South African passport in which there was a South African visa. In the strategic calculations of the Nigerian government, any visitor or traveler to South Africa could not but have interests that were likely to be inimical to those of Nigeria in South Africa. Consequently, the friends of South Africa were not wanted in Nigeria.[347]

As earlier argued, it will be of immense benefit for African states if their choice of representatives on an enlarged SC is assessed against this background. If this is done, the above holds a positive implication for Nigeria's candidacy with regard to the SC seat. Another positive implication of Nigeria's role in African decolonization for its UNSC seat ambition lie in the promotion of articles 1-5 of the UN Charter on Human Rights which states that human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights, entitled to all rights and freedom, shall not be held in slavery or servitude, and above all shall not be subjected to torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. The Articles also forbid discrimination of human beings on the basis of their colour, nationality, creed, origin, sex, etc. [348] Nigeria played a key role in the promotion of these principles as enshrined in the UN Articles during the struggle against

---

[347] See Akinterinwa B. A. (2005) "Nigeria and the Permanent Membership of the United Nations Security Council: Dynamics and Definienda" in Nigeria and the United Nations Security Council, B.A. Akinterinwa ed, Vantage Publishers, Ibadan, Nigeria, pp. 71-72. NB Book titles in italics!
[348] See the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, available online at: www.ohchr.org/en/udhr/document/udhr/translations/eng.pdf.

colonialism and racism in Africa. This commitment was captured in the inaugural address of President Shehu Shagari in 1979 thus:

> . . . Also it is our national will that Africa shall be free, free of racial bigotry, free of oppression, and free from the vestiges of colonialism. My government is determined to see the cause of justice and human decency prevail in Namibia, Zimbabwe, and South Africa. We shall continue to support all forces of progress and oppose all forces of oppression in Africa and elsewhere. I hereby reaffirm our faith and support for the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. . .[349]

In respect of the above, Nigeria has done creditably well to help promote and uphold one of the basic principles upon which the UN system is founded as pledged by Nigerian Prime Minister Balewa upon the country's admission into the organization in October 1960 that: "We are committed to uphold the principles upon which the United Nations Organization is founded."[350] In conclusion, the section has discussed positive implications of Nigeria's role in African decolonization for its case for the UNSC seat. It has established a linkage between the roles played on the colonial issues in the UN and the contemporary desire to represent African in a permanent capacity on the UNSC. The above discursion demonstrate Nigeria's capacity and strength of character over a period of 30 years in the struggle against colonialism on the continent which implies that if given the opportunity to serve Africa, the country has the potentials to advance, and protect the interest of Africa on the global stage. The next section addresses the issues that may cost the country this opportunity.

---

[349] Cited by Sani S. (2012), "Nigeria's Foreign Policy, Globalization and National Security," in Review of Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Issues and Perspectives, E. Anyaoku (ed), Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos, Nigeria, pp. 70-71. NB book titles in Italics!

[350] See Mr Prime Minister, A Selection of Speeches Made by Alhaji (Sir) Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Prime Minister of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1960-1966, Nigerian National Press Ltd, Apapa, Lagos, Nigeria, 1964, p. 51.

5.6.2. Challenges

The preceding section examined the positive implications of Nigeria's role in African decolonization issues in the UN for the country's contemporary political ambition with regard to the UNSC. Here, we shall examine the factors that threaten Nigeria's ambitions. In considering these issues, there is a need to understand what the phrase "Domestic Condition" stands for before beginning with the discussion. This phrase was used by Ambassador Olu Sanu to explain the dilemma of the Nigerian State in the race for UNSC seat. The domestic condition according to the Nigerian diplomat refers to the socio-political and economic realities on the home front which does not portray the country as a serious contender for the UNSC seat.

These realities dictate that Nigeria must first of all put its house in order and concentrate inwardly to develop the country. He submitted that the country's leadership and its foreign policy machinery should not ignore this factor which will weigh heavily in the minds of members of the UN when the additional seat for Africa comes under consideration. Ambassador Sanu recalled that it was this factor that robbed Chief S.O. Adebo of the UN Secretary General position despite being seen as the most qualified candidate for the job.[351] These factors will be considered under this section in order to establish the fact that Nigeria's greatest credentials lie not in its records of service to the African cause but in the combination of that record with appreciable domestic condition. What then are these prevailing domestic conditions? The following section seeks to provide this question with answers.

Corruption Pandemic – If there is any factor that will stand in Nigeria's way to becoming a permanent member of the UNSC, it is corruption. Corruption is the greatest evil that has bedeviled Nigeria since independence. It was corruption which birthed all the socio- political and economic problems that have faced Nigeria for the better part of it post-colonial life. That Nigeria is where it is today in terms of development is largely due to absence of financial probity, accountability, moral uprightness and sacrificial political leadership in the country's. As

---

[351] See The Nigerian Guardian Newspaper, September 22, 1997.

a result, the country has repeatedly failed to demonstrate moral leadership due to lack of political will. Corruption has become the most talked about topic about Nigeria in recent times. According to Ire Omo - Bare: "No discussion of Nigeria can be complete without, at least, a brief mention of the problem of corruption."[352] This underscores the pandemic nature of the problem which has become worrisome to many patriotic citizens of the country who have ceaselessly lamented the country's degeneration into this infamy. Pat Utomi, A Professor of Political Economy and Management Expert, described the Nigerian system as "an extremely corrupt system".[353] He noted regrettably that this has impeded the country's growth in every aspect of its national life.

The corruption pandemic in Nigeria has a devastating effect on the country. According to former Vice President of the World Bank and a two-time Nigerian Minister, Obiageli Ezekwesili, corruption was largely responsible for Nigeria's stunted growth when compared to its peers across the world. She observed that several countries rated along with Nigeria in the 1960s as third world countries have made tremendous progress in transforming from the third world position into a first world because of the efforts made to develop those countries. The former Nigerian Minister noted that Nigeria lost a staggering $600 billion in the last five decades to corruption in governmental circles, as she puts it, . . . "our country has earned more than $600billion in the last five decades and yet can only boast of a United Nations Human Development Index score of 2 out of 1 proximate to that of Chad and maternal mortality rate similar to that of Afghanistan. Nothing reveals the depth of our failures than such performance indicators considering the vastly greater possibilities that we have been bestowed."[354] She also observed that the country was rated number 32 on countries with high corruption index, adding that the rating was as a result of the systemic corruption in Nigeria which continues to fester.

---

[352] See I. Omo – Bare, "The Democratic Transition in Nigeria," apcentral.collegeboard.com.
[353] See Punch Nigerian Newspaper 29, October 2014, available online at: www.punchng.com.
[354] See Punch Nigerian Newspaper, March 6, 2014, available online at: www.punchng.com.

In his inaugural lecture in 2010, Kunle Ajayi, a Professor of International Relations, noted that corruption could cost Nigeria the SC seat. He argued that the epidemiology of corruption in the country is such that no institution of state is immune from the corruption virus. With regard to a SC seat for Nigeria, he said that the country leaders would have to first of all address the image problem because "corruption is one of the factors affecting Nigeria's image abroad."[355] Some Nigerian scholars' have also observed the corruption trend in Nigeria and concluded that the country's leaders are to blame for the rots and Nigeria's descent into infamy. James, C. and Agazie, James argued persuasively in their 2013 article on corruption in Nigeria thus:

> If you judge African nations by the degree of corruption that goes on at both the governmental and local levels, Nigeria has no equal. To say that there is no corruption in Nigeria is to make an irresponsible statement, despite glaring evidence to the contrary. Pejoratives abound in every discussion about Nigeria which is considered to be the so – called "Epitome of African corruption."[356]

The authors' sentiments are faultless going by the prevailing situation in that country. The burdensome truth is that Corruption walks naked in Nigeria and the political leadership in Nigeria itself is deeply enmeshed in that practice. There is recent evidence to support this claim. For instance, the incumbent Nigerian government led by President Jonathan has perhaps surpassed the ignoble corruption record which was inherited from the past Nigerian governments as proven treasury looters of Nigeria's commonwealth have been awarded national honours as "outstanding promoters of unity, patriotism and national development." The case of former Nigeria's military dictator and Head of State late General Sani Abacha 1993-1998 is offers a cursory example. The Nigeria government gave him a posthumous centenary

---

[355] See Ajayi K. (2010), "Seeking Equality in An Unequal World: Nigeria and the Permanent Security Council Seat Aspiration," University of Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria, 22nd Inaugural Lecture, 12 January 2010.
[356] See James C. and Agazie, J (2013), "Nigeria Has the Most Outrageous Corruption – Leaders To Blame" available online at: nigeriamasterweb.com/blog/index.php/2013/09/08.

award back in March 2014 during the celebration of 100 years of Nigeria's amalgamation as a single geographical entity by the British colonial authorities in 1914.[357]

This was despite the fact that the award recipient in his life time stole a staggering $6billion from Nigeria's coffers while in power. As Nuhu Ribadu, pioneer chairman of the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFFC), said at an event in London in November 2006, "Abacha took over $6billion from Nigeria."[358] At of that sum, $500m was recovered under the presidency of Olusegun Obasanjo 1999-2007, finance minister Okonjo Iweala said.[359] This is inimical to the candidacy of a country seeking to represent Africa on the SC. Notably, it was during the military regime of General Abacha that Nigeria became a pariah state in the international community – the status that was reminiscent of the fate suffered by the defunct apartheid regime of South Africa due to the wild human right violations and state sponsored assassinations of dissenting voices in Nigeria. Alas the incumbent Nigerian government thought it worthwhile to recognize that same individual with a posthumous award national award. This is symptomatic of a state's culpability in aiding and abetting corruption. Suffice to say that it was the inclusion of Abacha's name on the lists of awardees that forced Nigerian Nobel Laureate Prof Wole Soyinka to reject his own centenary award. Soyinka described Abacha as a "murderer and thief of no redeeming quality."[360] In March 2014, barely a week after President Jonathan bestowed that posthumous award on the late Head of State, Gen. Sani Abacha, for his "contributions to the nation," the United States ordered a freeze on another $448m in assets looted by the ex-dictator and his accomplices. According to Mythili Raman, the acting assistant attorney general in the department of justice, "General Abacha was one of the most notorious kleptocrats in memory, who embezzled billions from the people of Nigeria, while millions lived in poverty."[361]

---

[357] See Nigeria's the Punch Nigerian Newspaper, July 3, 2014, available online at: www.punchng.com.
[358] Ibid.
[359] Ibid.
[360] See the Punch Newspaper, June 27, 2014.
[361] See the Punch Newspaper, March 6, 2014.

Again, this is an indictment of the Nigerian government. The US department described the forfeiture as "the largest civil forfeiture action to recover the proceeds of foreign official corruption ever brought by the department."[362]Similarly, Transparency International (TI), an anti-corruption group, had in June 2014 criticized the decision of the Nigerian government to drop corruption charges against Mohammed Abacha, the son of the late Gen. Sani Abacha who was facing charges for assisting his late father to "steal and lauder" millions of dollars from government's coffers between 1995 and 1998. The TI's regional director for Sub-Saharan Africa, Chantal Uwimana, expressed the group's disapproval of the Nigeria's government decision in June 2014 thus: "allowing the theft of public funds to go unpunished sends the wrong message that those with powerful connections can act with impunity."[363] His submission captures it all as corruption with impunity reigns supreme in the country particularly in governmental quarters where the virus is bred. A former United States Ambassador to Nigeria, John Campbell noted in a recent interview with *Punch Nigerian Newspaper* that corruption is deeply rooted in Nigeria He said: "I would pay more attention to corruption. It is mind-boggling how millions of dollars go missing."[364] In the same vein, Campbell's compatriot Bissa Williams, the United States deputy assistant secretary, bureau of African affairs, gave her opinion about the corruption problem in Nigeria in an interview with the *Vanguard Nigerian Newspaper*, the American official said frankly: "if you ask me, I would say that corruption is extremely high in this country; there is no other way to say this."[365] Likewise, the United States government itself had in a "detailed and frank" assessment report on corruption in Nigeria published in 2013, entitled "Corruption and Lack of Transparency in Government" alleged that, in Nigeria, "Massive, widespread and pervasive corruption affected all levels of government and the security forces."[366] The report alleged further that even judicial officials were not left out of the "massive corruption ring", the Nigerian government was heavily indicted of not implementing

---

[362] Ibid
[363] See the Punch Newspaper, June, 2014
[364] See the Punch Newspaper, August 3, 2014
[365] See the Vanguard Newspaper, April 6, 2014
[366] See the Punch Newspaper Editorial on "Damming US Corruption Report On Nigeria" March 19, 2014, available online at: www.punchng.com

the law on corruption with the seriousness it deserve, thus encouraging and deliberately allowing "officials to frequently engage in corrupt practices with impunity."[367] The foregoing indicates as earlier stated that the political leadership in Nigeria aids and abet corruption. Consequently, the question that begs for answer is: can Nigeria obtain the United States support for its UNSC ambition with the prevalence of state engineered corruption in that country? This self-inflicted problem rubbishes Nigeria's credentials and claims for the UNSC seat. NB this paragraph is too big. Break it.

Since the beginning of 2014, there have been allegations of corruption in government circles in Nigeria, the biggest of which was the allegation made by the immediate past governor of the central bank of Nigeria Lamido Sanusi Lamido that a colossal $20 billion had gone missing from the federation account, for daring to expose the scandal, the CBN governor was asked to proceed immediately on terminal leave by the Nigerian government without verifying the authenticity of his allegations first. It later emerged that there were elements of truth in Sanusi's allegations as both the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation and the incumbent Jonathan Presidency itself acknowledged on national and international television that "only $10.8 billion was unaccounted for. . ."[368] However, the then CBN governor insisted that $20 billion got missing and not $10.8 billion the Nigerian government admitted was "unaccounted for."   Now, this particular case is instructive with regard to corruption in Nigeria for two reasons: first, it vindicated the 2013 US corruption report on Nigeria cited above that the Nigerian government allows corruption to thrive. Second, it also give credence to the arguments made earlier that impunity thrives in Nigeria; otherwise, as at the time of writing this dissertation, none of the state's officials that heads the government ministries and corporation where the $10.8 billion got missing or "unaccounted for" to use Nigerian government phrase has been relieved of their positions and handed over to the security

---

[367] Ibid.
[368] Ibid.

agencies for prosecution which should be the case in a country where punishment is meted out on law offenders.

Unfortunately, the two female ministers under whose watch this financial atrocity was committed – Okonjo Iweala and Diezani Madueke still retain their governmental portfolios as the country's finance and petroleum ministers respectively despite massive calls for their sacking and prosecution from the Nigerian public. Again, it's instructive to note that the admittedly "unaccounted for" $10.8billion dollars in Nigeria is more than the combined Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of African countries such as Sierra Leone $4.929 billion[369] Cape verde $1.888 billion[370] and Swaziland $3.791 billion[371] which have a total GDP of $10.608 billion going by the world bank GDP figures of countries in the world as at 2013. This is the consequence of institutionalized corruption in Nigeria which the state itself has helped to fester in recent times as elucidated above. The implication of this therefore is that Nigeria has a burden of morality to contend with as the search for a UNSC permanent seat continues. As argued in this present chapter, corruption is responsible for all the vices in Nigeria including the security situation occasioned by the terror activities of Boko Haram – the Islamists fundamentalist group. As former United States' Secretary of State Hilary Clinton, said about Nigeria in a public interview with *ABC's* Robin Roberts, "they have squandered their oil wealth, they have allowed corruption to fester and now they are losing their territory because they wouldn't make hard choices."[372]

The above indicates that Nigeria has not been able to put its house in order as expected. The country's continued failure in this regard poses a huge challenge for its bid for the UNSC seat. The irony of the situation is that the same crop of leaders that presided over the rots in the

---

[369]See www.worldbank.org/en/country/sierraleone.
[370] See www.worldbank.org/en/country/CapeVerde.

[371] See www.worldbank.org/en/country/swaziland.

[372] Cited in this day live "As the World Rallies For Nigeria" available online at: www.thisdaylive.com/articles/as-the-world-rallies-for-nigeria.

system has been the most vociferous campaigners for Nigeria's bid. Second, Nigeria was a signatory to the African Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption which was adopted on 11 July 2003 by the 2nd ordinary session of the Assembly of the Union in Maputo.[373] The country was also a signatory to the UN Convention against Corruption which came into force on 14 December 2005.[374] Nigeria has however repeatedly failed to uphold the principles of these conventions thus placing a moral question on the country's eligibility for the SC seat. How then can a country which has failed to act in accordance with these basic principles leverage on the same Organizations to secure a permanent seat for itself? This is simply paradoxical. Corruption potentially remains the greatest obstacle to Nigeria's ambition for the UNSC seat.

Bad Leadership – Bad leadership in Nigeria also constitutes a major impediment to the Nigerian dream of getting a SC seat. Bad governance has prevented a massively endowed country from attaining its potential in every aspect of human development. As far back as 1984, renowned novelist Chinua Achebe gave a damming view about the leadership crisis in Nigeria. Although, at the time he wrote that book *the trouble with Nigeria,* political leadership was not as bad as it is today. However that particular era set the stage for the current leadership rots being experience today in Nigeria. If not attended to urgently like a patient in an intensive care unit facility of a hospital, this could lead to Nigeria being officially declared as a failed state. Achebe explained Nigeria's leadership problem thus: "The trouble with Nigeria is simply and squarely a failure of leadership . . . the Nigerian problem is the unwillingness or inability of its leaders to rise to the responsibility, to the challenge of personal example which are the hallmarks of true leadership."[375] The most worrisome thing about this submission is that the leadership problem still plagues the country till today far worse than the case was then. This is a major problem for

---

[373] See the African Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption, available online at: www.au.int/.../AFRICAN Union-CONVENTION-PREVENTING_C. . . .

[374] See the UN Convention against Corruption, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 31 October 2003 at the UN Headquarters in New York, Nigeria became a signatory to the convention on 9, December 2003 two months after it adoption. Available Online at: https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC.

[375] See Achebe C. (1984) "The trouble with Nigeria", Heinemann Publishers, p. 1.

Nigeria ambition. The failure of leadership has brought the Nigerian state to where it is at present, as Achebe again noted: "Nigeria is what it is because its leaders are not what they should be."[376] It will take a direct or indirect beneficiary of the Nigerian failed leadership system to fault this thought as it aptly captures the Nigerian leadership situation.

For Nigeria to be taken seriously by the international community as a contender for the SC seat, the leadership infrastructure has got to be redeemed. The current leadership situation does not in any way suggest sanity, as Friday Jarikre opined, "In a sane society, leadership is influence but in Nigeria leadership is affluence and how much a leader can amass from the collective patrimony of the people."[377] This brings us back to the argument made earlier that corruption birthed all other malaises that Nigeria faces currently. Leadership failure will be a contributory factor to Nigeria not getting the SC seat if these issues are not addressed. As Wakdok Samuel said, "the story of Nigeria is a pathetic one. . . . A country with rich human and natural resources has been brought to the brink due to years of bad leadership."[378] A Retired Nigerian Ambassador Dapo Fafowora, was of the view that the leadership problem in the Nigerian domestic scene had caused the country's leaders to be held in low esteem abroad over the years because of their serial failure to institutionalize probity and good governance in the country. The retired Nigerian diplomat said leadership and respect are won abroad by showcasing exemplary leadership at home and not just throwing money around as it has been the case with Nigeria. He stated: "Leadership and respect are not won by simply throwing money around, but by setting an example of good government and probity in Nigeria's public life. Nigeria's foreign policy would have had a major success and impact in Africa, but for the low esteem in which Nigerian leaders are generally held abroad.[379] Implicitly, a failed domestic

---

[376]Cited by Jarikre F. (2012) "Nigeria and its Fading Dreams", Urhobo Times, www.urhobotimes.com/individual, p. 1.
[377] Ibid Pg. 1
[378] See Wkdok, S. S. "How African Underdeveloped Africa." available online at: www.credoworld.blogspot.com.
[379] See Fafowora. O. (1984), "The Role of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the Formulation of Nigerian Foreign Policy: Personal Reminiscences." *The Quarterly Journal of Administration*, Vol. xvii, Nos. 3 & 4, April/July, pp. 92-110.

leadership cannot not produce a successful leadership abroad because it is said that charity begins at home.

Weak Democratic Institutions – Another one of the factors that could count against Nigeria's candidacy for the SC seat is its weak democratic institutions. The Nigerian democratic system has not yet recorded appreciable progress in the same way other emerging democracies in Africa have done. While democracy is waxing stronger in countries such as Senegal, Ghana and South Africa, the contrary is the case in Nigeria as democratic institutions have been debased. Electioneering processes are monetized to the extent that those who get elected into public offices are often the highest bidders. As a result of this, Nigeria operates the most expensive and wasteful democracy in the world.[380] Given these realities, the odds might be stacked against Nigeria's candidacy despite its credentials because of the premium placed on sound democratic institutions and good governance by Western countries such as United States, Britain which are both permanent members of the UNSC (Saliu and Omotola, 2008). The country's history of intermittent coups arguably the worst in Africa which produced seven military regimes in 33 years is due largely to the absence of strong democratic institutions.[381]

Insecurity – The security situation in Nigeria currently is inimical to its UNSC ambition. This owes largely to the corruptness of the country's ruling class which has failed to bring the situation under control despite billions of dollars budgeted for security in the last few years. The most challenging of it all is the Boko Haram insurgency in the North Eastern part of Nigeria which has led to the death of many innocent people – including security personnel. This has had negative foreign policy implications for Nigeria in the sense that it portrays Nigeria to the outside world as a country slipping gradually into anarchy; as a country where leadership infrastructure is collapsing; as a country where the state has lost the monopoly of violence. Thus, wherever global terrorism is mentioned Nigeria will be cited as an example. This problem

---

[380] See Wkdok. S. S. "How African Underdeveloped Africa." available online at: www.credoworld.blogspot.com.
[381] Adebajo. A. (2008), "Hegemony on a Shoestring, Nigeria's Post-Cold War Foreign Policy," in Gulliver Troubles, Nigeria's Foreign Policy after the Cold War, A. Adebajo and A. R. Mustapha (eds.) University of KwaZuluNatal Press, Scottsville, South Africa, p. 1. NB book title in italics!

flows is as a result of the corruption pandemic which then leads us to the conclusion that Nigeria's domestic problems are interwoven. Against the background of the foregoing, the foreign policy machinery of the Nigerian state would have to pay urgent attention to these issues of religious terrorism.[382]

Mass Poverty – The problems of corruption and bad leadership has had a corresponding effect on the generality of Nigerian masses over the years. Despite huge revenue from crude oil and gas exports, a preponderant number of Nigeria's population still remains chronically poor with a staggering 69% of the domestic populace living in acute poverty. According to the Nigerian Statistician General, and the Head of National Bureau of Statistics Yemi Kale, "In 2004, Nigeria's relative poverty measurement stood at 54.4% but increased to 69% or 112.518 million Nigerians in 2010."[383] This is staggering when compared to the World Bank population total of Nigeria put at 173.6 million in 2013.[384] The question that arises from this is, can a country suffering from this self-inflicted social malady push successfully for a UNSC permanent seat? Mass poverty in the midst of abundance is due majorly to the corrupt practices in public offices and bad leadership in Nigeria. The case of Nigeria's Niger Delta region is particularly ironic in this regard; despite the fact that oil is produced there, the poverty level in the region is extremely high due to rampant corruption and heartless mismanagement of the oil proceeds by states' officials. As Joseph Ebegbulem, Dickson Ekpe and Theophilus Adejumo expressly noted,

> What is going on in the Niger Delta region is a clear demonstration of the fact that after many decades of oil exploration in the region, the natives have become poorer and less empowered, contrary to what one would have expected, judging from cases of oil countries like Saudi Arabia and Venezuela, who have learnt how to manage the excess wealth generated by oil. Crude oil as an essential commodity in this technological age;

---

[382]See Azazi. O.A (2012), "Internal Security and Nigerian Foreign Policy," in *Review of Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Issues and Perspectives*, E. Anyaoku ed, Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos, Nigeria
[383]See, "112.5 Million Nigerians Live in Poverty - NBS", Punch Nigerian Newspaper, February 12, 2012, available online at: www.punchng.com.
[384] See World Bank Data on Nigeria, available online at: data.worldbank.org/country/Nigeria.

even though it has empowered many countries that possess it, has ended up impoverishing some countries like Nigeria, who cannot manage the enormous profit it generates as a result of corruption, selfishness and greed.[385]

The significance of the above is instructive in the sense that it proves further that Nigeria's domestic scene is fraught with maladies which the country's leaders have foisted on it. A cursory look at that 112.5 million figure of people living in abject poverty despite huge revenue from oil and gas sales shows that the total number of Nigerians that are poverty stricken outstrips the total human population of seven West African countries namely, Ghana[386], Mali[387], Senegal[388], Burkina Faso[389], Cote d' Ivoire[390], Chad[391]; and Liberia[392]. These countries have a population total of 109. 704 million people which then leads to the conclusion that there are more people living in abject poverty in Nigeria than the whole populations of these countries put together. Available data also suggests that there are more people living in poverty in Nigeria than the individual populations of South Africa - 52. 98 million in 2013, Ethiopia 94.10 million - 2013; and Egypt 82.06 million – also in 2013 according to the 2013 World Bank data on the countries mentioned. This is the accumulated results of corruption and bad leadership in Nigeria.

5.7. Conclusion

The chapter has been able to draw a link between Nigeria's past roles in African decolonization issues and its present political activities regarding the UNSC permanent seat ambition. It reckons that although Nigeria has impressive credentials needed to lay claim to that seat, however, as things stand, it will be extremely difficult if not impossible for Nigeria to realize this

---

[385] See Ebegbulem. J.C. et al (2013), "Oil Exploration and Poverty in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria: A Critical Analysis," *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol. 4. No. 3, March 2013.
[386] www.worldbank.org/en/country/Ghana.
[387] www.worldbank.org/en/country/Mali.
[388] www.worldbank.org/en/country/Senegal.
[389] www.worldbank.org/en/country/BurkinaFaso .
[390] ewww.worldbank.org/en/country/Coted'Ivoir.
[391] www.worldbank.org/en/country/Chad.
[392] www.worldbank.or/en/country/Liberia.

dream if the issues discussed in this chapter are not addressed urgently with demonstrable and convincing results. The Nigerian case for the UNSC permanent seat is paradoxical in the sense that the country wants to represent Africa in the apex decision making organ in the international system - the UNSC when it has failed unremittingly to show leadership at home and also failed to fulfil its international obligations with regard to upholding the AU and UN conventions on corruption which it is a signatory to.

How then can the country leverage on these diplomatic platforms to secure the UNSC seat because Nigeria would have to secure the nod of AU and UN member states and then the UNSC P5 members to get that seat. This places Nigeria in a dicey situation. The chapter also examined the UN proposed reforms and the countries across the globe that are contesting for the permanency of the UNSC and submit that the P5 members that make up the UNSC veto club are not likely to allow a structural alteration of the UN system unless member states force the P5 to do so. The next chapter will present the conclusion on the key issues discussed in the study and make recommendations that should inform future studies and proposes the way forward regarding Nigeria's case for a permanent seat in the UNSC in light of the negative factors discussed above.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS: CHARTING THE WAY FORWARD

For Nigeria to effectively project influence abroad and safeguard its interests, it ought to ensure that its house is in order in all aspects: national cohesion; socio-economic development; justice and observance of human rights . . . The Security Council would most unlikely be willing to receive a permanent member that would end up as an agenda item in its deliberations. (Gambari, 2012:59)

If the leaders of a country like Nigeria are really interested in elevation into the exclusive club, they must become serious with the business of governing Nigeria with seriousness of purpose, accountability, dedication to the delivering of the dividends of democracy. . . [393]

6.1.   Introduction

The study has historically examined the roles of the Nigerian state in African decolonization politics as well as those of other actors in the United Nations (UN) within the period 1960 – 1994. The study drew a link between Nigeria's past anti-colonial activism and its contemporary political ambition with regard to the anticipated United Nations Security Council (UNSC) permanent seat bid. The present and last chapter primarily reflects on the key issues discussed in this study and proffers recommendations that should inform further studies and more importantly proposes the way forward regarding Nigeria's case for a claiming to be the best candidate for the anticipated Security Council (SC) permanent seat. In essence, the chapter pulls the study together and lays the foundation for future research while also providing some advice on what Nigeria needs to do going forward if the bid for the permanent seat in the UNSC is to bear any positive results. Certainly, historical achievements will not be enough to

---

[393] See Okosun. A. (2014), "Dialectics and Forensics of Nigeria's Bid for a Permanent UN Security Council Seat" available online at: www.nigeriavilliagesquare.com/articles/dialectics-and-forensics of Nigeria-s-bid-for-a-permanent-un-security-council-seat.html.

guaranteed Nigeria a permanent seat in the UNSC. This is particularly important because the other contenders also have their own strengths.

6.2.   Conclusion

This study has brought to the fore the historic roles which Nigeria played during the struggle against the forces of colonialism and racism in Africa within the period mentioned above and its implications for the country's contemporary political ambitions both positively and negatively. Although Nigeria was actively involved in the articulation of the colonial problem on various platforms such as in the OAU, Commonwealth of nations, Non-aligned movement, International Labour Organization and in other multilateral organizations, this study's investigation was particularly narrowed down by focusing on Nigeria's advocacy, roles and contribution during the debates, and in the politicization of African decolonization in the UN. As discussed above, Nigeria's anti-colonial policy in the 20th century was primarily driven by the desire to play a dominant leadership role in Africa (See chapter three). Consequently, from the 1960 onwards, the term "leadership" featured prominently on the diplomatic agenda and vocabulary of Nigeria particularly in its African relations. As shown above, Nigeria's obsession with African continental leadership was well noticeable in virtually all the public statements issued by the Nigerian leaders, diplomats and top government officials in the course of the last century which have been analysed in this study.

Invariably, these leadership aspirations led to Africa being declared as the "centrepiece" of Nigeria's foreign policy thrust at independence. This implied that Africa was the focal point of its foreign policy engagements and it was on this basis that Nigeria conducted its foreign policy activities in the colonial years. In view of the above synopsis, this study has contributed to knowledge in three ways: first, it has shown that Nigeria's anti – colonial policy was primarily motivated by its leadership ambitions in Africa from its independence in 1960 thus justifying the realist theoretical framework employed in the study. Apart from the historical statements that were analysed in the study, there are recent works which suggest that Nigeria's leadership

ambitions was the utmost determinant factor which influenced the making of the country's foreign policy. As Akinterinwa asserted in 2012:

> In 1960, Nigeria's foreign policy was specifically designed to be an instrument of national development, and particularly, to facilitate the political objective of leadership in African affairs. Political leaders and the elite in general wanted Nigeria to be Africa's leader and also an African leader to be reckoned with in global affairs.[394]

With regard to how Nigeria fits into the defining features of realism, this study discussed the statements and speeches made by successive former Nigerian leaders, diplomats, and top government officials since its independence in 1960; the study also showed that the early independence of Ghana in 1957 shaped Nigeria's post-independence diplomatic thoughts and behaviour particularly as it relates with Africa; a historical survey of Nigeria's foreign policy within the 34 years period which this study covers was also presented in the study (See chapter 3). The history of the UN and its general tendencies featured as a subject of discourse in the study. In this regard, the study considered the general tendencies across the UN system.

Second, the study has established through the analysis of the minutes, documents, transcripts and records of the UN as well as other scholarly sources that African decolonization was politicized in the UN since the early 1960s due to the bitter rivalry between the United States and Soviet Union – which affected virtually all issues of global concern throughout the period the Cold War crisis which lasted until 1989 (See chapter four). This had a significant impact on the African decolonization process as the belligerent East and West factions schemed to outshine and outsmart each other in pursuit of their national interests, especially their Cold War objectives. However, the manner in which both blocs sought to protect their interests differed significantly. For the United States – the arrowhead of the Western divide, the approach employed in dealing with the colonial problem which its Cold War allies foisted on the

---

[394] Akinterinwa B. A (2012), "Overview of Nigeria's Foreign Policy, 1960-2010: Challenges and Recommendations," in *Review of Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Issues and Perspectives*, E. Anyaoku (ed) the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos, Nigeria, p. 18.

African continent was hypocritical. The weapon employed by the United States in respect to the colonial problem in Africa was merely rhetorical condemnation of the excesses of the colonial authorities in the colonies like they did after the 1960 Sharpeville murderous incident in South Africa and also during the 1976 killing of high school children in Soweto South Africa that both constituted a crime against humanity under the UN Charter. Simply put, the United States acted merely as a critic of colonialism but supported the phenomenon tactically in practice because of the need to protect its national interests. The blockage of UNSC resolutions which sought to force the apartheid rulers of Pretoria into submission and the continued supply of weapons to the apartheid regime by the West despite the arms embargo imposed on the country concretized this argument.

On the part of the Soviet Union, its anti-colonial declaration at the UN in 1960 which set the stage for the acrimonious and tension-laden debates on the African colonial problem was not purely humanitarian. As a matter of fact, as shown above, both blocs acted based on the dictates of the principles of realism which was used in framing this study. From the Soviet Union's perspective, this study established that the bloc's actions with regards to issues of African decolonization at the UN was in pursuit of "self-interests" and were "motivated in seeking more power."[395] The East was determined to get the Western satellite states dismantled which would mean reducing the power orbit of the Western hemisphere that was simply the underpinning for the politicization of African decolonization issues.

After all, history attests to the fact that the Soviet Union had its own satellite orbit in the now independent Eastern Europe. Even Nikita Khrushchev – the then Soviet Union leader who led his country's delegation to the 15th session of the GA in September 1960 affirmed this during his presentation. Consequently, the attitude of both blocs was a function of the Cold War. Thus the Cold War was the defining factor that shaped the African decolonization discourses at the time. The Soviet Union wanted to reduce the power base of the West because of the latter's

---

[395] See "Political Realism in International Relations" (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy) available online at: www.plato.stanford.edu/entries/realsim-intl-relations-April 2013.

massive influence in Africa which was colonially administered by Britain, France, Spain, Portugal, (Germany at some point in the then Tanganyika, now Tanzania), Belgium and the Netherlands. The United States as argued in the study was not directly involved in the colonial enterprise but the transatlantic relationship was such that the United States was indirectly involved because the country had overwhelming influence over Western Europe. The emergence of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949 further cemented relations between the United States and Western Europe. Third, this study discussed the implications of Nigeria's historical activities in the UN as outlined above for its contemporary political ambitions and argued that the country's success in this regard will be influenced negatively by its prevailing domestic condition if urgent and concrete steps are not taken to fix the situation. The study demonstrated that Nigeria has a wealth of history with regards to service to the African cause and humanity at large but it is plagued by the poverty of domestic present which does not in any way portray Nigeria as a serious bidder for the UNSC permanent seat.

The above represents one major area that has been insufficiently articulated with regard to Nigeria's UNSC ambition as opinion makers, scholars, diplomats and government officials have over-dwelled on the positive credentials of Nigeria to make a case for the country. Although these credentials are outstanding when compared with those of other contenders for the UNSC seats in Africa like South Africa and Egypt, the stack reality however, is that the so - called credentials which some authors/commentators of Nigerian origin have described as "intimidating", "towering" "unmatchable" is at variance with the prevailing situation on the domestic scene in Nigeria at the present moment. Some of these current challenges such as the situation in the Niger Delta region, activities of Boko Haram and many others have been discussed in this study.

Thus, despite its historical activities which look irrefutably impressive, it is evident that Nigeria has a lot to do if the country is really serious about getting the anticipated UNSC seat. Nigeria can only secure the UNSC seat on the basis of both historical antecedents and appreciable domestic conditions. After all, it is said that "foreign policy draws greater respects when it is

rooted in domestic strength."[396] The domestic strength in this sense is non-existent as far as Nigeria's case is concerned. The study also examined the quests for the reform of the UNSC organ and the cases of the aspirant countries like the G4 and the major contenders from Africa. With the study having articulated the challenges that confront Nigeria's bid for the UNSC seat, it is expedient to chart the way forward for the country's policy makers, diplomatic community and the political leadership in respect to addressing the challenges identified in the study.

6.3.   Recommendations

6.3. 1. Putting the house in order

For Nigeria to clinch the UNSC permanent seat, it has to first and foremost get out of its self-imposed socio-political and economic maladies that plague the country. According to an African proverb, "one should first assess the cloth an individual is putting on before accepting the clothes he/she is offering as a gift." Implicitly, it defiles logic for a naked man to give out clothes as a generous gesture. This aptly describes the Nigerian situation in respect to its desire to represent Africa on an enlarged UNSC seat when socio-political and economic statistics on the ground suggest that the country is unworthy of taking up such a role today given the failure of leadership at home with its attendant effects in the proliferation of corrupt practices with impunity in the country. Therefore, it is as a result of this existential reality that this study employs the usage of the phrase "moral burden" to dissect Nigeria's paradoxical situation. In essence, the study recommends very strongly that Nigeria must first put its house in order before aspiring to represent Africa in global politics.

Suffice to say that the claimants to Nigeria's right to the UNSC seat have forgotten the dictum that says, 'Charity begins at home'. Otherwise they should have known that the prevailing events on the domestic fronts will shape the trajectory of debates on matters of this nature. Nigeria as it is today has a moral burden on its neck with regard to making a successful push for the permanent membership seat on the SC of the UN. The moral burden represents the

---

[396] See the Punch Nigerian Newspaper Editorial, August 25, 2004, Pg. 16

domestic condition which has been discussed in detail in this study in general and in the preceding chapter (chapter five) in particular.

What then needs to be done? The next section will try to find answers to this question by making recommendations that should help bolster Nigeria's case for the permanent seat in the UNSC. Apart from this, the sub sections will also make recommendations to the AU regarding the selection/election of African representatives on the UNSC. There will also be recommendations on the candidacies of the G4 countries, as well as for Nigeria's African co-contenders like Egypt and South Africa.

6.3.2.   Addressing leadership problems

This study has identified five major domestic problems that will affect Nigeria's chances in getting a permanent UN seat on the SC. These are: the corruption pandemic, bad political leadership, weak democratic institutions, insecurity; and mass poverty amidst oil wealth. The following recommendations are offered in light of these domestic ills. First, Nigerian leaders and government should use the domestic scene as a springboard to showcase their seriousness about the country's candidacy for the UNSC seat by tackling corruption headlong.

No country whose name is quickly linked to corruption in discourses can ever be allowed to ascend to an exalted position like the permanent membership of the UNSC. Consequently, the architects of Nigeria's bid for a UNSC seat must stop being delusional that the country deserves the seat on the basis of its historical strength as statistics have shown that Nigeria is extremely incapable to occupy that seat unless practical and results-oriented steps are taken to address the ugly situations on the domestic scene by the country's political leadership. In view of the foregoing, this study recommends that the Nigerian leaders should first of all purge themselves of corruption before making any attempt to sanitize the system. Corruption in Nigeria is systemic; it flows right from the highest echelon of the political leadership to other component parts which make up the body system of Nigeria thus no corruption sanitization effort can succeed without the leadership being involved in the system cleansing process.

The thefts and the impunity which accompany the acts in Nigeria are gradually bleeding the country to death as millions and billions of dollars disappear without traces while those whose hands were soiled in financial scandals are left unpunished by the authorities (See chapter five). Hence, the Nigerian government and leaders owe it a duty to lead the country out of this infamy if they are serious about the country's candidacy for the UNSC seat. Second, this study recommends that as part of measures to tame and kill corruption in Nigeria, the political leadership should study the model employed by countries whose rating in the recently released Transparency International 2014 corruption perception index was impressive in dealing with the Nigerian corruption pandemic. These countries were: Denmark in first position, New Zealand in second, Finland in third; while Sweden and Norway occupied the fourth and fifth positions respectively.[397]

Nigeria can leverage on the models used by these countries in sanitizing its system. The Nigerian leadership should invoke the political will it showed during the brief but agonizing battle against the Ebola virus between July 20, 2014 when the virus was imported into the country by a Liberian and October 20, 2014 when the World Health Organization (WHO), declared Nigeria free of the virus in the fight against corruption. If this is done, Nigeria will begin to live to its potentials as a country. The state's anti-corruption agencies should be empowered financially and with modern technological equipment that will help contain corruption in Nigeria.

The problem of bad political leadership in Nigeria has been a function of its corrupt system. Therefore, for Nigeria to succeed in its UNSC seat bid a corrupt free and dedicated political leadership must be instituted firstly to prove to the outside world that Nigeria is indeed a serious contender for the UNSC permanent seat. It must be stressed that responsible leadership is of utmost importance in matters of this kind given that the UNSC seat represents the position of leadership. Consequently, Nigerian leaders should demonstrate leadership at

---

[397] See the 2014 transparency international global corruption perception index, available online at: www.transparency.org/cpi2014/results.

home before projecting the country for leadership in the international arena. A failed political leadership on the domestic scene lacks the moral wherewithal to provide leadership abroad.

Thus this study recommends that immediate steps be taken to rid the Nigerian political system of money politics and its effects in order to pave way for the emergence of genuine leaders and not leaders who materially induce their way to power which has been the case since the return to democratic rule in Nigeria in 1999. The financial inducement of voters during electioneering period has affected the growth of democracy in Nigeria and has had implications for good governance. As Victor Adetula asserted in 2008:

> Today in Nigeria, money politics, vote buying . . . and "share the money" are regular household phrases and slogans portraying moral decadence of politicians. . . This has implications for good governance processes including political participation.[398]

From the foregoing, the Nigerian democratic system is still far from crystallizing. The democratic institutions in the country should be strengthened to ensure transparent and credible elections while persons of proven integrity should be appointed by the government into the election management commission. The country's elections are still characterized by acts of brigandage, allegations of vote rigging, thuggish display and electoral violence. As earlier pointed out, the gravest of these problems is the monetization of Nigerian politics. The Nigerian government must ensure that these acts are not only discontinued but criminalized constitutionally. Doing so will help instil integrity into the Nigerian electoral system. Nigeria cannot secure the support of global democratic powerhouses like the United States of America, Britain etc. with a weak and vulnerable democratic institution.

Good governance and responsible political leadership are basic requirements which Nigeria must meet in order to make a successful push for the UNSC seat. On insecurity, the study recommends that the government first carry out a self-purging exercise to rid itself of the

---

[398] See Adetula V. A. O. (2008), "Money and Politics in Nigeria," *International Foundation for Electoral System, IFES*, Abuja –Nigeria, p. xxviii.

corruption cankerworm. If this is done then Nigeria can overcome the present security challenges facing the country.

Finally, poverty which corruption and bad leadership unleashed on the country and its hapless citizens should be addressed squarely. Available statistics about human development are currently stalked against Nigeria's political ambitions. For instance, in terms of power generation, the UN under-secretary, Kandeh Yumkela in September 2014 at a lecture held in Abuja Nigeria stated that, "Africa remains the most energy poor. Globally, 600million Africans have no access to electricity. . . Nigeria has 80million people without electricity. Nigeria is a significant part of that energy poverty."[399] This is reflective of leadership failure given the fact that Nigeria has the potentials to reverse this situation. Also in November 2013, the World Bank disclosed as reported by the *Nigerian Punch Newspaper,* that out of one billion two hundred people that live in destitution globally, Nigeria contributes 100 million people. According to the World Bank country director for Nigeria, Marie-Francoise Marie-Nelly, "one billion two hundred people live in destitution out of which 100 million are Nigerians."[400] This is another indictment on the political leadership in Nigeria.

Another agency of the UN – UNICEF, also claimed most recently in November 2014, as again reported by Nigeria print media that "119 million Nigerians lack toilets."[401] It is instructive to note that the Nigerian government never faulted any of these reports released by these reputable international agencies and organizations. In fact, the Nigerian apex bank – the Central Bank of Nigeria, said through one of its officials Aisha Mahmood, that "80million youths in Nigeria are either unemployed or underemployed."[402] The blame for this lies with the Nigerian leadership. The foregoing has demonstrated that Nigeria lacks the domestic strength to make a good case for the UNSC seat due to the ills articulated above.

---

[399] See www.busisnessdayonline.com/2014/09/80million-nigerians-withoutelectricity.
[400] See the Punch Newspaper, November 12, 2013, available online at:
www.punchng.com/100millionnigeriansliveindestitution.
[401] See the Punch Newspaper, November, 20, 2014, available online at:
www.punchng.com/119millionnigerianslacktoiletts/20/11/2014.
[402] See the Punch Newspaper, June 6, 2014, available online at: www.punch.com/80%nigeriayouthareunemeployed

In conclusion, therefore, this study recommends that Nigeria should not crave for the UNSC permanent seat at least for now as evidence abounds to the effect that the country has failed repeatedly in fixing the socio-political and economic rots within its borders. Nigeria lacks the capacity in view of the challenges articulated in the study. It behoves on the country's leadership to cultivate and demonstrate responsible and dedicated leadership at home before seeking leadership abroad. As a matter of fact, the UNSC seat need not be laboured for in view of Nigeria's wealth of history in service to Africa and humanity as elucidated above if things were to be working as expected on the domestic turf.

China for instance was not part of the P5 at the beginning; it was invited on the strength of its population and on the basis of sound leadership at home. Today the world bears witness to the giant strides that country is making in the global economy. Nigeria on the other hand, despite being home to the largest concentration of black people on earth had, regrettably still continues to keep itself down on the ladder of human development due to the problems discussed in this study. For Nigeria to have the ears of the world in respect to its ambition for the UNSC seat, the challenges articulated in this study should be addressed first. The only factor that will deny Nigeria the UNSC permanency is Nigeria itself and its leaders who keep searching for positions of leadership abroad when they have failed to demonstrate leadership at home.

6.3.3. Lessons for the African Continent

African leaders should rededicate themselves to the promotion of good governance, accountability and probity in public office, all of which seem elusive at the present moment. They should work towards upholding the African Union Charter on the prevention of corruption in public offices and in the larger societies. They should also shun corruption and every untoward act that has brought shame and disrespect to the African continent and its people. The AU also owes it a duty as the foremost pan-African organization to ensure that mechanisms are put in place to prevent the sit-tight syndrome of African leaders which Mngomezulu (2013)

aptly described as the "President for life Pandemic."[403] This has plagued Africa for the better part of its post-colonial life. Zimbabwe and Uganda are classical examples in this regard. With regards to the selection/election of countries that will be representing Africa should the UNSC seats become available as anticipated, the AU should base its selective/elective criterion on merits and not just on historical sentiments.

Aspiring countries for the UNSC seat from Africa should be assessed against the background of their antecedents and contributions to upholding the AU Charter on good governance, prevention of corruption, probity in public office and other principles and ideals as enshrined in the AU Charter. The AU and its member states would be doing the continent a disservice should they base the selection/election process of candidates on historical sentiments. Aspiring countries must have shown substantial commitment to the promotion of the AU Charter. It is public knowledge that Africa remains the most developmentally backward continent in the world hence it needs a respectable voice with proven moral pedigree as its permanent representatives on the biggest diplomatic and political stage of all – the UNSC.

Leading African countries positioning themselves for the UNSC seat like South Africa have got to also improve on their credentials. In this case, the ANC-led South African government should address the problems of unemployment, weak economy, the land issues – arguably the most sensitive, and other development related problems to bolster the country's candidacy. Political stability and respect for human rights are all good and count to the country's advantage. However, these are not enough to guarantee the country a seat in the UNSC. More work still needs to be done in all spheres of life. Egypt should also fix its leadership impasse if the country is to mount a serious challenge for the seat. The turmoil they experience now doesn't speak well for the Egyptian setting.

---

[403] Mngomezulu, B.R. (2013), "The President for Life Pandemic: Kenya, Zimbabwe, Nigeria, Zambia and Malawi" Online Review available at: www.amazon.com/the-president-life-pandemi-zimbabwe/dp/1909112313.

The pharaoh country should quicken the process of restoring political stability within Egypt. Just like Nigeria, it would be unwise and illogical to seek to represent the entire African continent when the country cannot manage even its own domestic problems. As for the candidacies of the G4 countries, they should ensure that they make peace with their regional neighbours that are opposed to their bids for the UNSC seat. In this respect, Japan should lobby China whose veto weapon can thwart its bid. It is said that there are no permanent enemies in politics hence the historical resentment between the two economic juggernauts in Asia must first of all pave way for Japan's bid to succeed. This is not an insurmountable goal to achieve if both countries could have the political will. The onus is on them to do the right things. The rest will follow.

In light of the above, future studies could do a consistent comparative analysis of those countries that have expressed interest in occupying the anticipated permanent seats in the UNSC. Such studies could either focus on one region (e.g. Africa, South America, Asia, etc.) or draw parallels between two or more regions. Other studies could focus on the extent to which the call for the reconfiguration of the UN can be sustained given the likely complications alluded to in this study. These and other studies would take the findings of the present study much further and contribute to knowledge production that would assist international relations students and scholars alike. No research is final. This one is no exception in that regard, hence these suggestions for possible future researcher themes/topics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources: UN Documents

United Nations Official Records, 15th Session, 902d meeting (October 12, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly, Official Records, 15th Session 947th meeting (December 14, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, Sixteenth Session, 1065th meeting (November 27, 1961).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 68th Plenary Meetings 48th and 49th, GA/11451, (November 8, 2013).
United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 16th Session, 1031st meeting (October 10, 1961).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 16th Session, 1066th meeting (November 27, 1961).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 16th Session, 1061st meeting (November 22, 1961).

United Nations General Assembly Official records, 15th Session, 932d meeting (December 2, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 939th meeting (December 7, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 947th meeting (December 14, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 931st meeting (December 13, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 926th meeting (November 28, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 947th meeting (December 14, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 926th meeting (November 28, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 927th meeting (November 29, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 945th meeting (December 13, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 931st meeting (December 1, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 947th meeting (December 14, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 931st meeting (December 13, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session, 945th meeting (December 13, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official records, 15th Session, 932d meeting (December 2, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session 902rd meeting (October 12, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, 15th Session 903rd meeting (October 13, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records Sixteenth Session, 1056th meeting (November 16, 1961).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records Sixteenth Session, 1066th meeting (November 27, 1961).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records 15th Session, 947th meeting (December 13, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records 15th Session 937th meeting (December 6, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records 15th Session 927th meeting (November 29, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records 15th Session 925th meeting (November 28, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Official Records 15th Session 925th meeting (November 28, 1960).

United Nations General Assembly Document A/59/565, (2 December, 2004) Original: English Version, 59th Session Agenda Item 55.

United Nations Draft Resolution A/L323, No. (November 28, 1960).

United Nations Document A/L.370, (November 27, 1961).

United Nations Document A/L.366 and Add 1-3 (November 21, 1961).

United Nations Document A/L.355, (October 9, 1961).

United Nations Document A/L.328, December 13, 1960).

United Nations Document A/L.323, (November 28, 1960).

United Nations Document A/L.312/Rev.1, (October 12, 1960).

United Nations Document A/4889, Sixteenth Session, (27 September, 1961).

United Nations Document A/4859, Sixteenth Session, (August 28, 1961).

United Nations Document A/4502, (September 23, 1960).

United Nations Document A/ L.366 and Add. 1-3, (November 21, 1961).

United Nations Document 1492 (XV) fifteen Session 893rd Plenary meeting, (7 October, 1960).

UN Centre against Apartheid. *Declaration of the Seminar on the Legal Status of Apartheid Regime and Other Legal Aspects of the Struggle against Apartheid,* Held in Lagos, Nigeria, (13-16 August 1984).

U.N Centre against Apartheid. *The New France in the Campaign against Apartheid, Report By His Excellency, Maitama – Sule (Nigeria), Chairman Of the Special Committee Against Apartheid, On the Mission to France (1-3 March 1982).*

Special Meeting of the Special Committee against Apartheid for Consultations with the Ministers of External Relations of France, U.N Headquarters, and (9 October 1984).

Government Publications: Nigeria

Nigeria at the United Nations: A Partnership for Better World, A Ministry of External Affairs, Federal Republic of Nigeria Production, (Third Press Publishers, Lagos, Nigeria 1991).

Mr Prime Minister, Collected Speeches of Sir, Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Prime Minister of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1960-1966.

March of Progress, Collected Speeches of His Excellency General Olusegun Obasanjo, Nigeria's Head of State, 1976-1979, Federal Ministry of Information, Federal Military Government, Lagos, Nigeria (1979).

Secondary Sources

Books/Chapters in Books

Acemoglu, D. and Robinson J.A. (2012), *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty,* Profile Books Ltd, London.

Achebe C. (1984), *the trouble with Nigeria,* Heinemann Publishers, Ibadan Nigeria

Ackah, W. B. (1999), *Pan-Africanism: Exploring the Contradictions,* Ashgate Publishing Company, Sydney.

Adebajo, A. (2008), *Hegemony on a Shoestring, Nigeria's Post-Cold War Foreign Policy,* in Gulliver Troubles, Nigeria's Foreign Policy after the Cold War, A. Adebajo and A. R. Mustapha (eds) University of KwaZulu Natal Press, Scottsville, South Africa NB Correct this

Adebo, S.O. (1988), *Our International Years,* Spectrum Books Ltd, Ibadan, Nigeria.

Adekunle, A. (1989), *Nigeria and the Southern African Liberation Movements* in B. Akinyemi, S.O.Agbi and Otunbanjo (eds) Heinemann Educational Books, Ibadan, Nigeria.

Adeniran, T. (1986), *Nigeria and the United Nations in Nigeria's External Relations: The First Twenty- Years,* in G. O. Olusanya and R. A. Akindele (eds), University Press Limited Ibadan.

Adetula A.O. (2008), *International Foundation for Electoral System,* IFES, Abuja, Nigeria.

Adeyemo, F.O. (2002), *Dynamics of Nigeria's Foreign Policy 1993-1998*, Franc-Soba Nigeria Limited, Lagos, Nigeria.

Ajibola, W.A. (1978), *Foreign Policy and Public Opinion,* University Press Ibadan, Nigeria.

Akiba, O. (1998), *Nigeria's Foreign Policy towards Africa: Continuity and Change,* Peter Lang Publishers, New York.

Akinboye, S. (1999), *Nigeria's Foreign Policy, in Elements of Politics,* Remi Anifowose and Francis C. Enemuo (eds) Malta House Press Ltd, Lagos, Nigeria

Akinboye, S.O. (1999), *Nigeria's Foreign Policy* in Anifowose. R. and Enemuo, F (eds) *Element of politics*, Malta House Press Ltd, Lagos, Nigeria.

Akinboye, S.O. (2005), *From Confrontation to Strategic Partnership: Nigeria's Relations with South-Africa, 1960-2000, in New Horizons for Nigeria in World Affairs,* U. Ogwu (ed) NIIA, Lagos, Nigeria

Akindele R.A. and B. A. Akinterinwa (2011), *Reform of the United Nations: Towards Greater Effectiveness, Enhanced Legitimacy Profile and Equitable Regionally - Balanced Membership in*

An Enlarged UN Security Council in Africa and the UN System: in Africa and the UN System: The First Fifty Years, in G. A. Obiozor and Adekunle Ajaja (eds), Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA), Publishers, Lagos, Nigeria.

Akindele R.A. and G.O. Olusanya (1986), *Nigeria's External Relations: The First Twenty Five Years,* Ibadan University Press, P

Akindele, R.A. (2005), *Nigeria and the United Nations*: *An Overview:* in Nigeria and the United Nations Security Council, B.A. Akinterinwa (eds), Vantage Publishers Ltd Ibadan, Nigeria Edit!

Akinterinwa B. (2012), *Overview of Nigeria's Foreign Policy, 1960-2010: Challenges and Recommendations*" in E. Anyaoku (ed) *Review of Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Issues and Perspective*, NIIA Publishers, Lagos, Nigeria.

Akinterinwa B. A. (2005) *"Nigeria and the Permanent Membership of the United Nations Security Council: Dynamics and Definienda"* in Nigeria and the United Nations Security Council, B.A. Akinterinwa ed, Vantage Publishers, Ibadan, Nigeria

Akinyemi, A. B. (1975), *Nigerian Foreign Policy in 1975: National Interest Redefined,* in O. Oyeniran (ed), *Survey of Nigerian Affairs*, United Press Limited, Ibadan.

Aluko, O. (1981), *Essays in Nigeria's Foreign Policy*, George Allen and Unwin, London.

Aluko, O. (1976), *Ghana and Nigeria 1957-1970: A Study in Inter-African Discord,* Rex Collings Ltd, London.

Anderson, B. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections On the Origin and Spread of Nationalism,* Verso, London and New York.

Asobie, H.A. (2010), *Nigeria's Foreign Policy, 1960-2010: An Overview in 50 Years of Nigeria's Foreign Policy, Issues, Challenges and Prospects,* in C. E. Osita (ed) NIIA, Lagos, Nigeria.

Azazi, O.A (2012), Internal Security and Nigerian Foreign Policy, in E. Anyaoku (ed) *Review of Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Issues and Perspectives*, Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos, Nigeria.

Baker W.B. (1968), *the United States and Africa in the United Nations: A Case Study in American Foreign Policy,* Imperimerie Offset Composition Services, INC. Washington D.C. (USA)

Bassey, E.A. (1987), *Decolonization and Dependence: The Development of Nigerian – U.S. Relations, 1960 – 1984,* Westview Press/Boulder London

Basu, R. (2004), *the United Nations: Structure and Functions of an International Organization,* Sterling Publishers Limited, New Delhi.

Birmingham, D. (1995), *the Decolonization of Africa,* University College London.

Bourantonis, D. (2005), *the History and Politics of UN Security Council Reform*: Routeledge London and New York

Brett, E.A. (1973), *Colonialism and Underdevelopment in East Africa, the politics of Economic Change, 1919-1939*, Heinemann, London.

Chamberlain, M.E. (1998), *European Decolonization in the Twentieth Century,* Longman Publishers, London and New York

Chamberlin, M.E. (1999), *Decolonization: The Fall of the European Empires,* Blackwell Publishers Ltd Oxford, United Kingdom.

Charles, O.L. and Abdul A. (1979), Concepts of International Policies, in *Global Perspectives*, 3rd edition, Prentice Hall, New Jersey

Christopher, A.J. (1984), *Colonial Africa:* Croom Helm Publishers London

Clarke, J.H. (1991), *new dimensions in African History* African, World Press, New Jersey.

Dallin, A. (1963), The Soviet Union: Political Activity, in Zbigniew Brzezinski's *Africa and the Communist* NB Incomplete!

David, A. K. (1970), *the New Nations in the United Nations,* 1960-1967, Columbia University Press, New York and London Essex CM20 2JE United Kingdom.

Duke, A. A. Z. (1999), *From Abubakar to Abubakar: 40 years of Nigeria's Foreign Policy* Newsbreak Communications Ltd, Abuja, Nigeria.

Dumor, E.K. (1991), *Ghana, OAU AND SOUTHERN AFRICA: AN African Response to Apartheid*, Ghana Universities Press Accra

Evan, L. (1989) *a History of the United Nations: The Age of Decolonization 1955-1965*, Macmillan Press London.

Evan, L. (1994) *The United Nations: How It Works and What It Does,* St. Martin's Press, New York.

Fafowora, D. (2005) Nigeria's Quest for Permanent Seat on the Security Council: The Main Challenge, in B.A. Akinterinwa (ed) *Nigeria and the United Nations Security Council*, Vantage Publishers Ltd, Ibadan, Nigeria.

Fafowora, O. (2001), *Selected Essays and Speeches on Nigerian Diplomacy, Politics, and Economics,* Dokun Publishing House, Ibadan, Nigeria.

Fanon, F. (1963) *the Wretched of the Earth,* English Version, Grove Press, New York.

Fawole, W. A. (2003) *Nigeria's External Relations and Foreign Policy under Military Rule, 1966-1999*. Obafemi Awolowo University Press, Ife, Nigeria.

Frankel J, (1975) *British Foreign Policy*, London, Oxford University Press Order!

Frankel, J. (1963), *the Making of Foreign Policy*, Oxford University Press, Place?

Gambari, I.B. (2005), *Nigeria and the United Nations: The Pursuit of National Interest Through Multinationalism in a Changing World Order* in *New Horizons for Nigeria in World Affairs* Ogwu (ed) NIIA, Lagos, Nigeria

Garba, J.N. (1987), *Diplomatic Soldiering: The Conduct of Nigeria's Foreign Policy,* 1975-1979 Spectrum Books Ltd, Ibadan, Nigeria.

Geiss, I. (1974), *the Pan Africanism Movement*, Methuen and Co Ltd, London.

Goldstein, J. (2001), *International Relations*, fourth Edition, Pricilla McGee ham, USA.

Graf, W. (1998), *the Nigerian State: Political Economy, Political System in the Post-Colonial Era*, James Currey, London.

Grimal, H. (1978), *Decolonization: The British, French, Dutch and Belgium Empires 1919-1963,* Translated by Stephen De Vos, Routeledge and Kegan Ltd, London.

Hobson, J.A. (1938), *Imperialism:* A third edition, G. Allen and Unwin publishers London.

Ibeanu, O. (2005), *Nigeria and the United Nations,* in Osita Eze (ed) *Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Issues, Challenges and Prospects*, NIIA, Lagos, Nigeria.

Idang, G. J. (1973), *Nigeria: Internal Politics and Foreign Policy 1960-1966,* Ibadan University Press, Ibadan Nigeria

Irogbe, K. (1997), *The Roots of United States Foreign Policy toward Apartheid South Africa, 1969-1985,* The Edwin Mellen Press Ltd, Lampeter, Ceredigion, United Kingdom.

Janari F. e.tal, (2006), *History: Learners Book,* South Africa, New Africa books Order!

Jinadu L. A. (2005), *The Philosophical Foundations and Fundamental Principles Of Nigeria's Foreign Policy in New Horizons for Nigeria in World Affairs,* U. J. Ogwu (eds), The Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos, Nigeria.

Kalley, J.A. Schoeman, E. & Andor,) (1999), *Southern Africa Political History: a chronology of key political events from independence to mid-1997*, Greenword Westport

Lacey, A. and Luff, D. (2001), *Trent Focus for Research and Development in Primary Health Care: An Introduction to Qualitative Analysis*, Trent Focus, and London

Legum C. (1980), *African Outlooks toward the U.S.S.R,* in Africa and International Communism, David E. Albright (ed), the Macmillan Press Limited London

Legun, C. (1962), *Pan Africanism: A Short Political Guild*, Pall Mall Press Ltd London

Martin M. (2004), *Russia, America and the Cold War,* Pearson Education Ltd

McKay, V. (1963), *Africa in World Politics,* Harper and Row Publishers, New York and Evanston

Meredith, M. (2006), *The State of Africa, A History of Fifty Years of Independence,* FP free Press, London

Millar T.B. (1969), *On Writing About foreign Policy*, The free Press New York

Morgan, D. and Webber M. (2002), *Sub-Saharan Africa: Nigeria and South Africa,* in Foreign Policy in a Transformed World, David Allen e.tal, Pearson Education Ltd 2002, Edinburg Gate Harlow, United Kingdom.

Morgenthau, H. J. (1967), *Politics among Nations,* Alfred Knopf, New York.

Naidi, G.J. (1999), *the Organization of African Unity: An Analysis of its Role*, Second Edition, Mansell, London and New York.

Northedge, F. G. (1968), *the Foreign Policies of the Powers,* Faber Publishers London.

Nugent, P. (2004), *Africa since Independence,* Palmgrave Macmillan, New York.

Nwolise, O.B.C. (1989), *The Civil War and Nigerian Foreign Policy* in Nigeria since Independence: The First Twenty-Five Years A.B. Akinyemi, S. O. Agbi and A.O. Otubanjo (eds) Heinemann Educational Books, Ibadan, Nigeria.

Oche, O.D. (2005), *Nigeria's Support For The United Nations*, 1960-2005, in Nigeria and the United Nations Security Council, B.A. Akinterinwa (ed) Vantage Publishers Ltd Ibadan, Nigeria.

Ogunsanwo, A. (2005), *Nigeria and the European Union (EU): Past, Present and Future* in New Horizons for Nigeria and World Affairs, U. Ogwu (ed) NIIA Lagos, Nigeria.

Ogwu, J. (1986), *Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Alternative Futures,* Macmillan publishers Ltd, Lagos Nigeria.

Osuntokun A. (2005), *Nigeria and the United Nations: Service Deserves Its Rewards,* in Nigeria and the United Nations Security Council, B. A. Akinterinwa ed, Vantage Publishers, Ibadan, Nigeria.

Osuntokun, J. (2005), *Historical Survey Of Nigeria's Foreign Policy* in *New Horizons for Nigeria in World Affairs,* U. J. Ogwu (ed), The Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos, Nigeria.

Otubanjo, F. (1989), *Phases and Changes in Nigeria's foreign Policy* in Akinyemi A.B. (ed) Nigeria Since Independence: The First Twenty Years: vol x International Relations, Heinemann Educational Books Ltd, Ibadan.

Otunla, T.A. (2005), *Pan-Africanism with the African Union: Policy Options for Nigeria*, in New Horizons for Nigeria in World Affairs, U. Ogwu (ed) NIIA, Lagos, Nigeria.

Padmore, G. (1956), *Pan Africanism or Communism*, Dennis Dobson, London
Palgrave Houndmills, New York.

Palmer D. and Perkins H.C. (2010), *International Relations the World Community in Transition,* Third Edition, A.I.T.B.S. Publishers, India.

Prasenjit, D. (2004), *Decolonization: Perspectives from Now And Then,* Routledge, London and New York.
Ranjit, K. (2005), Research *Methodology: A Step- By- Step for Beginners,* Sage Publications London.

Reinhard, D. (2000), Japan's Quest for a Permanent Security Council Seat: A Matter of Pride or Justice? St Martin's Press New York.

279

Rodney, W. (1972), *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa,* (Dares Salaam: Tanzania Publishing House, 1972, and London.

Saliu, H. A. (2006), *Essays on Contemporary Nigeria Foreign Policy,* Vantage Publishers, Ibadan, Nigeria.

Salliant and Dillman, (1994), *How to Conduct Your Own Survey,* John Wiley and Sons, Inc. New York.

Sani, S. (2012), *Nigeria's Foreign Policy, Globalization and National Security,* in Review of Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Issues and Perspectives, E. Anyaoku (ed), Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos, Nigeria.

Silverman, D. (2010), *Doing Qualitative Research,* Sage Publications Ltd, London.

Soremekun, F. (1983), *Angola: The Road to Independence,* University of Ife Press Ltd, Nigeria

Springhall, J. (2001), *Decolonization since 1945: The Collapse of European Oversea Empire,*

Steans, J. And Pettiford, L. (2001), *International Relations*: *Perspectives and Themes,* Pearson Education Limited, England

Stremlau J.J. (1977), *the International Politics of the Nigerian Civil War, 1967-1970*, Princeton New Jersey

Taylor, P. And A. J. R. Groom, (2000), *the United Nations at the Millennium, the Principal Organs* Continuum, London

Theodore, A.C. and J. H, Wolfe, (1978), Introduction *to International Relations*, Prentice-Hall Inc. New Jersey

Thompson, V.B. (1969), *Africa and Unity: The Evolution of Pan Africanism,* Green and Company Ltd transformed World M. Webber and M. Smith (eds) Pearson Education Limited, Edinburgh Gate Harlow.

Uhomoibhi, M.I. (2008), *A Triple Web Of Interdependence, The UN, the Commonwealth and the EU," in Gulliver Troubles, Nigeria's Foreign Policy after the Cold War,* A. Adebajo and A. R. Mustapha (eds) University of KwaZulu Natal Press, Scottsville, South Africa.

Wayas, J. (1979) *Nigeria's Leadership Role in Africa,* Macmillan Publishers Press Ltd, London Whiteman (2008), *The Switchback and the Fallback, Nigeria – Britain relations*, in Gulliver Troubles, Nigeria's Foreign Policy after the Cold War, A. Adebajo and A. R. Mustapha (eds) University of KwaZulu Natal Press, Scottsville, South Africa.

Yoder, A. (1993), *the Evolution of United Nations System,* Taylor and Francis, New York

Newspaper Sources

Punch Newspaper Editorial on *"Damming US Corruption Report on Nigeria"* March 19, 2014,

Daily Service, February 21963

The Nigerian Tribune Newspaper January, 17, 1963

 The Nigerian Tribune Newspaper June 19, 1963

Nigerian Tribune October 22, 1963

 Daily Sketch December 18, 1976

The Nigerian Guardian Newspaper, September 22, 1997

The Guardian Nigerian Newspaper September 22, 1997

New Nigerian March 13, 2001

The Guardian Newspaper May 22, 2005

The Comet Newspaper July 28, 2005

The Comet Newspaper October 17, 2005

The Guardian Newspaper September 22, 2007

Punch Nigerian Newspaper, February 12, 2012

Punch Newspaper, March 6, 2014

Vanguard Newspaper, April 6, 2014

Punch Newspaper, June, 2014

Punch Newspaper, June 27, 2014

Punch Newspaper, August 3, 2014

Punch Newspaper, November, 20, 2014

Interviews

Personal Interview with Professor Ogaba Oche, Director of Research and Studies, Nigerian

Institute of International Affairs (NIIA), Lagos, Nigeria, 15/1/2014

Personal Interview with Professor Fred Aja Agwu, Senior research fellow, Nigerian Institute of

International Affairs, Lagos, Nigeria, 16/01-/2014

Personal Interview with Dr Godwin Ichimi, research fellow at the Nigerian Institute of

International Affairs, Lagos, Nigeria, 16/01/2014

Personal Interview with Professor Femi Omosini, Historian and International Relations Expert,

17/10/2014, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria

Personal Interview with Professor Kunle Ajayi, International Relations Expert, 17/01/2014, in

Nigeria

Personal Interview with Barrister S.K. Iyaniwura, a Nigerian Lawyer and Public Affairs

Commentator, 12/01/2014

Personal Interview with Dr Johnson Aremu, International Relations Expert, Nigeria, January 2014.

Internet Sources

Agreen I. J. (2013), *The Problematic of Redefining Nigeria's National Interest in the Context of Global Diplomacy*, available online at: http//probematicforeignpolicyhtmlpointbanknews.com.

Aid to Africa Policy Brief No. 1, October 2010, Published by the UN, available online at: www.un.org/africa/osaa/report/2010_Aidbrief. PDF

Ajere J. (2012), *Regional Voluntarism: The sustainability of Nigerian afrocentrism* E-InternationalRelationns-www.e.ir.info/2012/17/19regional-voluntarism-the-sustainabilty-of-nigerian-afrocentrism.

Akukwe, C. (2011), Nigeria*: The Need for a Dynamic Foreign Policy,* Technical Advisory Board of the African Center for Health and Human Security at George Washington University, DC). Available online at: www.africanexecutive.com/modules/archives.php
Assessed Contributions of Member States to the Regular Budget of the United Nations,

Balewa, (1960), Nigeria *Joins the United Nations*: Maiden Address delivered By Nigerian Prime Minister Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa on October 7th 1960 in New York, Available online at: http://www.nigeriaunmission.org

Basit, T. (2003), *Manual or Electronic? The Role of Coding in Qualitative Data Analysis,*
Brazil and the United Nations" Ministry of Foreign Relations of Brazil, www.mre.gov.br 2009

Bureau of International Organization Affairs, U.S Department of State, January 2000, available online at: https://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/200/32924

Chinade, J.D. (2005), Nigeria *and the United Nations: The Past, the Present and the Future.* Article Published by the Center for Democratic Development, Research and Training, Hanwa, Zaria, Kaduna, Nigeria), Available Online at: www.ceddert.com/publications.

Clarence Cottee, *Du Bois, the NAACP, and the Pan-African Congress of 1919,* The Journal of Negro History, vol. 57, No.1 (Jan, 1972) Published by Association for the study of African American Life and History, Inc. available online at: http//www.jstor.org/stable/2717070, accessed: 8/11/ 2014

Commentary: Brazil Seeking Security" The National Interest, 7 July 2010

Countries Welcome Work Plan as Security Council Reform Process Commences New Phase Centre for UN Reform, www.centerforunreform.org, February 2009

Dale, D. (2006), *Population Sampling Methods for Research Studies: Definition and Uses,* Available Online at: contributory.yahoo.com/user/Denis/dale

De Nesnera Andre, UN Security Council Reform May Shadow Annan's Legacy Voice of America, 2 November 2006 Education Research, Available Online at: http//dx.doi.org

Ehiedu E.G. Iweriebor, *The Colonization of Africa,* Hunter College, Africana Age, African and African Diaspora Transformations in the 20th Century, (2001), available at: www.Nypl.orlafricanage/essays-colonized En.wikipedia.org/wiki/List of Countries _by population

For an account of Nikita Khrushchev's Presentation at the Fifteen Session of the UNGA meeting, September-October 1960, see B. Piadyshev, "Khrushchev Stuns the UN". 163 www.mconway.net/page1/page6/.../Khrushchev, *viewed August 10, 2014*

Gardner, P. (2006) *Historical Analysis:* in V.Jupp (ed), *The Sage Dictionary of Social Research Methods, Sage Publications,* Ltd. Available Online at: http://srmo.sage.pub.com/view/the-sage-dictionary-ofsocial-research-methods/SAGE.xml

Growth in United Nations membership, 1945 – present'', available at www.un.org/en/members/growth.Shtml

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Foreign_relations_of_SouthAfrica_during_aparthied, accessed 2014/10/03

http://global.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/213380/foreign-policy
http://www.bing.com/search?q=topic+1o93+decolonization

Ibid

Is Brazil Economy Getting Too Hot? Forbes – www.forbes.com/fdc

 J. Paul and C. Nahory (2005) *"Towards a Democratic Reform of the UNSC."* Global Policy Forum, July 13, available online at: https://www.globalpolicy.org/security/41131.html

James C. and Agazie, J (2013), *Nigeria Has the Most Outrageous Corruption – Leaders To Blame,* available online at: nigeriamasterweb.com/blog/index. Php/2013/09/08

Jarikre F. (2012) *Nigeria and its Fading Dreams,* www.urhobotimes.com/individual, 1.

Karpowicz, K. and W. Julian (2013) *Political Realism in International Relations,* Available online at: http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum 2013/realism-int/relations.

Kim S. (2013), The Importance of Literature Review in Research" available online at: http://hubpages.com/hub/literature review

Kirsten Schlosser. (2012). *The Report on Security Council Reform Meeting 13 March 2012,* available online at: www.centerforreform.org/?=node/480

Koizumi: No Shift in Article 9, Globalpolicy.org, August 2004

Marika Sherwood, (2012), Pan-African Conferences, 1900 -1953: What Did "Pan-African Mean? The Journal of Pan-African Studies, vol. 4, no. 10, January

www.jpanafrican.com/docs/vol4no10/4.10 Pan-African.pdf

Martin E. Ridley (2009) *Have the Problems Leading to the Failure of the UN Security Council to organize Effective Action to Prevent the Rwandan Genocide Now Been Rectified?* available online at: www.academia.edu.

Mngomezulu, B.R. (2013), *"The President for Life Pandemic: Kenya, Zimbabwe, Nigeria, Zambia and Malawi"* Online Review available online at: www.amazon.com/the-president-life-pandemi-zimbabwe/dp/1909112313 nigeriamasterweb.com/blog/index. Php/2013/09/08

Motsoko P. (2011), "African History: Pan Africanism: Past, Present and the Future", available online at: www.pan.africanistscholarpheko.htm

Mthembu-Salter, G. 2009. *Elephants, Ants and Superpowers: Nigeria's Relations with China,* South African Institute of International Affairs, African Perspectives. Global insights. Occasional Paper NO 42, China in Africa Project. Available online at: www.saiia.org.za

Nigeria – South Africa Baseline Study, Brief No 44, September 2013, Open Society Foundation for Africa, South African Foreign Policy Initiative, (SAFPI),

Okosun. A. (2014), *Dialectics and Forensics of Nigeria's Bid for a Permanent UN Security Council Seat* available online at: www.nigeriavilliagesquare.com/articles/dialectics-and-forensics of Nigeria-s-bid-for-a-permanent-un-security-council-seat.html

Pheko, M. 2011. African History: *Pan-Africanism, Past, Present and Future,* Paper presented at Ohio State University, United States, on the 23rd May 2011 Available online at: www.worldpress.com

Political Realism in International Relations" (Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy) available online at: www.plato.stanford.edu/entries/realsim-intl-relations-

Powell: "Brazil Not Developing Nukes" Fox News Channel, available online at: www.origin.foxnews.com, 2009

Regular Budget Payments of Largest Payers" Global Policy Forum, 28 June 2009, www.globalpolicy.org

Simon J. M. (2011) *"An EU Seat in the Security Council as First Step towards a Democratic Organization of World Security"* available online at: http:www.simonlluma.eu/2011/06/an-eu-seat-in-the-security-council-as-first-step-towards-a-democratic-organization-of-world security,

Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy Political, Political Realism in International. First Published Monday July 26, 2010, substantive revision Tuesday April 2, 2013, www.http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/realsim-intl-relations/

The 1919 Pan-African conference resolutions can be accessed online at: www.youthcouncil-namibia.org/docs/1stPanc.Pdf.

The address delivered by J.F. Kennedy, President of the United States: 1961-1963 before the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York, September 25, 1961, Pg. 3, online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, the American Presidency Project, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?=8352.

The African Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption, available online at:
The Aljazeera Journalists Saga: available online at: www.aljazeera.com/news/middleeast

The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, Political Realism in International Relations. First Published, Monday July 26, 2010; substantive revision, April 2, 2013, available online at: www.httpplato.stanford.edu/entries/realsim-intl-realtions/

The UN Convention against Corruption, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 31 October 2003 at the UN Headquarters in New York, Nigeria became a signatory to the convention on 9, December 2003 two months after it adoption. Available Online at: https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC

The UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, available online at: www.ohchr.org/en/udhr/document/udhr/translations/eng.pdf

The United Nations Charter, available online at www.un.org/charter

The United Nations Charter, available online at www.un.org/charter

Turkish Straits Crisis Teaching American History, www.teachingamericanhistory.org/static/neh/interactives/Coldwareurope/map/data/info_10. html

UN Charter: www.un.org/charterarticle

V. B. Khapoya, (2012), *Colonialism and the African Experience* available online at:

Wafula. O. *Africa and the UN Security Council Permanent Seats, April 2005,* available online at: http://pambazuka.org/en/category/aumonitor/27913

Walter   Scott   Hudson   (2010),   available   online   at http//fightinworldwordsusa.wordpress.com/2010

Wikipedia.org/wiki/National-interest

World   Bank   Country   Profile   on   Brazil,   available   online   at: www.worldbank.org/en/country/brazil

World Bank Data on Burkina Faso: www.worldbank.org/en/country/Burkina Faso

World Bank Data on Chad: www.worldbank.org/en/country/Chad

World Bank Data on Cote d' Ivoire: www.worldbank.org/en/country/Cote d' Ivoire

World Bank Data on Ghana: www.worldbank.org/en/country/Ghana

World Bank Data on Liberia: www.worldbank.or/en/country/Liberia

World Bank Data on Mali: www.worldbank.org/en/country/Mali

World Bank Data on Nigeria, available online at: data.worldbank.org/country/Nigeria

World Bank Data on Nigeria, available online at: data.worldbank.org/country/Nigeria

World Bank Data on Nigeria, available online at: data.worldbank.org/country/Nigeria

World Bank Data on Senegal: www.worldbank.org/en/country/Senegal

www.au.int/.../AFRICAN Union-CONVENTION-PREVENTING_C. . .

www.busisnessdayonline.com/2014/09/80million-nigerians-withoutelectricity

www.nationsencyclopedia.com

www.un.org/charterarticle

www.unga.org/roles

www.unga.org/roles

www.worldbank.or/en/country/Liberia

www.worldbank.org/en/country/Burkina Faso

www.worldbank.org/en/country/Chad

www.worldbank.org/en/country/Cote d' Ivoire

www.worldbank.org/en/country/Ghana

www.worldbank.org/en/country/Mali

www.worldbank.org/en/country/Senegal

"Wachukwu Attacks Big Powers, South Africa", Jet Magazine, Johnson Publishing Company, Chicago, Illinois United States, 26 October 1961, available online at: http//www.jetmag.com

2014 transparency international global corruption perception index, available online at: www.transparency.org/cpi2014/re

African Leaders Call for Permanent Security Council Seat for the Continent, UN News Centre, available online at: www.un.org

Journal/Articles

Abdul-Garba, (1987), *Nigerian-Caribbean Relations: Agenda for the Future, Nigerian Journal of International Affairs,* Volume 13, ISSN 0331 – 3646 Number 1 1987

Adeniji, A. (2005), *Power and Representation at the United Nations: A Critique of Nigeria's Bid for Permanent Seat in the Security Council, India Quarterly Journal*, vol. LXI No. 2j April-June, 2005, Indian Council of World Affairs, New Delhi.

Ajaebili, C.N. (2011), *The Option of Economic in Nigeria's Foreign Policy, the International Journal of Humanities and Social Science,* Vol. 1 No. 17

Akpotor, A.S. and P.E. Agbebaku (2010), *The United Nations Reforms and Nigeria's Quest For A Permanent Seat*, Kamla-Raj Journal of Social Science, 24 (1) : 51-55

Amuwo, K. (1987), *Nigeria and the International Order: Thoughts on the Past, the Present and Reflections on the Future* – Review Article, The Nigerian Journal of International Affairs Volume 13, Number 1, 1987, p. 115, Vantage Publishers (Int.) Ltd, Ibadan

Anyaoku, E. (1987), *A Foreign Policy for Nigerians:* Nigerian Journal of International Affairs Volume 13, number 1.Vintage Publishers Int. Ltd, Ibadan, Nigeria.

Blum, (2005), *Proposals for UN Security Council Reform*, the American Journal of International Law 99 (July)

D. Archibugi (1993) *the Reform of the UN and Cosmopolitan Democracy: A Critical Review,* Journal of Peace Research 30 (3)

Ebegbulem. J.C. et al (2013), *Oil Exploration and Poverty in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria: A Critical Analysis* International Journal of Business and Social Science, Vol. 4. No. 3; March 2013

Horvath R. J. (1972), a Definition of Colonialism, Current Anthropology, Vol. 13, No.1. University of Chicago Press – Jstor Journals

J. E. Guzzardi and M. J. Mullenbach (2007-2008*) the Politics of Seeking a Permanent Seat on the United Nations Security Council: An Analysis of the Case of Japan* Midsouth Political Science Review, Vol. 9

Kaiser K. (2004), *a Seat for Germany on the UN Security,* DGAP IP JOURNAL,

Niemann, M (1993), Diamond are State's Best Friends: Botswana's foreign policy in Southern Africa Africa today, vol. 40. (1)

Nigeria – South Africa Baseline Study, Brief No 44, September 2013, Open Society Foundation for Africa, South African Foreign Policy Initiative, (SAFPI)

Obiozor, G.A. (1984), *Apartheid and Nigerian Foreign Policy,* Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, ISSN 0189-0819, Lagos, Nigeria.

Obuoforibo, G.I.J. (2011), *Nigeria and the UN Seat: A Discussion of Obstacles to Nigeria's Ambition,* Journal of Social Science and Public Policy, Volume, 3, March

Ogunbadejo, O. (1976), *Nigeria and the Great Powers: The Impact of the Civil War on Nigerian Foreign Relations,* Oxford Journals Oxford University Press African Affairs, Vol. 75, No. 298,

Okpokpo, E. (1999), The Challenges facing Nigeria's Foreign Policy in the Next Millennium 3(2):4, African Studies Quarterly

Omotola J.S. (2007), *the Intellectual Dimension of Corruption in Nigeria*, African Sociology Review 11, 2.

Price, G. (2005), *Top Table Trouble*, the World Today, 61 (August/September)

Rodrigues L.N. (2004), About-Face: the United States and Portuguese Colonialism in 1961, e. JPH, vol. 2, number 1 summer (2004), ISCTE-CEHCP, Lisbon

Saliu, H.A. and J. S. Omotola (2008), *Can Nigeria Get a UN Security Council Seat?* South African Journal of International Affairs, Vol. 15, No. 1, June

Saliu, H.A. and J. S. Omotola (2008), *Can Nigeria Get A UN Security Council Seat?* South African Institute of International Affairs, 15: 75-85

Schlesinger S. (1997), *Can the United Nations Reform?* World Policy Journal, 14.3, fall

Sinclair M. (1983), *An Analysis of Nigeria's Foreign Policy: The Evolution of Political Paranoia*, The South African Institute of International Affairs, Braamfontein, South-Africa, And ISBN: O90837111X

Spies, K. (2008), *the Multilateral Maze and (South) Africa's for Permanent United Nations Security Council Representation*, Strategic Review for Southern African Journal

Sullivan C.O. (2005), *the United Nations, Decolonization, Self-Determination in Cold War Sub-Saharan Africa, 1960-1994,* Journal of third World Studies, Vol. 2.

Tarka, S.T. (1984), *Does Nigeria Have A Foreign Policy without Apartheid?* Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, ISSN 0189-0819, Lagos, Nigeria.

Wyche S. e.tal (2006), *Historical Analysis: Using the Past to Design the Future*, GVU Centre College of Computing, Georgia Institute of Technology Atlanta, GA, USA

Conferences/Seminar Papers/Workshop Papers

Ajayi K. (2010), *Seeking Equality in an Unequal World: Nigeria and the Permanent Security Council Seat Aspiration,* University of Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria, 22nd Inaugural Lecture, 12 January 2010

Akinyemi B. (2005), *the Blackman Burden*, Text of the public lecture delivered on February 24, 2005, Lagos, Nigeria.

Bukarambe B. (2000), *Nigeria's Foreign Policy in Africa, 1960-1999,* NIIA Enlightenment Course Series Volume 1, Number 1, 2000, Selected Readings on Nigeria's Foreign Policy and International Relations, R.A. Akindele and E. A. Bassey (eds), NIIA Lagos, Vantage Publishers International Ltd Ibadan

Pham, J. (2007), *Nigeria's Foreign Policy: An Inquiry into Sources and Prospects,* (Paper Presented at VFLAD-IPRI International Conference 8-9 November 2007 Lisbon, Portugal)

Southern African Liberation Struggles and the Nordic Countries: Ideas for Research, in Workshop Report Documenting Liberation Struggles in Southern Africa, Select papers from the Nordic Documentation project worship 26-27 November 2009 Pretoria, South Africa, Chris Saunders (ed) the Nordic African Institute

The Search For A UN Security Council Permanent Seat – A Case For Nigeria, Text of a Speech by His Excellency, Dr. Abdullahi Adamu, Executive Governor of Nasarawa State, Nigeria at the Public Presentation of a Book on President Olusegun Obasanjo at Accra – Ghana, Saturday, August 13, 2005

Dissertation

Ifidon E.A. (2003), *The Power Motive in the History of Nigeria's International Relations, 1970-1993,* A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Department of History, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, February, 2003

Mazzeo, Domenico. (1969), *The United Nations and the Problem of Decolonization: The Special Committee of twenty – four,* a thesis presented to the Department of Political Science of the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ottawa as partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, Ottawa, Canada

Appendix

General Assembly Resolution 1514 (XV), 14 December 1960

Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

The General Assembly,

Mindful of the determination proclaimed by the peoples of the world in the Charter of the United Nations to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

Conscious of the need for the creation of conditions of stability and well-being and peaceful and friendly relations based on respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of all peoples, and of universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion,

Recognizing the passionate yearning for freedom in all dependent peoples and the decisive role of such peoples in the attainment of their independence,

Aware of the increasing conflicts resulting from the denial of or impediments in the way of the freedom of such peoples, which constitute a serious threat to world peace,

Considering the important role of the United Nations in assisting the movement for independence in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories,

Recognizing that the peoples of the world ardently desire the end of colonialism in all its manifestations, Convinced that the continued existence of colonialism prevents the development of international economic co-operation, impedes the social, cultural and economic development of dependent peoples and militates against the United Nations ideal of universal peace,

Affirming that peoples may, for their own ends, freely dispose of their natural wealth and resources without prejudice to any obligations arising out of international economic co-operation, based upon the principle of mutual benefit, and international law,

Believing that the process of liberation is irresistible and irreversible and that, in order to avoid serious crises, an end must be put to colonialism and all practices of segregation and discrimination associated therewith,

Welcoming the emergence in recent years of a large number of dependent territories into freedom and independence, and recognizing the increasingly powerful trends towards freedom in such territories which have not yet attained independence,

Convinced that all peoples have an inalienable right to complete freedom, the exercise of their sovereignty and the integrity of their national territory,

Solemnly proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations;

And to this end

Declares that:

1. The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation.
2. All peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.
3. Inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence.

4. All armed action or repressive measures of all kinds directed against dependent peoples shall cease in order to enable them to exercise peacefully and freely their right to complete independence, and the integrity of their national territory shall be respected.

5. Immediate steps shall be taken, intrust and Non-Self Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance, with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom

6. Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

7. All States shall observe faithfully and strictly the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the present Declaration on the basis of equality, non-interference in the internal affairs of all states, and respect for the sovereign rights of all peoples and their territorial integrity.

Below are the countries that participated in the voting which produced the above declaration:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian SSR, Cambodia, Cameroun, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, **Nigeria,** Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Dominican Republic, France, Portugal, Spain, and Union of South

Africa, United Kingdom, and United States