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ABSTRACT

At the end of First World War, the profile of diplomacy raise as a result of quest for sustainable global peace and security. Again, due to the emergence of globalization and interdependence in the global system, state cannot survive on its own without relating with one another. As a result of these factors, diplomacy therefore has been seen as the only tool states can employ to ensure effective and peaceful relationship with one another. Following this, Ghana - Nigeria relations since independence which characterized by tensions combined with some level of cordiality is not exceptional. Diplomacy has been viewed as an essential tool that helped both countries in achieving cordial inter-state relations. Therefore this dissertation has come up with some factors that lead to tension rising between Nigeria – Ghana relations since independence as well as role played by diplomacy in calming down those tensions. The study portrayed political instability in both countries and ideological differences of their leaders as the main factors behind it. Therefore, this study discusses how diplomacy helps to manage the strains in both countries relations. The analysis of the secondary data shows that diplomacy is playing major role in their inter-state relations. This work also makes recommendations to be considered in enhancing their relations.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.0 BACKGROUND

Ghana – Nigeria relations could be traced back to pre-colonial times. To a considerable extent, their relations could be said to be based on historical and colonial antecedents. Historically, these two countries were closely related in different ways: Records show that there are ancestral nuts that tie them together. The Ogonis, a community in the Niger-Delta in Nigeria migrated from Ghana and nearly forty percent of words that form the Ogoni language have striking similarities both in meaning and sound with the Twi language\(^1\). This ancient migration of Ghanaians to Ogoni land in the Niger-Delta eventually resulted in permanent settlement of some of them in the area that they mostly occupy. There is also the connection between the Gas of Ghana and the Yorubas of Ile-Ife in Nigeria\(^2\). The Ga people of Greater Accra Region are said to have come from Ile Ife in Nigeria. Thus the Ga peoples of Accra trace a part of their ancestry to the 500BC Yoruba Ile Ife culture. (Known as Ilefi to Ga people).\(^3\)

Ghana and Nigeria before independence were both colonized by the British. According to John E. Flint, the process had been somewhat haphazard. It began with the ‘exceptional’ annexation of Lagos in 1861 and the creation of Gold Coast colony in 1874. By 1890s, the British were pressured by the French and the Germans into annexing Ashanti in Ghana and Northern part of Nigeria under the colonial secretary; Joseph Chamberlain.\(^4\) He is also of the view that Ghana – Nigeria relations before independence had the same features of different cultural groups. This enhances their roles in the political economy of the African continent. They were also governed by the same crown colony system and indirect rule, a common background to which they
responded by forming joint unions which helped tied both countries together. Among them are the National Congress for British West Africa (NCBWA), which was formed in 1920 and the West African Students Union (WASU) in 1925 by Nigeria and Gold Coast students in England. Prominent among the students were Ladikpo Solanke of Nigeria and J.B Danquah of Gold Coast\(^5\). This union helped to motivate the two countries to work towards Africa’s emancipation from colonial domination. Ghana got her independence in 1957 which was followed by Nigeria in 1960.

Ghana, being the first sub-Saharan nation to gain independence, was seen as a model and also pace setter for Pan-Africanism\(^6\) which aimed at protecting and promoting African unity, culture and heritage. As a result, Africans looked up to Ghana to keep championing Africans’ democracy and integration. Thus Dr Kwame Nkrumah, the first President of Republic of Ghana, summed it all up, when he said that “the independence of Ghana was meaningless unless it was linked up with the total liberation of the African continent”\(^7\). With all these, Ghana had been seen as a pace -setter towards African Liberation. Hence W. Scott Thompson in his book, Ghana’s Foreign policy 1957-1966: Diplomacy, Ideology and the New State, saw Ghana as “the diplomatic cockpit of Africa”\(^8\). Several Nigerians who were then domiciled in Ghana took inspiration from Ghana’s independence and form the “All Nigeria Community”. Through this, the historical bond was more firmly established.

On the same basis of maintaining the cordial relationship, Chief Ojo Maduekwe, the Nigeria foreign Minister, urged that the two countries to live and keep heartily the beliefs and perception of their founding fathers, exhibiting a borderless world without any hindrance whatsoever.\(^9\)
In spite of all these, there have been several conflicts and misunderstandings between Ghana and Nigeria in the areas of trade, movement of people, goods, services, migration, sports, and crime, among others. Some of them are the expulsion of Nigerian citizens from Ghana in 1970 at the time of Busia’s regime; and the quarrel and misunderstanding that occurred between the two countries at the defeat of Nigerian Super Eagles (National football team) in the 1980s at the All African Games held in Lagos. It led to the setting of Ghanaian buses on fire. Then on the same note, the overthrow of the Limann government in 1981 by the Provisional National Defence Council (PNDC) incurred the wrath of which the administration in Nigeria. Consequently, Nigeria cut off oil supplies to Ghana, demanding downright payments before lifting. Hither-to Ghana enjoyed credit facilities up to 180 days. Again, Nigeria went further to expel all ‘illegal’ Ghanaian immigrants from Nigeria in 1983. The infamous “Ghana Must Go”. These acts by the Shehu Shagari regime caused a rise in tension between the two countries. However, these skirmishes and many more have been successfully managed in a diplomatic way without the situation escalating into violence, conflict or war.

One of the most fascinating measures that were taken was the establishment of a Joint Commission for Cooperation between Ghana and Nigeria in April 1988, which also gave the then Head of the State, Flt.Lt. J.J. Rawlings, the opportunity to pay an official visit to Nigeria to meet with his Nigerian counterpart, General Ibrahim Babangida, where a lot of issues on mutual benefits and cooperation, were discussed. Later in early January 1989 President Babangida returned the visit to Ghana which has been hailed as “water-shed” in Ghana – Nigeria relations.
This exchange of visits by the Heads of States is one of the diplomatic tools employed in order to ensure good relationship between the two states.

Later on, the return to civilian rule in both countries in 1992 and 1999 in Ghana and Nigeria, respectively, helped in many ways to even strengthen the ties between the two countries. Obviously significant were the 2001-2008 regimes of both countries, which collaborated with each other on several issues, including leading the integration process in the sub-region and Africa as a whole. Both Presidents Obasanjo and Kuffor were conspicuous and energetic in spearheading the realization of the ECOWAS dream and were equally at the forefront of the African Union’s New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD). These diplomatic ways through which difficult situations were managed and also helped in tightening both countries’ relationship is referred to as diplomatic offensive.

According to the Longman dictionary of contemporary English, ‘Diplomatic Offensive’ is a planned set of action intended to influence a lot of people’. In this sense, actions by governments and/or individuals to influence relationship may be termed as diplomatic offensive. One may note the oversea travels embarked upon by then candidate for US President, Barack Obama. It was a diplomatic offensive that caused affection and influenced global opinion about his candidacy. This was to be repeated by Mitt Romney, the Republican candidate for the 2012 US presidential elections, albeit without the success that Obama had earlier established. Diplomatic offensive is also the intensification of diplomatic mechanism and strategy in either resolving conflict in a peaceful manner between states or to influence opinion and choices.
In the thinking of S.E Quarm, diplomatic offensive may also be attributed to those efforts African leaders (prominent among them Nkrumah) displayed in the emancipation of African states, which shook colonialism to its very foundation and eventually led to Africa’s freedom. He sees it as “collective effort to inspire, encourage, even sometimes cajoling Africa to assume its responsibility for the restoration of its freedom and dignity in order to attain world peace, without which our newly-won freedom would be insecure and our development retard.”

A diplomatic offensive is intensive, targeted, purposive, and usually designed to thaw tense situations or to further intensify already burgeoning ones. Almost all countries do employ it at one time or the other. For example, diplomatic offensive was seen to be used by China to mend its ties with the Arab countries in an effort to manage the conflict that had arisen in Syria. In doing that, Chinese Foreign Minister, Yang Jiechi, expressed his worries and urged the international community to create favourable conditions to provide humanitarian assistance to Syria. He reiterated Beijing’s readiness to work with Arab League in resolving the crisis and their push for a peaceful settlement of crisis as soon as possible. Recently, Israel has also shown their latest diplomatic initiatives of conversation and indirect peace talk with their friendly countries, which has helped in reviving a long-running Mideast policy debate. In addition, a high-ranking North Korean official with long experience in nuclear talks is reported to have gone on July 2, 2013 to Russia, “in a sign that the reclusive nation is stepping up a diplomatic offensive after months of tension.” In the same vein, while its forces battle supporters of the ousted Muslim Brotherhood, the new Egyptian government is on a diplomatic offensive abroad, in a bid to overturn an African Union sanction. An Egyptian presidential envoy has told Sierra Leonean officials that the AU decision to suspend the military backed regime was taken on a
wrong basis and urged the support of the Sierra Leonean government to help reverse it\textsuperscript{14}. Hence, in order to achieve peaceful resolution of conflict between and among countries, diplomatic offensive needs to be employed.

On the note, it is interesting to note that Ghana and Nigeria have always been using diplomatic offensive as a positive tool in normalizing their relationship, as well as create avenues for further bi-lateral cooperations. This at times extends to the multilateral level. Mention here may be made of the collaboration between Ghana and Nigeria in effectively establishing the ECOWAS Monitoring Group (ECOMOG), a sub-regional security arrangement that finally helped to end the Liberian civil war.

1.1 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Conflicts and misunderstandings are inevitable, as far as relations between states are concerned. Records show that Ghana and Nigeria have had their fair share of sour relationship since their independence. Scholars have attempted to interrogate the causes of their rivalry which among them are the convergence of some of the national interest of the two countries as well as the clash of ideologies of their leaders. Considering the role of diplomacy in inter – state relations, the study looks at how diplomacy have been employed to manage their relationship that exists between these two nations without letting their differences escalate into violence, conflict and war, The questions below arises

- How did the change in Nigeria foreign policy towards Ghana within those periods affect their relations since independence?
- To what extent did the challenges influence the two states’ relations?
• What role did diplomacy play in managing those situations?

1.2 OBJECTIVES

The study generally seeks to review diplomacy as a veritable tool in inter – state relations, its application in Ghana – Nigeria relations and equally how both countries’ differences have been able to be managed through the use of diplomacy. Specifically, this study seeks to achieve the following:

• The overview of diplomacy in the modern world.
• Post-independence Ghana-Nigeria relations.
• Areas of conflict and cooperation and how diplomacy has been used in solving them.

1.3 SCOPE OF RESEARCH

This study will assess the hiccups in bilateral relations between Nigeria and Ghana since independence.

1.4 RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

It may be presumed that a key aspect of good relationship that exists among states is based on the application of diplomacy which determines its success. Such diplomatic mechanisms which may be implemented by Heads of state, ministers, individuals and the state representatives as a whole, ultimately seeks to enhance relations among states. This study attempts to fill the gap created in academic work concerning Ghana – Nigeria relations, their challenges and its resolution through diplomatic means. Hopefully, the recommendations given should contribute towards intensification of their relations.
1.5 HYPOTHESIS

Effective Diplomatic measures, when employed, result in cordial relationship and good neighbourliness between and among countries.

1.6 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This research is situated within the theory of cooperation. Joseph M. Grieco, in his book *Cooperation Among Nations*, defines international cooperation as the voluntary adjustment by states of their policies so that they manage their differences and reach some mutually beneficial outcomes. According to him, the concept of international cooperation comprises of a number of elements: First, cooperation involves efforts by states to work together voluntarily. Second, it involves the specification by states of some common or at least compatible ends, to which they devote their combined efforts. Third, cooperation signifies not a one-time interaction but rather a longer-term engagement by states.

David Mitrany, as quoted by Joseph M. Grieco, in his view said that there are technical issues that could be resolved only by cooperative action across state boundaries. Grieco also sees cooperation as “a subject of manifest importance for anyone concerned about the prospects for world peace and order.” This theory was viewed differently by two different schools of thought: realists and liberal institutionalists, but for the purposes of our study, the view of the latter appears more suitable and will be employed. Liberal institutionalists are of the view that in spite of the decentralized nature of the international system, the willingness of states to cooperate and work together has been encouraged, particularly with the assistance of international institutions and organizations, which help states to achieve their security goals, resolve and
overcome their obstacles. They also concede that aside security issues which is one of the reasons why states need to cooperate, the grow networks of trade, monetary, capital and technology flows among states are also factors that necessitated cooperation among the states. Liberal institutionalists again argues that the ‘low politics’ in the international political economy and especially the success and failure of co-operative efforts among these states are also important domains of international action.

According to Groom, A. J.R. in his article “the setting in world Society” as quoted by Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff in Contending Theories of International Relation, as well defines cooperation as a set of relationships that are not based on coercion or compellence and that are legitimized by mutual consent of members. Authors as well show the need for states to cooperate among themselves in order to face problems which solutions are beyond a state are required. Such problems includes functional sector like trade policy in which the need for cooperative behavior is believed to exist, environment, telecommunications, migration, health, investment, monetary policy and airline safety. The mutual gains from cooperative behavior in such areas are held to outweigh the benefits from acting alone. As quoted by David Mitrany, “the more successful cooperation was in one functional setting, the greater would be the incentive for collaboration in other fields.”

The relevance of this concept to the study is that it provides the basis to establish that the relations between Ghana and Nigeria in contemporary international relations, have demanded the need for them to cooperate in order to enhance their securities, eliminate trade barriers between them, promote each other’s economic well being, as well as replace mutual suspicions with
growing trust which will wipe off war attitudes and create an atmosphere of peace rather than war. It is against this background that the theory of cooperation is chosen to form the theoretical base of the work.

1.7 LITERATURE REVIEW

In contemporary international relations, virtually all states are independent. Diplomacy is more probable to bear fruit when a country is independent, autonomous, and developed. In spite of the existence of globalization and interdependence as a result of increase in modern technology as well as new states, still there is the need for interaction and cooperation among states in order to help them achieve their national interests. Therefore, it is quite challenging for a state to live in isolation. In order to explore opportunities across the world and cooperate well, there is need for diplomacy in state’s dealings with one another. This is because effective and accurate diplomacy helps to balance the equation between the domestic and international political system which are tied together in a Siamese relationship. Diplomacy hides nothing rather; it focuses on establishing cooperative channels and boosts friendship among states and also in managing their differences when they occur because misunderstandings are inevitable in any relationship.

In Keith Hamilton & Richard Langhorne’s assertion in The Practice of Diplomacy: its evolution, theory and administration, they see diplomacy as the most effective means of pursuing national Interests; it has substituted war which is the most ineffective means. They are of the view that if war is to be avoided in the future, there would have to be fundamental changes in the way in which nations deal and cooperate with each other²¹. Ghana and Nigeria relations over the years could be well placed in this context because both countries had been able to manage their differences in diplomatic ways by trying to do away with war and conflict. Consequently to this,
no matter what happened in the past Nigeria still remains the biggest brother of Ghana in the sub region.

Otoghile and Obakhedo in their article, “Nigeria – Ghana relations from 1960 – 2010: Roots of convergence and points of departure” views Nigeria – Ghana relations as twists & turns relationship despite their commonalities. They portray so many instances where Ghanaian leaders launched inter- state diplomatic offensive through themselves (leaders) as well as their delegates to Nigeria. The article also show how far the ruling elites can shape the disposition of one country towards another, and finally how the unstable nature of African governments can affect both countries’ relations.22

J. E Flit in his article, “History of Nigeria and Ghana” also explains that the relationships that exist between these two countries were dated back in their early years. He traces both countries relations from the time of slave trade when they fought for abolition of slavery till this modern era. The cooperation of both countries in their pre-colonial era till they got their independence were also analyzed. So many features like geographical background as well as wider European and Islamic back ground which both countries have in common are what the author envisaged that help them in cooperating well with each other. He also points out that the different cultural groupings in both countries are the main factors that are responsible in shaping their political scene23. All these cooperations they have in spite of unstable relations between them are achieved through diplomacy.
Fergus Lyona and Gina Porter in an article “Evolving Institution of trust: Personalized and Institutional bases of Trust in Nigerians and Ghanaians”, examine the process both countries followed in building cooperation in order to regulate their food trading sector. The article also reviewed that both countries are characterized by micro-entrepreneurs from different ethnic groups. The fragmented nature of this sector necessitated a range of cooperative forms in order for the enterprises to gain access to information, finance, quality products and market spaces. In other to achieve this, there is the need for both countries to build personal trust across boundaries. This cross boarder trust which they built, eventually helped them in building common norms of behaviour they had over centuries.

On the same vein of showing effective cooperation among states, S. E Quarm in Diplomatic Offensive: an overview of Ghana’s Diplomacy under Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, portrays how these diplomatic means were used by Nkrumah. He views diplomacy as a peaceful means, through which state relations should be pursued in order to attain world peace that is, those efforts put in place by states. According to him, although diplomacy in pursued in a peaceful ways, he also sees diplomatic armoury, namely coercion or pressure as another weapon of diplomacy. Recently, this means has been generally discredited but has been transformed in another form as a threat or use of economic sanctions. It was effectively used against South Africa in addition to the armed struggle of the African National Congress (ANC) itself which brought down apartheid. During the time of Nkrumah, Quarm attributes the elements of diplomacy to Nkrumah’s efforts such as speeches, writings, visitations, and aids among others, which Nkrumah put in place towards the emancipation of African states since there was no credible military option or capacity for effective economic sanction. Relating this to Nigeria – Ghana relations, a threat of
economic sanctions, as a diplomatic means to achieve aim and objective have severally been used by Nigeria. For instance, Nigeria has placed oil embargo on Ghana on several occasions as a means of pursuing her interest. From Quarm’s explanation of diplomatic offensive, one can deduce that such diplomatic means can be apply either positively or negatively.

In an article titled “The United State and Nigeria – 1960 to 1987: Anatomy of a pragmatic Relation” by Levi A. Nwachukwu. Nigeria during the civil war were forced to broaden its ideological embrace to become pro-east in spite of their policy of non-alignment. In this example Nigeria applied it negatively because it is against their policy of non-alignment. Nigeria as of then did what they did because they needed communist Russia’s diplomatic and military support in its war effort to defeat Biafra. Nigeria launched that diplomatic offensive towards Russia by admitting their communism idea in order to get such military favour from them. However, the same diplomatic offensive was also launched by United State towards Nigeria even before independence by giving Nigeria assistance through Britain. Eighteen months after Nigeria independence, precisely, May 1961, the former President of United States, John F. Kennedy, sent a special economic mission to Nigeria to study the country’s six year development plan. Other offers which include economic aid and technical assistance were also given to Nigeria. All these were because the prospect that Nigeria would assume leadership role in the African continent which made it desirable for any big power interested in Africa to gain Nigeria’s friendship. US saw Nigeria as the one Nation whose support was most critical for a U.S relationship with black people everywhere. This is because it was believed that most African Americans had their ancestry in Nigeria.
Moreover, in the article: “China wages diplomatic offensive with Arab countries” China having vetoed a UN resolution on February 4th 2012 with Russia, they backed an Arab league proposal for the Syria President Al Assed to step down and also incur the displeasure of the Arab League\(^28\). China decides to adopt diplomatic offensive strategies to restore its relationship with the Arab League; or at least in a bid to be seen by the league has been very much concerned and sensitive towards the plight of the people of Syria and commit to the peaceful resolution of the crisis in Syria. The Arab League leader Nabil Elaraby responded to the veto of China and Russia by saying that Russia and China have lost diplomatic credit in the Arab world because of their veto but China defended its decision by saying it was aimed at avoiding more casualties in Syria. However, China in a bid to mend its ties with the Arab countries, especially those that were angered by its veto, the Chinese foreign minister Yang Jiechi interacted with Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Algeria and other cities, indicating that Syria was the main topic of the discussions. Yang Jiechi urge the international community to create a favourable condition to provide humanitarian assistance to Syria. He adds that Beijing values the role of the Arab League in resolving the crises in Syria and is ready to work with Arab countries to push for a peaceful settlement of the crisis as soon as possible. He adds that China is deeply worried about the escalating violence in Syria. This may aptly be described as a diplomatic offensive, aimed at ending the fences with the Arab world.

Former President of Nigeria, Major –General Ibrahim Babangida, was as well seen launched an Intra-African diplomatic offensive with two high level delegations and ECOWAS Foreign minister, Professor Bolaji Akinyemi to West Africa countries\(^29\). This was as a result of an order to all illegal immigrants of West African countries to leave Nigeria within three weeks as
announced in radio broadcast on April 1985\textsuperscript{30}. So on Babangida’s attempt to promote regional integration, he sent good will visits and massages which was meant to remove strains in the relation of Nigeria and its neighbours, who are mostly members of ECOWAS of which Ghana, is one of them. This move was followed by the re-opening of Nigeria – Benin boarder which had been closed. In addition, former President Rawlings in April 1988 responded to the diplomatic offensive waged by Nigeria. He did that by paying a three day visit to the Nigeria President, Babangida, after there had been a long standing misunderstanding between both states as a result of which, all cooperation agreement, especially Ghana – Nigeria Permanent Commission, became defunct.

Abba Eban in his book \textit{Diplomacy for the Next Century} moreover sees diplomacy to be very essential in inter-state relations. His reason for this assertion is because states cannot change the policies of another but rather apply diplomacy in dealing with one another\textsuperscript{31}. The author is of a view that ethical impulses have never dominated diplomatic history that is why states should not neglect diplomacy because it based on prudence and reciprocal advantage. Again, he also established the fact that although modern technological tools are efficient and problem solving but they will not replace diplomacy which often inhibits the ripening of wisdom and open societies.

Finally, Christer Johnsson and Karin Aggestam in their article “Diplomacy and Conflict Resolution” also admit the fact that state needs to apply diplomacy in their dealings with others; but their interests lay more on the contributions of diplomacy towards conflict resolution. They saw diplomacy as a perennial institution that influences the relation between politics throughout
As an institution, they saw it as a response to a common problem of separate entities having the urge of coming together to have relation with one another (Sharp, 1999:51). Diplomacy was also viewed as one of the oldest forms of intervention to limit recourse to war.

From the above explanations, authors have established the fact that diplomacy plays an essential role in the inter-state relations. Therefore, there is need for diplomacy to be intensified in order to ensure continuous promotion of better inter-state relationship.

### 1.8 METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

The methods used in this study were historical descriptive and systematic methods of analysis. Hence, based on the aforementioned, the materials for this research will be acquired through the secondary data collection, making use of information gathered from books, published and unpublished works, journal articles, newspapers, magazines, documents as well as reports, which characterizes the relations between Ghana and Nigeria, especially within the time under review.

### 1.9 THE STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY

This study is divided into four chapters. Chapter one constitutes the research design: an introduction to the background of the study, the statement of the research problem, the objectives of the study, hypothesis, the rationale of the study, the scope of the study, the theoretical framework within which the study was conducted, the literature review, the methods of data collection as well as the structure of the study. Chapter two presents diplomacy as a veritable tool in inter-state relations. The third chapter examines Ghana and Nigeria relations since independence. Chapter four comprises of the conclusion, the summary of findings and recommendations.
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CHAPTER 2

DIPLOMACY AS A VERITABLE TOOL OF INTER – STATE RELATIONS

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The modern world has witnessed changes in the global distribution of power and the nature of power itself. Such changes bring the risk of conflict in different forms and everybody is affected by conflict in its various manifestations. The nature of the anarchical international system also creates a setting in which different self-interested states and non-state actors pursue their goals and purpose. This is because, since the 17th century, states have been seen as the principal and sometimes the only effective international actors\(^1\). So the arrival of large numbers of these new, post-colonial states with no essential experience of the actual rules as operated by the older states system is also modern example of important factor in the development of diplomacy; because there is need for these states to relate well with one another in the decentralized system of the global world. In an attempt to explain this better Hans Morgenthau opines that the paramount importance of diplomacy as an element of national power is to preserve International peace\(^2\). He also asserts that diplomacy which ends in war has failed in its primary objective of promoting the national interest by peaceful means.

However, looking at the factors that gave rise to diplomacy, the First World (1914-1918) war which brought about bankruptcy to all the powers involved in it and the subsequent economic issues\(^3\) provided a diplomatic space that encouraged negotiation. Therefore, the development of diplomacy occurred most significantly during the periods when war for one reason or the other...
had been regarded as an ineffective means of pursuing interests. Diplomacy thus became its principal substitute. Long Strang, a former British Diplomat, remarked: “in a world where war is everybody’s tragedy and everybody’s nightmare, diplomacy is everybody’s business”\(^4\). After 1815, when prevention of warfare became a principal objective of diplomacy, it resulted in the development of the peaceful conference in the early 19th century and the subsequent creation of both the League of Nations, and the United Nations in the 20th century\(^5\). Therefore, the profile of diplomacy raise basically because the quest for sustainable peace and security continued to bother the minds of all stakeholders – international organizations, governments, NGOs, and many others.

2.1 DEFINITION OF DIPLOMACY

There is no singular or a generally accepted definition of diplomacy in the contemporary international world. Practitioners and scholars have come up with definitions they think best suits the word diplomacy. Diplomacy as defined by Ernst Satow is the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of relations between the governments of independent states, extending sometimes also to their relations with vassal states; or more briefly still, the conduct of business between states by peaceful means\(^6\). In Satow’s definition, diplomacy is seen as actions that exist between independent states only, but looking at the world’s situation today and the number of conflicts that have ravaged the modern world, his definition is deficient of the international system as it is today. It does not capture the groups of people or the other stakeholders other than states involved in the act of diplomacy. This definition of diplomacy by Satow seems state-centric and therefore narrow.
Haas J. M. sees diplomacy from the perspective of international peace throughout the world. To Haas, international peace cannot be preserved through the limitation of national sovereignty and the reason for this is the nature of the relations that entrusts among nations. International peace, according to him, can only be attained through the transformation of present society of sovereign nations into a world state; and this world state cannot be attained through moral, social or political means prevailing in the world of our time. The only condition for the creation of world peace is through mitigation and minimization of political conflicts; and the method of establishing the precondition for permanent peace is what he termed as diplomacy. Morgenthau again sees diplomacy as an act of maintaining peace among sovereign nations which can be achieved through lessening of political conflicts only. However, a critical look at the present global system reveals that although most conflicts among nations are of political nature; his definition precludes adequate attention to economic, cultural, religious other social factors that have contributed immensely in unhealthy rivalry among nations. Against this backdrop, it was argued that the minimization of political conflicts only will not lead to the attainment of international peace.

Bolewski on his part defines diplomacy as the act and craft of communicating and interchanging among states through their representatives in the national interest through a peaceful means. To him, diplomacy in the 21st century is transforming and expanding from a peaceful method of inter-state relations to a general instrument of communication among globalised societies. Looking at the above definitions of diplomacy, they seem to have one thing in common. They portray diplomacy as an act of relation between independent states only. More so, these definitions understand diplomacy only as a means not as an end. In that case, diplomacy
becomes a tool. Therefore, if considered only as a tool then, should it fall into wrong hands, it can be counter-productive; but when considered as an end, diplomacy becomes a way of life. The reason is because diplomatic philosophy of life tends to limit suspicion and encourage trust, which in turn prevents conflicts. Following from the foregoing and for the purpose of this project, there is need for a working definition of the term diplomacy.

Diplomacy is here-by defined following Bolewski, as the management of an international entity’s policy by official and semi-official agents or individuals via dialogue with relevant international actors according to established rules and practice as well as informal mechanisms which do not violate international norms. By this definition, diplomacy becomes a practice not only for political states, but also for other non-political entities that have applied diplomacy not only as a means to procuring peace but also as a philosophy or way of life. Such non-political agent includes all international organizations and non-governmental organization example: United Nations (UN), International Labour Organization (ILO) among others. There are other regional and international organs that also engage in diplomacy. Hence, Saunders asserts that in today’s global village, state to state relations cannot in any way exhaust the overall relationship that exist between two countries instead, citizens of two countries can relate to one another independently of their governments either as individuals, members of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) as well as the emerging transnational civil society.

According to Cohen, as a result of globalization, many non-traditional actors such as NGOs, trans-national organizations and even individuals can be seen practicing diplomacy. Diplomacy has therefore, become an expanding art and the "engine room for international relations". This
Cohen’s argument was based on the fact that most of the new states are poor or small or even both, International organizations like the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the European Union need to adopt a means to relate with these states in order to assist them financially. These International Organizations can only do that through their representatives. By so doing, these international organizations are directly or indirectly involve themselves in diplomacy. Consequently, the aim of diplomacy can be seen in twofold: On one hand it protects and guides the individual interests of states. On the other hand, it aims at promoting global norms and values characterized in the growing sense of community of states and international unity.\textsuperscript{13}

It is in this second aim that our position of diplomacy as a way of life gets portrayed. Diplomacy has some intrinsic features which Johnson and Langhorne had grouped into three:

i. The formulation and execution of state’s external policy. Diplomacy deals with the formulation of external policies which involve the gathering and assessment of information about the international environment and weighing the alternative lines of policy. The execution aspect, on the other hand, comprises of the communication to either governments or the people of the line of foreign policy that has been decided. It also involves attempts to explain to the policy in order to secure cooperation from the people as well as foreign governments. These activities constitute the art of diplomacy.

ii. Diplomacy can be in a bilateral form which involves two states as well as in multilateral form which involves three or more states. Basically, multilateral form of diplomacy is conducted in a conference form where states have equal opportunities to
air their views and actively participate in discussing global issues. Alternatively known as ‘conference diplomacy’.

iii. Diplomacy may be ad hoc, that is, without mutual agreement or with rules on how it may be conducted. It is normally carried out in an urgent situation. Conversely, it can also be institutionalized with mutual and well understood rules and conventions.¹⁴

Diplomacy is carried out by diplomats, though in some cases officials with a variety of titles such as Presidents, Prime Ministers, Ambassadors or Special Envoys can also engage in diplomacy. Their roles in diplomacy include information/intelligence gathering, reporting, representation, negotiation, lobbying, policy making, among others. In order for them to carry out their functions effectively, some immunities and privileges are accorded them. These immunities and privileges are codified in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relation of 1961. With these immunities and privileges, diplomats, to some degree, personify and symbolically represent their countries. According to Rourke (1997:285) Ambassadors who speak the language and respect the customs of the country to which they are accredited are apt to making good impressions that enhance the image of their country.¹⁵

2.2 TYPES OF DIPLOMACY

Looking at the different phases in which diplomacy is being carried out in managing states relations; it is worth explaining the different types of diplomacy and their contributions in states’ relationships.
2.2.1 Conference Diplomacy: John Kaufmann defined it as part of the management of relations between governments and of relation between governments and intergovernmental organizations that take place in international conference. Adding to John’s definition, Rusk as quoted by Berridge also described it as type of multilateral negotiation which involves the following factors: continuity of organization, public opinion, rules of procedure and conclusion based on the majority votes.

2.2.2 Bilateral Diplomacy: according to Callieres means communication limited to two parties at any time, which does not necessary matter the method or means the parties involved communicate with. Its conduct is on state–to–state basis. It also involved direct face to face contact between the two parties. This is mostly conducted by Nigeria and Ghana through which their leaders sort out the differences between them by themselves without involving third party. Moreover, it can equally be via formally accredited resident missions. In this type of diplomacy, negotiation partners are highly needed. The parties are not seeing each other face to face but have contact through an intermediary, who stands between them trying to achieve agreed solutions. This supported Callieres’ statement that indeed the purpose of negotiation was not to trick or deceive anybody but for states to reconcile with one another on the basis of true estimate of their enduring interests. The example of this type of diplomacy was seen when United Nations under Secretary General Ralph Bunche acted as an intermediary on the Island of Rhodes in January 1949 in talks between Egypt and Israel.
2.2.3 **Multilateral Diplomacy**: Berridge sees it as an interaction or conference attended by three or more states by means of verbal and face to face exchange.\(^{21}\) This type of diplomacy provides the best chance for a successful negotiation because it brings together all parties in necessary agreement.

2.2.4 **Economic Diplomacy**: Rana (2009) defines it as the process through which countries tackle the outside world, to maximize their national gain in all the fields of activity including trade investment and other forms of economically beneficial exchange, where they enjoy comparative advantages. It can be in form of bilateral, regional or multilateral dimension. Berridge and James (2003) state that economic diplomacy is concerned with economic policy questions including the work of delegation to conferences sponsored by bodies such as the WTO. It is a plural set of practices all aimed at advancing the home country’s external economic interests. It is also the use of the full spectrum economic tools of the state to achieve its national interest. It does not only promote the state’s prosperity but also helps in promoting relationship between and among states.

2.2.5 **Summitry**: is a multilateral diplomacy of a very special kind which involves only the Heads of governments or Heads of States. This also helps a lot in managing states relations especially issues that need urgent attention. Some delicate issues are mostly solved through this means. It can be Bilateral or Multilateral. For instance, bilateral summitry was found mostly in Ghana – Nigeria relations more especially during 2001 – 2008 regime (Obasanjo and Kuffor’s regime). Through their leaders’ one in one talk, both countries settled their issues.
To wrap it up, these different types of diplomacy are seen to have a common role to perform in inter-state relations which is managing states relations especially when things are not moving on well the way it is supposed to be. In managing the relations, the type of relations states are into determines the type of diplomacy that is suitable for them. For instance, the bilateral relations that exist between Ghana and Nigeria required bilateral diplomacy.

2.3 THE ORIGIN AND EVOLUTION OF DIPLOMACY FROM ANCIENT TO MODERN

Historically, in the olden days, human groups though were living together but in hostility as a result of quest for food and territory. During that time, Persuasion as a tool of diplomacy was used by them to achieve their goals of peace living. This is because when living in peace, they relate with one another in a more friendly way by exchanging goods like animals among themselves. For them to make this good moment last, peace agreement was concluded among them and emissaries were sent to ensure or guarantee the implementation of the agreement.

Etymologically, the word 'diplomacy' is derived from the Greek verb ‘diplono’ which means 'to fold'. It referred to the folding metal plates used in Roman times as formal documents. Its earliest record was found inscribed on a tablet which had been dated sometime around 2500 BC, in present – day northern Iran. The Amarna Tablets where the diplomatic record was first found provided an insight into the manner in which that country conducted its relation with their neighbours.

Edmund Burke was the first person to use the term, diplomacy in its modern sense in 1796. Before then, diplomacy was known most commonly by Cardinal Richelieu, French as
'negotiation' continuelle. During that time, sovereigns traditionally sent their envoys to other sovereigns for various reasons such as to prevent war, cease hostilities, conclude treaties or merely continue peaceful relations and further trade. In the 16th century, the mythological Origins of diplomacy were cited for good effect. For instance, in De Legstionibus (1584) the Italian Jurist Alberico Gentili establishes the inviolability of envoys by tracing the origin of diplomacy back to God and his legates, the angels. Later, its meaning was extended from management of archives to the management of international relations in general in the 18th century. As a result of the phases it has gone through, diplomacy has been seen to be of two stages: ancient and modern diplomacy.

2.3.1 Ancient Diplomacy

The ancient diplomacy is all about political relations between countries usually conducted in secrecy. It was intermittent and generated no permanent institutions. The envoys or emissaries were sent on ad hoc basis either to pay tribute, delimitation of frontiers or settlement of conflicts. According to Krieger, it is often and correctly observed that the beginnings of diplomacy occurred when the first human societies decided that it was better to hear a massage than to eat the messenger. Hass, also point out that ancient diplomacy was conducted mainly by career diplomats with well established decorum and in a traditional style. Despite the fact that it was being conducted by career diplomats, it was characterized by porous boundaries, slow communication, little need to deal on a continuous basis with any other entity and large loosely form of empire which the state’s structures have as of then.
The earliest diplomacy that eventually influenced Greece and Rome began the Western diplomacy in Eastern Mediterranean and the region around the Tigris and Euphrates valley. This continued and advanced in ancient Greece and Rome, in which many concepts like reconciliation, truce, alliance and commercial treaty, used in modern diplomacy originated\textsuperscript{33}. Specifically, Greek diplomacy had three kinds of representatives: angelos or presbys, Keryx and the proxenos\textsuperscript{34}. The first two means messenger and elder respectively. They were used for brief and highly specific missions. Greek diplomacy had a lot of good things for which they were known. Their ambassadors were good in offering assistance and hospitality to visitors and also good in giving advice on domestic political situations. The first international organization was claimed to be developed during this time. This was based on the fact that Olympic game and other similar festivals, during which a general agreed truce occurred, represented a period of deliberately controlled international relation during which co-operative arrangement was made\textsuperscript{35}. In spite of all these, Greek diplomacy had its negative sides which made it to be replaced by Roman diplomacy. Such includes its openness and publicity in nature\textsuperscript{36}. Again, its embassies were strictly on ad hoc basis. There was no permanent embassy in charge of running day to day activities. Their credentials were valid for one negotiation and appointment as an envoy was always a brief tenure. Finally, the numbers of ambassadors involved in a mission were as many as ten\textsuperscript{37}. These large numbers of ambassadors represent different strands of opinion of the sending state as such crippled the effectiveness of embassies. Therefore, the lack of consistency, continuity and confidentiality rendered the pace of Greek diplomacy extremely slow.

Roman diplomacy marked the beginning of treaties. Records showed that the first treaty was written during the Roman time. It also established the rudiments of diplomatic law, which was
first written in code of Justinian\textsuperscript{38}. This is because Roman diplomacy was of the notion that the exchanges of ordinary life should occur in a stable and regulated environment. Romans did not use diplomacy as a means of maintaining its supremacy rather as a means of business transaction. This is the reason why it was the method of managing long distance legal or commercial business principally within the empire. Perhaps because of the unhealthy rivalry and competition involved in business transactions, Roman ambassadors were mostly used in negotiating disputes.

Following the Roman diplomacy was Byzantine diplomacy. It flourished after the collapse of Rome and also added more spice to the evolution of diplomacy by specifically training negotiators and by establishing the first department of foreign affairs. During this time, the empire was converted to Christianity. They were also careful in keeping all the physical signs of their unique superiority in evidence, despite the fact that there was no resident ambassador. They relied so much on information gathering and diplomatic initiatives undertaken by its frontier officers. Diplomacy was continuously used during this period too.

In the 15th century, Italian city states emerged after Byzantine diplomacy. Italian city contributed to the establishment of the first permanent mission. They also introduced summit meetings as a diplomatic practice and so became popularly known for diplomatic artifice.\textsuperscript{39}.

\subsection*{2.3.2 Modern Diplomacy}

Modern diplomacy started with French system. The French system diplomacy came into sight after the Italian city states. It is the direct predecessor of modern diplomacy. Cardinal Richelieu,
who served as Chief Minister (1624 – 1642) to King Louis XI11, was the first to see diplomacy as an ongoing process rather than as an experience. He consolidated all foreign affairs function under one ministry under the French system diplomacy. Later, a permanent embassy was established under Louis XIV (1643 – 1715). During this period, secrecy was the hallmark of diplomacy.

Next to the French system which ushered in modern diplomacy was the World War I (1914 – 1918) era which also serves as a benchmark in the transition of modern diplomacy. It was the beginning of the end of European world dominance. New powers – US, China and Japan – began to assert themselves and they joined or replaced the declining European countries as world power. Diplomacy under this era took root in centuries of multipolarity.

In addition to the evolution of modern diplomacy, it was conventionally dated to the peace of Westphalia in 1648, which ended the hostilities in the thirty years war as well as established the independence of states and the notion of religious freedom and tolerance. Since then, diplomacy remains however, the institution by which states pursue their own particular interests. Following this contention, many scholars try to air their views on how states use diplomacy in pursuing their interest. Krieger asserts that modern diplomacy is now considered to be an essential international institution which provides the norms, protocols and practices for the reconciliation of differences between sovereign states. Likewise Bolewski on his own sees it as a rule–governed activity involving communication, negotiation and representation between states, international organization and Trans – national participants. These rules are seen to help in avoiding or settling conflicts.
Looking at the current phase of diplomacy, it is obvious to notice that diplomacy has gone through a lot of transformations since its origination. This transformation of diplomacy from ancient to modern was as a result of many factors like globalization. Records showed that modern diplomacy cooperates well with globalization. This is because globalization increases the contacts between people across national boundaries be it in economy, technology, culture and governance. It also has different departments in the diplomatic affairs. Globalization makes the world faster, thereby affecting the way diplomacy works. Such development in today's technology makes for more transparent diplomacy. For instance, Media and social media help to facilitate fast dissemination of information to the public, sometimes even before the embassies receive the same information. These changes in technological advancements, which tend to shape the political order and economic environment, have deep impacts on the way political leaders conduct diplomacy. Example, modern telecommunication techniques and the improved jet lines have significantly improved the mobility and altered the way actors behave in international politics. They contributed a lot in summit and conference diplomacy. Once more, Jet lines make it possible and easier for the Heads of States to be fully involved in diplomacy. In addition to modern diplomacy, it also encourages open and public diplomacy, rather than secret and quiet diplomacy. This is well understood by the former U.S. President, Woodrow Wilson, who explains modern diplomacy to mean an open covenant of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understanding of any kind, but it shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

This modification of diplomacy was aimed at exposing diplomacy to the media and public opinion, with direct and unmediated conduct of negotiation by politicians and high–ranking
officials, including heads of states and ministers. This new diplomacy includes: multilateral diplomacy, parliamentary, democratization, open diplomacy, leader to leader diplomacy and public diplomacy. All these practices have been greeted as ‘reforms’.

Some scholars have argued that the transformation of ancient or modern diplomacy into ‘new diplomacy’ was as a result of widespread and popular views that secret intrigues of the powers, carefully concealed from their own people had led to a war over obligations, promises and counterclaims that would not have stood the light of public scrutiny. Hence, the experiences of world alliances in the nineteenth century and their roles in the expansion of World War I have portrayed the importance of transparency in diplomatic process. As a result, the significance of collective decision making among states had been recognized since the end of First World War. In addition, the lessons of the diplomacy between United State and Soviet Union, especially their approach towards negotiation did cast doubt on the suitability of ancient diplomacy of secrecy. The advent of railroads, the first telegraphic system, the radio and telephone tremendously altered diplomacy at the end of the nineteenth century from what it had been at the beginning of those hundred years. According to Johnson & Edgar, the fast expansion of communication and the growing relevance of public opinion in international politics also brought about new diplomacy. Again, technological progression as well advanced travel and communication among states in modern diplomacy. The existence of all these moreover, raised multilateral diplomacy to its peak during this period. Multilateral diplomacy encompasses summit and conferences at the highest level. As Monlana has suggested,” the technologies and institutions of communication which have become so central to world politics and economies over the past couple of decades, have fundamentally altered the nature, sources of power and influence both
domestically and internationally”\textsuperscript{50}. Understanding this, Ebo held that, media diplomacy – TV diplomacy has been used to articulate and promote foreign policy\textsuperscript{51}. Consequent upon this, Kalb concluded that “indeed, only the foolish foreign leader can any longer afford to underestimate the power of TV news”\textsuperscript{52}. These fundamental changes in diplomacy, politics and global communication have created new modes of interaction between the media and diplomacy. To this effect, there have been efforts to coin phrases that capture the new role of global media, television in particular in modern diplomacy, hence; media diplomacy, teleplomacy, photoplomacy, sound-bite diplomacy, instant diplomacy and real-time diplomacy.\textsuperscript{53}

Another factor that led to the transformation of diplomacy is the clash of ideological differences between the super powers – U.S and Soviet Union. The U.S believed in capitalism while Soviet Union believed in communism; and there was a struggle and competition over which one will prevail against the other. Indeed, the Cold War became the metaphor for defining international relations and therefore created new forms of diplomacy. During that time, the world was virtually cut into two camps, with mutual suspicion of each other. As a result, conference diplomacy took much of the time.

Thus, the above explanations show that ‘ancient diplomacy’ did not vanish, rather it changed substantially. Again, with the characteristic structures of diplomacy which have been modified to fit in the purpose of the contemporary world, simply demonstrate the continuity of diplomacy. Diplomacy today is vastly different from what it was in the 19th century; and it will continue to evolve and change. Tomorrow’s diplomacy will be even being further removed from the famous
pictures of the dancing Congress of Vienna, where the foundations of the structure of diplomacy for many decades were laid.

2.4 THE ROLE OF DIPLOMACY IN THE MODERN WORLD

Apparently, the major functions of diplomacy have been to establish, communicate, negotiate and bargain for tolerable agreements and other arrangements between sovereign centres of decision making in the international system\textsuperscript{54}. Conclusively, diplomacy works towards achieving conflict resolution and therefore it is used for two or more conflicting parties when they are ready for conflict resolution, negotiation and agreements. It can equally be used by officials in a form of media to communicate with state and non-state actors to build confidence and advance negotiation and to mobilize public support for agreements. Diplomacy can be pursued through various routines and special media activities like press conferences, interviews as well as visits of Heads of states and mediators of rivals’ countries. For instance, the televised ultimatum President Kennedy of United State sent to the USSR about the 1962 Cuban Missile crisis, Nixon’s visit to China in 1992 and Sadat’s 1977 visit to Jerusalem\textsuperscript{55} were examples of TV diplomacy, designed to achieve breakthroughs in crisis and conflict.

Again, in resolving an issue, people to people contact diplomacy is also another form of diplomacy that is best suitable. As Mohammed Khatami, an elected Iranian President in May 1997 asserted that, people-to-people contacts diplomacy was guided by the assumption that a major impediment to the re-establishment of normal relations between the two countries that have been hostile to each other can be resolved\textsuperscript{56}. Thus, there is the need to reconcile the two people by means of friendly exchanges between their governments. Khatami proposed the above
assertion as a way of solving the Iranian and the US crisis, caused by the Iranian invasion of the U.S embassy in Iran, violating their archive as well as keeping their diplomats in hostage. As a result, the U.S broke their diplomatic relations with them in 1980. Sports competition as one and a means of improving people-to-people relation was used to settle their misunderstanding.

The role of diplomacy in the global world has also been enhanced by modern technology. Its role made diplomacy to incorporate in so many areas of world politics which unify the world. Similarly, the advancements in technology make diplomacy faster and easier. Example, Global television in particular has become a central source of information about world affairs. It was due to the live CNN – global television, coverage of Bush's speech that prevented the Russian coup attempt in August 1991\(^5\). The aim of this type of diplomacy is to cultivate favorable image abroad. According to Malone, it also aims at affecting foreign people’s thinking and ultimately that of their governments.

In addition, role of diplomacy is that in terms of content, public diplomacy describes activities directed in the field of information, education, and culture among others whose objective is to influence a foreign government by influencing its citizens\(^5\). Mass media – international broadcasting in particular- is one of the channels used in public diplomacy. Others include cultural and scientific exchange of students, scholars, intellectuals, artists, participation in festivals and exhibitions, building and maintaining cultural centre, learning of foreign languages and establishing local friendly leagues and trade associations. Diplomacy also facilitates communication between the political leaders of the states and other entities in the world politics. Without communication, there are no international societies. Most
African leaders today solve the differences among them through direct communication they engaged themselves in. In so many instances, Nigerian and Ghanaians’ leaders have engaged in direct communication in several occasions in a bid to sort things out. Diplomacy is as well meant to minimize friction.

Writing in the 1400s in one of the first treaties on diplomacy, Emalao Barnaro asserted that “the first duty of an ambassador is “… to do, say, advise and think whatever may best serve the preservation and aggrandizement of his own state”\(^59\). With this, diplomacy also fulfils the functions of symbolizing the existence of the society of states. Diplomats that engage in diplomacy are the visible expression of existence of rules to which states and other entities in international system pay some allegiance.

2.5 THE RELEVANCE OF DIPLOMACY IN THE GLOBAL WORLD.

There are lots of ongoing arguments in the world today about the relevance of diplomacy. Some scholars are of the opinion that diplomacy has no relevance again in the modern world because of increasing use of modern technology and summits by Heads of the States. To some, diplomats have been by-passed by Presidents and Ministers. The high-level policy makers are visiting countries themselves and also bringing back shared valued insights and information. These also support the argument that the importance of ambassadors as observers and reporters have declined as a result of technological advancement.

Moreover, countries are less isolated from one another than they once were because of emergence of technology. For that reason, the whole area of activity becomes internationalized.
As one US official puts it “there is a diminished value of classical diplomatic reporting. If you had a choice between reading the diplomatic cables in your box and tuning into CNN three times a day, you would tune in to CNN.”

Contrary to all these arguments, the study maintains that diplomacy has not lost its relevance as far as state to state relations are concerned. For, despite the fact that summits and other forms of multilateral diplomacy, like conference diplomacy, has taken over contemporary politics, diplomacy is still of much relevance to the international system. Functions like information gathering, pre-negotiation and other arrangements that are supposed to be done before the main summit or conference are still being carried out by diplomats and not the Heads of States themselves. So, without the help of diplomats, such functions will not be carried out. More so, it has clearly been proven by many scholars that major disputes among nations can only be settled with the help of diplomacy. As already indicated, diplomacy’s main pre-occupation is the maintenance of international peace in the preservation of the national interest. To achieve this primary objective, Morgenthau suggests that diplomacy must follow four basic principles:

i. It must determine its objective in the light of the power actually and potentially available for the pursuit of these objectives. In other words a state must set goals that are not beyond its power. For if it is beyond its power, such a state may risk facing war because it will not be able to deter hostile nations from challenging them beyond endurance.

ii. Diplomacy must be able to assess the objectives of other nations and the power actually and potentially available for the pursuit of these objectives. In this, it is
also a fact that a nation will equally invite war if its diplomacy wrongly assesses
the objective of the other nation and the power at their disposal.

iii. It must also determine to what extent these objectives are compatible with each
other. The objectives of both states must be equal in order to attain peace.

iv. Finally, diplomacy must employ the means suited to the pursuit of its objectives
which includes persuasion, compromise and threat of force. To attain world
peace, Morgenthau also suggests the application of the mixture of threats and
persuasion as diplomatic approaches during war and negotiation in order to
achieve peace.

The above mentioned approaches of achieving international peace are equally supported by Kofi
Annam, former United Nations secretary-General, in one of his statements that reads “you can do
a lot with diplomacy but with diplomacy backed up by force, you can get a lot more done”61.

Generally, the whole argument was imbedded in our working definition of diplomacy which
compels the actors to carry out their functions according to established rules and practices in a
manner that does not violate international peace. Put differently, the issue of force as well as
submission to the established rules, being carried out in a peaceful manner is the same as the
mixtures of threats and persuasion.

Moving on with the relevance of diplomacy, it has also been noted that in the contemporary
world where there is emergence of new independent states, the only means through which these
states can relate and communicate with one another is through diplomacy. The issue of
globalization and interdependence in the contemporary world also gave these states more reason
not to overlook one another. This is because sometimes, events trends in one society affect political, economic, social and cultural development in other societies. Therefore, where there is the need to solve a problem which is too much for a state, global assistance will be highly needed. For instance the recent issues of violence in most African countries today like Boko Haram in Nigeria, Al-Qaida in Somalia and the Arab Maghreb and others have attracted the attention of the African Union in their quest for peace.

Additionally, the multiplicity of international organizations is also another reason for which diplomacy is still relevant today. As the name implies, these organizations are beyond borders and there is the need for them to relate with one another through their representatives from every state. These representatives are those we know today as permanent missions and their functions are more or less like that of state’s representatives which are same as the functions of diplomats. Diplomacy is highly suitable in a situation where the states are pursuing different interests because through negotiation, a common agreement will be reached. Negotiation according to Rourke is a combination of art and technical skill that attempts to find a common ground among two or more divergent positions\(^\text{62}\). This supports one of Morgenthau’s view on the rules of diplomacy where he explains that before diplomacy can achieve its primary aim, which is the attainment of international peace, it must determine the extent to which both states’ objectives are compatible with each other.

In conclusion, looking at the origin of diplomacy, the factors that gave rise to diplomacy, its role from the ancient times to this modern era, it is obvious that diplomacy is indispensable as far as inter – state relations is concerned. It is a veritable tool used in inter-state relations, because it
keeps the relation going no matter the situations in which the states find themselves. Without diplomacy, the world would be littered with violence, conflict, and war between and among states and nations.
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CHAPTER 3

GHANA - NIGERIA RELATIONS

3.0 INTRODUCTION

Nigeria is the seventh most populated country in the world as well as the most populated country in the West African sub-region, if not in the entire African continent\(^1\). Consequently, it is not surprising that many of its citizens are permanently residing and making their living in all its neighbouring countries, including Ghana. Likewise, many Ghanaians are in Nigeria. Estimate (2009) had put the number of Ghanaian emigrants in Nigeria at \(25,000^2\), which represents 13 percent of Ghanaians living outside Ghana and the number of Nigeria living in Ghana at more than \(50,000^3\). According to the former Nigerian High Commissioner to Ghana, Senator Obanikoro, more than one million Nigerians live in Ghana, which has a total population of 23 million\(^4\). Both countries have a very long tradition of relationship, though with ups and downs. Even before 1960, on Ghana’s attainment of independence in 1957, according to Olajide Aluko, many institutions and other interests were being shared in common between them such as common official educational system from the UK and Commonwealth membership on their independence.\(^5\)

After their independence too, both countries' ensured that they maintained continual and strong relationship with each other. Records show that Ghana is among the first countries that Nigeria established diplomatic ties with immediately after their independence in 1960. Even though Ghana and Nigeria formally established their diplomatic relations during the above mentioned period, their diplomatic ties dated back before their independence from British colonial rule\(^6\). Their relationship is the one both countries have benefited immensely in the areas of socio-
cultural, economic, political, military and regional cooperation. The president of the National Association of Ghanaian Communities in Nigeria (NAGHACON), James Kwegyir-Aggrey testified this on the cerebration of Ghana’s 45th Republic Day Anniversary and 10th Anniversary of NAGHACON after his historical excursion. Notwithstanding the symbiotic relations that existed between Ghana and Nigeria, their relations according to Otoghile & Obakhedo could best be described as twists – turns, because of the kind of rivalry that used to pop-up between both countries. Their relations were unstable and had an unpredictable, full of troubles. Based on the forgoing, the main thrust of this chapter is to highlight the problems which both countries had experienced since their independence and how those problems were resolved through the instrumentality of diplomacy. These shall be assessed under the aspects of Economic / trade, political, Scio-cultural and diplomatic relations.

3.1 GHANA – NIGERIA DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS

Records show that Ghana and Nigeria established diplomatic relations immediately Ghana got her independence. This was made clear in W. Scott Thompson’s book Ghana’s Foreign Policy 1957-1966 Diplomacy Ideology and the New State, in one of Nkrumah’s speeches after Ghana’s independence. Nkrumah expressed a willingness to establish diplomatic relations with those countries which had "honoured Ghana by sending delegations to their independence Cerebrations to which Nigeria is one of them". Later in 1958, Ghana opened a consulate in Nigeria. As quoted by Thompson “From a traditional diplomatic point of view, Ghana should have opened a mission in Lagos before anywhere else, yet it was almost two years before Ghana had opened a consulate.”
Ghana and Nigeria enjoyed a happier relations at diplomatic level from 1959 – 1960, after which their relations soured as a result of their differences on the issue of Southern Cameroons, where Nigeria supported Chief Endeley’s quest for a federal structure, while Ghana was opposed to Nigeria’s stand and supported Foncha’s KNDP (Kamerun National Democratic Party) campaign for union with French East. This issue raised a lot of remarkable dusts. In one of the statements made by a Ghanaian diplomat while addressing Foncha, he said, “our man” “Nkrumah did not want Nigeria to get too big.”

Later diplomacy was used both countries tried to settle their differences in 1959, which led to the appointment of a long-time resident of Nigeria as Nkrumah’s commissioner. Also a Ghanaian diplomat was posted to Lagos in early 1960.

Tensions later emerged again between Ghana and Nigeria on August 1969 as a result of the change in Power in Ghana which brought Busia’s administration into power. Under Busia’s era precisely in 1969, the Alien Compliance Order, which expelled all the illegal migrants from Ghana, was imposed on the foreigners, of whom the most affected were Nigerians. Most of those who refused to go were detained. It was in 1972, when Col Acheampong took over that about 1000 Nigerians who were detained under Busia’s regime as illegal immigrants were released. Later in the 1980s, under Shagari’s regime, Nigeria deported about 300,000 Ghanaians, who had gone to benefit from Nigerian oil boom, as a measure to curb Nigeria’s economic and social problems including rising crime rate. In spite of this, Nigerian President, Buhari and Ghana President, Rawlings still maintained military solidarity that existed between them, which was successfully used to overthrow democratic government in their respective countries. According to Boafo –Arthur, both leaders “were likely to see issues from the same prism.”

45
In August 1985, there was another bloodless coup that brought former Nigerian President, Babangida into the system. On assuming office, he became very close friend with President Rawlings of Ghana and stopped the expulsion of Ghanaians as well as other Africans from Nigerian. G.K. Bluwey sees it as ‘Anti – ECOWAS’ and ‘Un – African.’ J.J Rawlings took advantage of the change in power to pay an official visit with the intention of mending the fences in Ghana-Nigeria relations. The measure taken by J.J Rawlings in mending the fences is simply termed as diplomatic offensive. To let all go and for the improvement of their relations, Ghana and Nigeria laid the foundation of ‘Big Brother Diplomacy’ by establishing a joint commission for bilateral cooperation in 1988 which led to the exchange of visits by both leaders. According to Owusu, the two leaders regularly consulted each other on issues that concerned them such as trade, transition to democracy and also focus on peace and prosperity within West Africa.

Though diplomatically, both countries were relating well but later threatened to cut when Nigerian traders complained over discriminatory treatment they did encounter when setting up trading companies in Ghana, claiming that the ECOWAS protocol relating to free movement and right of establishment were not being implemented. In a while, negotiation which is one of diplomatic tool was employed by both Heads of States and automatically led to the peacefully settlement of the issue. Therefore, it is true to say that the diplomatic bond between Nigeria and Ghana is that which is based on a shared interest of brotherhood, in which problems or diplomatic issues are settled amicably. This was the extent of their friendship at the diplomatic level.
3.2 NIGERIA – GHANA POLITICAL RELATIONS

Ghana being the first sub-Saharan African nation to gain independence was seen as a model and also a pace setter for Pan-Africanism which aimed at protecting and promoting African unity, culture and heritage. All Africans looked up to Ghana to keep championing African democracy and integration. This was echoed by Dr Kwame Nkrumah’s, (the first president of Republic of Ghana) statement on the eve of Ghana’s independence that “the independence of Ghana will be meaningless unless it was linked up to the total liberation of Africa”\(^{22}\). Nigerians who were living in Ghana assembled together to form “All Nigeria Community,”\(^{23}\) drawing inspiration from the spirit of the era.

At the time of Nkrumah’s regime, Azikiwe was also manning the administration of Nigeria. During that period notwithstanding, the good relations between the two countries were strained because of three major reasons: firstly, both countries were ruled by political leaders who had different ideologies and attitudes. Dr Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana was a renowned nationalist, a strong advocate of Unity of African states and also a believer in socialist system whilst Nnamdi Azikiwe of Nigeria on the other hand believed in capitalism and also a conservative who viewed Unity of African States with great caution. Thus, he proposed a gradual approach to African Unity, which was totally different from Nkrumah’s view \(^{24}\). Steve Egbo asserts that during that time, “all sectors of Nigerian economy were not only controlled by the West, but were entirely dependent on their capitalist orientation for the country’s consumptive patterns and developmental efforts”\(^{25}\). This clash of ideas between Nkrumah and Azikiwe led to the formation of two opposing camps- Casablanca group under the leadership of Ghana and Monrovia group led by Nigeria in the quest for Pan Africanism. This was the first and immediate post –
independence conflict between Nigeria and Ghana. These two blocs operated along their leftist and rightist approaches until the formation of Organization of African Unity (OAU) in 1963. The apparent differences in both countries' system of governance prompted Mr. V. Iketuonye, a leading member of National Council for Nigerian and Cameroonian (NCNC) to make a remarkable comment in early 1961 that “Ghana and Nigeria could not be compared, as one was a dictator and the other a democracy.”

Secondly, after the formation of OAU in 1963, Nigeria and Ghana had a strained relationship as a result of competition over continental leadership. Dr Kwame Nkrumah in his speech on the attainment of Ghanaian independence showed their intent over Continental leadership. He said that, “Ghana had a historical role to lead our brethren who are still struggling to be free…” On the other hand, Nigeria considering its population size viewed herself as the giant of Africa and equally eyed the leadership too. Perhaps, this notion led Nigerian former Action Group Party (ACP) leader in foreign legislature, R.A. Fanikayode to assert that “Nigeria was destined to lead Africa towards the total emancipation of all African peoples.”

Also, Jaja Nwachukwu, Nigerian first Minister of External Affairs said in 1960 that “Nigeria was the largest single unit in Africa and therefore must lead Africa”. This spirit of competitiveness between these countries also manifested itself in war of words as used by the then Nigerian diplomat, Maitama Sule. During the second Conference of Independent African States in Addis Ababa, Maitama Sule warned that Nigeria would not tolerate the attitude of someone who “thinks he is a messiah with a mission to lead Africa”. Circuitously, the diplomat was referring
to Dr Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana following his statement on Ghana championing Africa's emancipation project.

Finally, in 1962, Nkrumah of Ghana was accused by Nigeria’s President and Prime Minister, (Nnamdi Azikiwe and Tafawa Balewa, respectively) of training a group that was meant to overthrow the government of Nigeria. This accusation found its base on some members of the Action Group who went into exile while running away from persecution from the Northern People Congress that was supported by the Nigerian federal government.  

Those years were dominated by leadership tussles between the two countries. Ghana and Nigeria were seeing each other as rivals and obstacles to having their way, as such, almost all the common inter-territorial organizations between them were dissolved at the end of 1962. As an instance, an Agreement between Nigeria Shipping Line and Ghana’s Black Star line, which could have taken effect from 1964 to form a conference line that would eventually control the north-bound trade of both states, was dissolved. The two countries were in this sour relationship until both countries’ governments were militarily removed in 1965 and 1966 respectively.

Even though the coincidental change of government by both countries ushered in a new phase of friendship between them, from 1966 to 1975, the countries’ relations were impulsive initially. However, it was highly improved in the early 1966. The reasons behind this improvement in relationship could be traced to two factors. In the first place, the Nigerian president, General Aguiyi Ironsi, who came into power through a coup d’état and Major General Kotoka, who was
the principal actor in the Ghana’s coup then were friends\textsuperscript{34}. Secondly, the two leaders had no ideological differences. Nigeria under Ironsi was one of the first African countries to recognize the National Liberation Council (NLC) government (the junta that took over from Nkrumah) under General Ankrah at OAU Ministerial Council meeting, held in Addis Ababa in 1966\textsuperscript{35}. Thereafter, diplomatic offensive was seen launched through the exchange of letters and reciprocal visits between both leaders – Ironsi and Ankrah. The latter later sent delegates to the former on a good will message to deliver a letter in appreciation. Later Nigerian President Ironsi reciprocated by paying back a visit to the Ghanaian Head of State, General Ankrah\textsuperscript{36}. Apparently, their political relations were rebuilt.

Nonetheless, this cooperation did not last. It was marred again following a military coup in Nigeria, which brought about Gowon’s administration into power. It was during that era, in 1967 to be precise, that the Nigerian civil war occurred as a result of the division of the country into 12 states; a situation unacceptable by the Eastern part of Nigeria, who went ahead to declare themselves as the Republic of Biafra. On this occasion, Ghana was accused of according a diplomatic recognition to the new Biafran republic. That was because the then President of Ghana, Ankrah as well a member of the committee set up by OAU to settle the Nigerian Civil War, referred to Ojukwu as the Head of State to the annoyance of the Nigerian delegation.\textsuperscript{37}

Again, General Ankrah was among those who accorded the Igbos of Nigeria a refugee status. Based on the second allegations, Kano’s State Commissioner of Information, Alhaji Tanko Yakasi, declared the order as an intelligent means of recognizing the secessionist Biafra government\textsuperscript{38}. All these accusations put together against Ghana prompted the former Nigerian
Ambassador to Addis Ababa, Mr A. A. Haastrup, to make a provocative statement in a Lagos press saying, “some African countries, pretending to support Nigeria, actually hated her, they disliked Nigeria being called the giant of Africa that is why they wanted Nigeria’s disintegration so they could lead Africa.” In addition, the apartheid policy in South Africa during Busia’s regime brought about misapprehension between both countries. Nigeria was in support of the OAU’s policy decision of total isolation of South Africa and armed confrontation with the racist regime, but Ghana was against it instead, Ghana supported the idea of dialogue.

Afterwards, the emergence of J.J Rawlings on Ghana’s political scene caused further deterioration in relations between the two countries. This was prompted by the anti-democratic and violent changeover of power in Ghana, which the Nigerian government under Obasanjo was critical about. This was because, according to Obasanjo’s administration, Rawlings’ coup could have contagious effect on Nigeria. Hence, the Nigerian government did not only refuse to recognize Rawlings’ government, but also denied Ghana the flow of oil. That situation continued until October 1st 1979 which was very significant and remarkable in the history of both Ghana and Nigeria. It marked the transition from military to civilian rule and ushered Nigeria into its Second Republic. Ghana, at the same time, also entered her Third Republic. This coincidental change in government brought both countries in close relationship once again. Dr Hilla Liman of Ghana, in November 1979, took advantage of this re-emerging relationship and paid an official visit to Nigeria, where special concession for crude oil and continuation of informal trade with Ghana were discussed. Record had it that Ghana imports a lot of consumer goods like toilet soaps, cutlasses, drugs and medical equipment from Nigeria informally.
Yet again, this new found relationship did not last. The second coming of J.J Rawlings into power distorted Nigeria’s foreign policy towards Ghana. Nigeria refused to recognize J.J Rawlings’ government, while J.J Rawlings on his part demonstrated displeasure for the Shagari administration and accused it of corruption. Nigeria’s relation with Rawlings’ administration at that time was mainly soured as a result of Ghana’s relation with Libya. This was viewed as destabilization of the continent and interference in the internal affairs of some countries in Africa. Libya was seen as the hub of PNDC’s relations in Africa. In retaliation, Ghana accused Nigeria along with Britain and United States of planning to enter into Ghana with foreign troops to install Limann government. Nevertheless, in 1982 Rawlings decided to restore Ghana’s international confidence, good neighbourliness, adherence to ECOWAS protocol and treaty of free movement of persons, goods and services, and also to mend its ties with other African states. Thus, he employed diplomatic offensive measure by sending delegates to those states along with Lome, Abidjan and Nigeria. Three – man delegate led by Brigadier J. Nunoo – Mensah (the chief of defense staff and vice chairman of PNDC), was sent to brief Nigeria’s Federal Government on the event that led to the topple of the Limann government. This group was unsuccessful. Later in same year, another seven – man delegation was again sent. During this visit, Shagari, in reaction of Nigeria to Ghana’s accusation over planning to restore Limann to power, categorically stated that:

he was “anxious to disabuse the minds of all Ghanaians that Nigeria had no intention of invading their country in an attempt to restore the overthrown government of President (Dr.) Limann. It is the rightful Responsibility of Ghanaians to solve their own problems by themselves without interference from anywhere. It is a long held policy of Nigeria not to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries.”

Although they were given attention unlike the first group yet, Nigeria continued to resent Ghana because until 1983, Nigeria expelled more than one million Ghanaian from Nigeria and still
refused to continue the supply of the much needed oil to Ghana with the reason that Ghana owed debt to the tune of about US$150 million to Nigeria.

The challenges both countries faced under the political relations were seen solved mostly through the exchange of visit by both countries either in ministerial or Head of State level. In that visitation, negotiation as one the best well to manage their countries’ affair is being carried out. This negotiation between the Heads of States is what is normally referred as summit. Summit as one of diplomatic means were seen working mostly in terms of trying to settle Ghana and Nigeria issues. Therefore, it is worth saying that both countries know the important of bilateral summit and intelligently applied it in their relations which help a lot in managing their political relations well.

### 3.3 NIGERIA-GHANA ECONOMIC/TRADE RELATIONS

In spite of all the odds in Ghana – Nigeria relations, trade ties were particularly important. This is because both countries had been faced with similar economic problems of mass poverty and under-development. Nigeria as well as Ghana are still far away from economic independence as the two nations remain raw material producers for the manufacturing economies of the Western world. According to the World Bank Economic Index of 1979, both of them are among the fifteen ECOWAS countries in West Africa ranked as being the poorest countries\(^49\). Although the discovery of petroleum in large quantities in Nigeria since 1958\(^50\) and Ghana in 2007\(^51\) were natural blessing for both, it has not totally freed them from poverty. Nigerians still need Ghanaians and vice versa. Records have shown that the two countries have been trading in various goods and services for the past fifty years though without any formal agreement between
them. In order to facilitate the free flow of goods between these two countries (by removing tariffs and non-tariff barriers) several measures were taken. These include the signing of bilateral Agreements and Protocols. In January 1989, at the 4th Ministerial Session of Permanent Joint Commission held in Lagos, both countries worked together towards reviving their Permanent Joint Commission for co-operation where they expressed their commitment to forge closer links between them, especially in the area of trade.

At the session, certain measures, which were aimed at controlling informal trade and reviving of all existing Trade Agreements, were adopted. Among such measures was the establishment of the trade mission of Ghana and Nigeria, which comprised of representatives from government, exports, banking and manufacturing sectors. To that effect, Ghana and Nigeria exchanged visits on February 1989 and May 1989 respectively, with the aim of exchanging views on trade relations and considering ways of formalizing and increasing trade links between them. They also agreed on organizing trade fairs and seminars in which both of them will be actively involved. The Committee was later established in Accra on the same year by the two Heads of State, and was finally launched as ‘Lagos and Accra Chapter of Ghana-Nigeria Joint Committee’ for the facilitation of trade. This Joint Committee formation was supported by the ECOWAS Protocol Agreement otherwise referred to as chapter VII of the revised Treaty of 1993. In 1990, both countries’ experts would have harmonized draft Bilateral Trade Agreements presented by the government of their countries with the content that the countries would grant each other the Most Favored Nation (MFN) status in all matters relating to imports and exports trade which will help to enhance their balance of trade. Thus, In January 2000 at Convention in Abuja on Mutual Assistance in Custom Matters, the two countries agreed on implementing the issues surrounding
exchange of information and consultation on joint monitoring & training. They have also largely aligned their tariff schedules to what would likely be Common External Tariff (CET)\(^{57}\). In addition, there was collaboration between National Agency for Food and Drug (NAFDAC), Food and Drug Board (FDB) and Ghana Standard Board (GSB) to facilitate trade in locally produced goods\(^{58}\). All these were to enhance the free movement of their locally produced goods in and out of their various countries.

Both have bilateral agreements on cooperate meeting on Joint Commission and Treaties of Friendship and Co-operation especially with those African nations that they had 'abolition of visa deal' with. Similarly, since 2007, Ministries in Ghana and Nigeria have been meeting to address bilateral trade issues with Nigeria focusing on the treatment of Nigerian traders living in Ghana, while Ghana on the other hand has expressed concern on the difficulties her exporters of goods face\(^{59}\). Against this backdrop, a bilateral Trade and Investment Agreement were drafted where both countries agreed on several things. The first one is to fully implement the ECOWAS Protocol on free movement of goods and services. Secondly, the agreement states that both parties will make special provision in their Investment law for ECOWAS nationals. Thirdly, the agreement foresees the establishment of a Joint Standing Committee for the harmonization of regulatory procedure and the inclusion of special investment provision. Finally, it prescribes the use of 'diplomatic channels' for the settlement of disputes that could emerge from this agreement\(^{60}\). These series of trade agreements between Ghana and Nigeria have proved to be feasible because they limit the challenges their local goods used to face whilst entering each other’s markets. At the same time they enhanced their mutual benefits. According to Boafo Arthur, in 1983 Nigeria was Ghana’s major trading partner in Africa and in the world\(^{61}\).
Equally, in 2005, there was close international economic cooperation between Ghana and Nigeria. It is apt to call Ghana the choice destination for Nigeria’s trader in their West African business operation. Hence, almost all of Ghana's imports were from Nigeria. Estimated record showed that out of 900 million dollars of Ghana’s import from Nigeria, 80% was oil, while Ghana in turn exported nearly 34 million in products to Nigerian markets mainly cocoa and textiles. This actually enhances both countries' economies. Following Thomas Pugal’s explanation of the principle of comparative advantages, a country will export the goods and services that it can produce at a low opportunity cost and import the goods and services that it would otherwise produce at high opportunity cost with this assertion; it is true to say that Ghana and Nigeria have benefitted advantageously from each other. To sum up the volume of total trade between Nigeria & Ghana, statistics showed that it increased from US$64 million in 2000 to US$2.6billion in 2006 though with the balance of trade skewed in favour of Nigeria as a result of the oil they deal in, which as at then had not been discovered in Ghana. Ghana was only added to the exclusive club of oil producing countries in 2007. Moreover, in 2008, the total volume of export trade between Nigeria and Ghana was officially put at $525 million with a brake down for the period showing that Nigeria recorded $89 million non-oil exports to Ghana, while the value of Ghana’s export to Nigeria was $25 million.

This partnership in trade continued through 2010 when Nigeria was seen as Ghana’s third–most important trade partner, accounting for almost 10% of total Ghana’s foreign trade. Ghana in turn was Nigeria’s ninth-largest trade partner in that same year, accounting for some 1.3% of Nigeria’s trade including 1.95 of export. According to a research conducted by the World Bank in 2009, more than 90 percent sampled companies said that most of their products were being
exported to Nigeria and about one-third of the interviewed companies’ exports, made up a significant part of their business, indicating that more than 50 percent of their products were export goods. The average share of exports going to Nigeria for all interviewed companies was 45 percent. This showed the closeness in trade between Ghana and Nigeria. Therefore, it will not be wrong to say that they are each other’s most trading partner; a partnership that has substantially benefitted both countries.

In addition to the various trade agreements between the two countries, both countries have airlines and buses that made their trading easy. For instance ABC Bus, Bellview Airlines, Virgin Nigeria (Air Nigeria), Aero Contractor and Antrak Airline were daily operating scheduled flights between Lagos and Accra. Both countries have been a very important source of investment in each other’s countries with the help of ECOWAS Protocols on ‘RIGHT OF ESTABLISHMENT’. This provides citizen of both countries with the fundamental right to own real estates and fixed assets consisting of commercial and industrial installations, accessories, freehold and leasehold interest in land, plants and machinery among other accessories as well as working capital. This Protocol serves as an incentive for both countries’ business communities. Hence, they venture into cross-border investments and transactions whereby an increased number of Nigerian private and cooperated owned entities have been established in Ghana and other West African countries. Record show that Nigeria is among the list of top ten investors countries in Ghana both by number and value of project between 200- 2007. Likewise Ghana business has been also established in Nigeria and other places. For instance, in information and communication technology sector, Antrak Airlines which is owned by a Ghanaian Alhaji Barda had started its shipping business in Nigeria. Other Nigeria companies which are operating in
Ghana include: Nigerian telecommunications company- Globacom, Zenith Bank International PLC, Fidelity Bank, Oceanic Bank, Zinox Technologies Limited, Omatex Ventures PLC, Computer Warehouse Group (CWG), Vintage Vision, ABC transport among others. At the end of 2010, Nigerian businesses accounted for about 60 percent of foreign investments in Ghana from within the African continent. Estimates show that FDI from Nigeria as of 2010 exceeded USD $1 billionth. Recently, Nigeria’s FDI in Ghana by the close of 2012 according to the Nigeria High Commissioner in Ghana, Ademola Oluseyi Onafonoka stood at US$ 198.07 million. It is believed that the profile and volume of Nigerian business in Ghana is second to China. Besides improving and enhancing Nigerian business transactions in many sectors of the economy like the telecommunications, banking, insurance, agriculture, pharmaceutical, transportation, food, media and real estate sectors, the Protocol has assisted in providing employment opportunities for Ghanaians. This was appreciated by the current President of Ghana, John Mahama in one of his speeches when he said that

“the investment relationship between Ghana and Nigeria has grown into an enviable position and we are building on the partnership because the activities of the Nigeria banks have impacted greatly on Ghana’s financial institutions.”

Following their guiding principles of good neighbourliness and friendship on regional foreign policy, and the notion of a big brother to Ghana, Nigeria has supported Ghana’s economy tremendously in several ways. Initially, in 1970, the Gowon administration helped to reduce the burden on the import of West African countries which among them was Ghana by supplying them with oil at concessionary prices. In 1980s when Ghana’s economy experienced a downturn, Nigeria’s economy was highly affected as a result of the influx of a large number of
refugees into the country. Equally, in 1985, Nigeria pursued an economic diplomacy where it played a leading role in the regional economic integration by opening its borders for free and unhindered cross-border trade between her and her neighbours, including Ghana. Furthermore, according to Boafo Arthur, in 1989, the Ghana National Petroleum Cooperation (GNPC) signed a USD $2.5 million agreement with the integrated Data Service Cooperation (a subsidiary of the Nigeria National Petroleum Corporation) for the latter to conduct a seismic survey in the Tano basin at Half-Assini in the Western Region of Ghana. Even quite recently during Obasanjo’s regime, Nigeria offered to sell energy and oil to Ghana at less than the market prices which may be considered as 'consumer surplus or net gain'. Thomas A. Pugel in ‘International Economics’ states that "the lower market price results in both an increase in economic well-being for consumers who would have bought anyway at the higher price and an increase in economic well-being for those consumers who are drawn into purchasing by the lower price."  

Unfortunately, despite all these, this friendly joining has not been without issues. A number of unhealthy skirmishes pop up every now and then. There have been conflicts characterized with threats and counter threats of placement of bans on products and services from both countries. For instance in 2005, a good number of import commodities to Nigeria with over a hundred being Ghana products, except salt, were banned from entering Nigerian markets as part of measures to stop what was referred to as 'cheap products'. Seth Adeji Baah, President of the Ghana Chamber of Commerce and Industry, also expressed his grief on the Nigeria’s ban on importation of rice from Ghana. Ghanaian manufactures as well as exporters also found substantial informal payments, delays, transit charges and requirements for product registration to be the most challenging difficulties and key barriers in accessing Nigeria goods market. In
2009, a World Bank research revealed that up to 15% of Nigeria’s imports enter the country informally and this offered evidence on the difficulties the Ghanaian exporters’ encounter\textsuperscript{81}. It was based on this issue that Ghana’s current President, John Mahama, in one of his chats with the ‘Daily Graphic’, expressed his displeasure over the unilateral decision by the Nigerian authorities to ban their products from Nigerian markets and so, called for dialogue to resolve the snag. The prohibitions were generally justified by Nigerian Custom Officials on the grounds that the bans were based on fake certificates of origin for Ghanaian products. They claimed that products were simply repackaged in Ghana to obtain duty-free access to Nigeria markets\textsuperscript{82}. In furtherance of their claim, the ban was generally justified by the Nigerian customs officials, as a result of fake certificates of origin for Ghanaian products and as a result of ‘Trusty Foods’, a Ghanaian tomato puree producing company, who exceeded its exportation quota into the Nigerian market\textsuperscript{83}. Meanwhile, according to Ghana-specific reports, Ghana sometimes blocks the duty-free importation of goods originated in ECOWAS which Nigeria belongs, and applies a large number of additional taxes and fees that are not custom duties\textsuperscript{84}. The West African Trade Hub report also stressed how Ghana has continued to apply (temporal) import bans on quotas for a few, mostly agricultural items\textsuperscript{85}.

Consequent upon their recent experience, the Nigerian Trade Union Association, Ghana (NTUAG), opines that the ugly development in Ghana–Nigeria trade relations started in 2007. This was when Nigerian traders in Ghana witnessed several harassments ranging from closing down of their businesses by the Ghanaian authority, physical molestation, and detention over non-payment of US $300,000.00 required of foreign investors by the Ghana Investment Promotion Centre (GIPC) Act. To substantiate their claim, NTUAG went on to portray how
Ghanaian authorities, on Thursday September 9th, 2010 closed down about 14 shops belonging to Nigeria businessmen and about 100 retail shops of Nigerian traders for the whole month while some of their owners were arrested by a task force, detained and subsequently charged to a local court. In a similar situation, Nigerian banks operating in Ghana were forced to recapitalize US$ 60 million minimum by the end of 2009\textsuperscript{86}. In early 2010, the Nigeria second telecommunication carrier, Globacom also declared its preparation to pull out of Ghana as a result of frustrations and sabotage of every effort it had made to provide national coverage of the country\textsuperscript{87}.

The GIPC Act, which the Nigerian traders are accused of flouting, reserves a number of economic activities exclusively to Ghanaians such as petty trading, taxi and car hire services, barbering and beauty saloons\textsuperscript{83}. The section 19(3) of the GIPC Act, 1994 Act 478 states that “in the case of trading enterprise involving only the purchase and sale of goods, which is either wholly or partly owned by a non-Ghanaian, there shall be an investment of foreign capital or its equivalence in goods worth at least $300,000.00 by way of equity capital and the enterprise shall employ at least 10 Ghanaians”\textsuperscript{88}. The aim of this Act was to protect Ghanaian petty traders from Nigerian intrusion and vandalism; that is, from the Nigerians who have come to Ghana for business to seek economic freedom. Furthermore, Attah Mills' administration was alleged plan to enter into agreement with Equatorial Guinea for the supply of oil instead of the initial agreement with Nigeria under the previous governments\textsuperscript{89}. This equally deteriorated the already troubled trade relations between Nigerian and Ghana. Most of these conflicts have been the consequence of change in government from either of the countries. Thus, it is true to say that the political situation in Ghana affects not only its political relation with Nigeria, but also its trade relations and vice versa.
In order to mitigate these challenges and to deepen trade relation between Nigeria and Ghana, a number of high level diplomatic engagements were undertaken by the two Heads of State. This includes a series of talks by Ghana’s Trade Ministry led by the then Minister, Alan Kyeremateng, with his Nigerian counterpart. In the process, Nigerian authorities reduced their list of banned items. Nigeria government under a new commercial initiative known as “Commerce 44” approved the scrapping of export levies for some 33 products. In yet another encouraging development in Nigeria-Ghana trade relations, both countries took a giant step on October 2008 towards the consolidation of Intra-African trade relations. The second Ghana–Nigeria Business Summit was opened in Accra, which was a stepping stone towards the establishment of the Ghana–Nigeria Chamber of Commerce. Others include the Economic Summit in Accra (2010), a Joint Meeting in Abuja (August 23rd and 26th, 2010) and others. All these Summits served as diplomatic space to formalize trade relations that would eliminate trade barriers between West Africa’s foremost economic giants and open up opportunities for growth. According to Senator Obanikoro, the former Nigerian High Commissioner to Ghana, the idea of establishing a joint commission is to bring all the challenges both countries are having on the table and come up with the best solutions so that such will not re-occur; but most importantly, to have a lasting structure so that when these problems arise, the structure will ensure their immediate disposal.

In conclusion, it was noticed that the trade war between Ghana and Nigeria could be attributed to incompatible of custom officers of both states in the area of their trade relationship. These trade wars were seen solved through negotiations, summits, signing of agreements and protocols. All these are diplomatic instruments used to enhance Ghana – Nigeria relations.
3.4 SOCIO–CULTURAL RELATIONS

Ghana and Nigeria share the same tribal and cultural similarities in terms of existence of the Hausa-Fulani tribe. Apart from that, in so many ways, both have strived strategically to exploit the social ties between them. Their socio-cultural relations mostly revolve around their Heads of the States. Since their independence, a lot of state visits between the two countries have taken place at the Head of State level. This level of visits was well expressed by Boafo-Arthur who intimated that Ghana–Nigeria relations were strengthened during Kuffor and Obasanjo’s era. For him, "Apart from the presence of the Nigerian President at Kuffor’s inauguration, Ghana’s ties with Nigeria had been strengthened with several visits between them and their close cooperation in search for peace and stability in West Africa"⁹¹.

There were several instances where both Heads of the State witnessed cultural festivals of each other. In 2004, Obasanjo participated in traditional durbars in Ghana on Kuffor’s invitation such as the Adae Kese of the Asantehene, Otumfu Osei-Tutu II, in Kumasi and Edina Bakatue in Elmina. Likewise, President Kuffor visited Nigeria in the same year for a grand durbar and civil ceremony to commemorate the bi-centenary of the Sokoto Caliphate⁹².

In addition, in 2007, there was close cultural cooperation between the two states, during which Ghana was invited to the annual “Abuja Carnival” by Nigeria’s Ministry of Culture ⁹³. Similarly, on the same note of portraying good cultural relations that exist between both countries, Asantehene, the ruler of Asante kingdom of Ghana, honoured President Obasanjo as one of the few world leader as he marked his 10th anniversary on the throne on April 2009⁹⁴. In the same year too, the then Nigeria High Commissioner in Ghana, Hon. Simon Ejike Eze, also
launched Nigeria’s 47th Independence anniversary in Accra, where he showed appreciation towards an honour given to Nigeria by naming one of their major roads after one of their former presidents, President Olusegun Obasanjo and equally made him a guest of honour during the 50th anniversary celebrations in Ghana\textsuperscript{94}.

Ghana and Nigeria have also showed their interest towards exhibition of their culture and tourism potentiality, through “Expo on Culture and Tourism”. This did not only increase their bilateral relation but also, according to Frank Kofighah (the Deputy Executive Director of Operations of Ghana Tourism authority), the exhibition was aimed at strengthening the ties between the two countries. The bilateral agreement on this was aimed at maximizing the tourism and cultural potential of both countries for mutual socio-economic gains.

Similarly, there had been a lot of collaboration between the two countries’ entertainment industries. The collaboration between Ghana’s film industry and Nigeria Nollywoods was with the aim of improving the Ghanaian film industry has given birth to the emergence of Ghana’s equivalent of Nollywoods called Ghallywood. According to Haynes, Nigerian video industry and Ghanaian video industry are twins, closely parallel and intertwined\textsuperscript{95}. A lot of Ghanaian actors and actresses are featuring in Nigerian movies; so also, Nigerian actors and actresses are featuring in Ghanaians movies. There is also relation between both states in entertainment, modelling and beauty pageant industries. Both countries have been engaging in modally and beauty pageant competitions, for instance, the modelling and pageant competition sponsored by Nigeria entertainment industry (Ovation Magazine industry) in 2007\textsuperscript{96}.
Recently, on the 29th of June 2013 at Accra International Conference Centre (AICC), both countries had their 3rd edition of musical concert named “Ghana meets Naija” hosted by Mobile Telecommunication Network (MTN) and Roagam Links Ghana (RLG). In that event, both countries musician featured and entertained people. The concert was aimed at cerebrating what the two countries have in common as brother countries, rather than a battle for musical supremacy.

Again in terms of religion, both countries also relate with each other. Christianity and Islam are also dominants religion in both countries. Nigeria has been seen as the most exporters of gospel of Christ which have been seen in almost every part of the world including Ghana. To this effect, most of Nigerian churches are operating in Ghana. Such includes: Synagogue of all Nations, Christ Embassy, and Redeemed Christian Church of God (RCCG), Living Faith (Winners Chapel), Pure Fire, Mounting of Fire and Christian Faith among others. Even in the religious aspect of their relations there is also misunderstanding too. In 2005, Ghanaian head of a big Winners Chapel in Accra broke away from the mother church in Nigeria and appropriate all the properties of the church, which turned out to become a major court case in Ghana.  

Moreover, education is another way Ghana and Nigeria’s relations have been greatly improved. Although there is no formal educational agreement between the two countries which allow their students to study in each other’s country, their educational cooperation are growing from strength to strength. This was demonstrated by so many factors. Firstly, the signing of s technical cooperation agreement between University of Lagos, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology and South African university, University of Venda for Science and Technology
in 2006\textsuperscript{98}. Secondly, both countries nationals have received formal education in various universities of the two countries both in undergraduates and postgraduate levels. Likewise in 2005, the Nigeria Federal Ministry of Water Resources offered scholarship to Ghanaians for postgraduate and Higher National diploma in water engineering and management at the National water Resources institution in Kaduna Nigeria\textsuperscript{99}. Also statistically, Nigerian students who enrolled in the University of Ghana alone between the year 2000 – 2006 were about two thousand, nine hundred and thirty-two (2,932)\textsuperscript{100}. Another area of cooperation in terms of education is the influx of Ghanaian teachers and Lectures into Nigerian schools and universities for their teaching profession. This cooperation has been in existence for long till now. Example is a Ghanaian, Dr H.K. Menokpor, who is a senior Lecturer in Community Medicine at the Usman Danfodiyo University, Sokoto Nigeria. This educational cooperation also comes with its own challenges. In 2005-2006, there is an issue of criminal activities involving Nigeria students in KNUST, which led to the expulsion of those Nigeria students regardless of High Commissioner and his officials’ intervention\textsuperscript{101}. Under this educational cooperation, the significant incidence that has deployed diplomacy as a tool to maintain the ties between the two countries took place in September 2006. The Nigerian students in Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi (KNUST) attempted a revolt over the death of one of them, Ukpong Uddo Udunegunde, a second year social science student, who was stabbed to death and two other Nigerian students injured by armed robbers. However, the intervention of the Nigerian High Commissioner in Ghana forestalled every form of demonstration\textsuperscript{102}. Thus, the Nigeria - Ghana relation remained intact.
More so, in the area of sports, both countries have had a lot of games together which also helped in strengthening their relations. According to the Federation of International Football Association (FIFA) official website, the first sport between the two countries was held in Accra on 28th August 1960; and since then, there have been friendly matches between them such as: Kwame Nkrumah cup 1963, Jalco cup 1995, among others. In 2000, both countries co-hosted the African Cup of Nation\textsuperscript{103}. Hemila in his article “Sports and International Understanding – A contradiction in Terms” sees sports competition as a means of improving people-to-people relations\textsuperscript{104}. This is supported by Riordan and Peppard, who asserted that sports competition can suggest a palpable signal that the leaders of the states intend to embark on a redefinition of relation\textsuperscript{105}. In Amienyi’s view; he sees sports as a metaphor for unity which can unite people and the nation’s together\textsuperscript{106}. Former Ghana President, JJ Rawlings, in one of his speeches, saw sports as an avenue for improving diplomatic relations between estranged nations.

Even though these socio-cultural activities between both countries were supposed to have provided a good platform for their citizens to fraternize and renew the strong bond of friendship that existed between them over the years. In its stead, they have triggered some unhealthy rivalries. First of all, a lot of misunderstandings have been going on recently between both countries’ entertainment industries. Ghanaians have been showing their grief over Nigerian musicians and comedians featuring in Ghana. Their reason to this is that the Nigeria entertainment industry has taken over their Ghanaian counterpart place. This is based on the fact that Nigerian musicians have dominated so much of Ghana's social activities like night clubs and live shows on stage. Nollywood films were also accused of corrupting young Ghanaians because of its risqué theme. As a result, high tariff was imposed on Nigerian movies in Ghana
and Nigerians were restricted from shooting movies in Ghana. Accordingly, the chairman of Film Video Producers and Marketers Association of Nigeria, Mr Norbert Adegbu, at one of their meetings held in Lagos, he expressed his displeasure over the treatment the Nigerian film industry experience in the hands of their Ghanaian counterpart: prevention of the release of Nigerian films on the Ghanaian market, charging fees from Nigerians to shoot films in Ghana, and debts owed by Ghanaian producers to the Nigerian entertainment industry. This unhealthy situation has also been portrayed by one Emmanuel Osax as ‘Cold War’ between Nigeria and Ghana. He explained this to be also found among Ghana Web which posts and disseminates false stories and make derogatory remarks online against Nigerians there by disrespecting Nigerian nationals. For example, a manager of an internet café in Accra, with his name withheld on the interview said that he suspected a Nigerian uses his shop for scams. Such comments destroy the reputation of Nigerians especially those living in Ghana. It can equally leads to false suspicion and maltreatment of innocent people. One Nigerian street vendor, Ike Egbon on interview expressed his grief over Ghana’s treatment towards him as an internet fraudster. Likewise during 2008 Confederation of African Football (CAF) Nation Cup in Ghana, press reported that some Ghanaians were killed in Nigeria after Nigeria lost their match with Ghana. This story was later found out to be unfounded and untrue, which almost caused uproar between the two nations in Ghana until Ghana High Commission to Nigeria cleared the air and labeled it a fallacy.¹⁰⁷

In conclusion, Ghana – Nigeria’s relationship over the years has undergoes series of challenges which at times have threatened the good relationship they enjoy. Nevertheless, both countries especially at the Heads of States level tried to manage those challenges diplomatically. It is therefore worth mentioning that diplomacy has played a vital role in the substantial improvement
of the relations between Nigeria and Ghana. Since their independence, both countries have extremely benefited from each other. The welfare of both countries in their relationship with each other has been the uppermost priority. Put differently, their relation has been more mutual. The conflicts witnessed so far in their various aspects of relations have been greatly managed diplomatically, thus the two countries have both enjoyed peaceful atmosphere devoid of manifest conflicts.
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CHAPTER 4

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

4.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter is divided into three parts consisting of summary of findings, recommendations and conclusions.

4.1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This study sought to explore the problems Nigeria and Ghana have encountered in the course of their relations since independence and how diplomacy have been employed in solving those problems. The assumption highlighted in this research is based on the fact that diplomacy has played a vital role in Nigeria – Ghana relations. It has helped in managing their relationship in a way such that none of the challenges that beclouded both countries led to violence, conflict or war. Nigeria and Ghana over the years have enjoyed some good relationship. The reason is not only because they shared common heritage or were colonized by the same colonial masters, but because their relationship was seen to be natural. It is more consanguine; hence, it existed prior to colonialism.

Meanwhile, it was noted that their relation has neither been smooth-sailing nor rosy all through however, it is nothing short of any relationship. Misunderstanding is inevitable in any relationship. Nonetheless, the pattern of resolution of such misunderstanding is far more important than the problem itself. A resolution mechanism can either escalate or de-escalate the conflict. If escalated, it can lead to manifest or open conflict. If de-escalated, may result to peace.
Against the backdrop, the study has continued to highlight the important role diplomacy has played in enhancing Nigeria-Ghana relations.

Furthermore, the study examined some of those challenges both countries have encountered under different aspect of their relationship thus: Under diplomatic relations, the study has recognized that a diplomatic tie between Nigeria and Ghana was established in the early years of Ghana’s Independence. Ghana was the first country in the West African sub-Sahara to get their independence in 1957. Soon after their independence, Ghana was able to establish diplomatic ties with Nigeria by opening a consulate in Lagos. Although their relationship at the diplomatic level was a happier one at the beginning which made Dr. Kwame Nkrumah to appoint a Nigerian long resident as his commissioner, tension later arose. The tension was as a result of different ideas both countries expressed towards the issue of Southern Cameroon in the bid to protect their national interests.

Under political the aspect of their relation, the study found out that political instability experienced by Nigeria and Ghana, especially in the early years of their independence through coups and counter-coups was the main cause of the political challenges that existed between them. Moreover, clash of ideologies from both Heads of states leading to mistrust and suspicion was another factor that gave rise to their problem.

Both countries know the importance of trade / economic relation between them. Thus, they have maintained that relationship through different trade agreements and protocols to ensure economic growth and progress of both countries. Despite these agreements, treaties and protocols, their
trade relations are not devoid of squabbles. Greed, fear and jealousy have led to ban and counter-ban of products and services between them. For instance, for the fear of the local market by foreign necessitated that and unfortunately got caught up in the web.

The socio-cultural relations have helped both countries in exchanging their values and cultures. Hence, there have been culture contacts between them that have aimed at establishing Nigeria-Ghana plan of expo on culture and tourism. Their socio-cultural relations are evidently clear in the following aspects of their existence as independent nations: formal education, entertainment industries, sports and exchange of visit by both countries’ Heads of State. Meanwhile, the study found that the problems in their socio-cultural relations were most recently among the entertainment industries, where spirit of rivalries has overtaking conscious attempt to express cultures values and talents.

4.2 CONCLUSION

Following from the information and data gathered in this study, it is true to assert that diplomacy is the key to inter-state relations. The international system would have been more peaceful if diplomacy is accorded a primary position. Nigeria and Ghana fully understand the essence and significance of diplomacy in inter-state relations, thus, have adopted it adequately in their dealings with each other. Both countries have known and enjoyed peace, mutual benefits, among others more than conflicts (if any) between them. In so doing, the hypothesis of this research that effective diplomatic measures result in cordial relationship and good neighbourliness between two countries is confirmed.
4.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Despite the apparent peaceful relations between Nigeria and Ghana, there is still a cold war between them which hinders their relation from getting to desired level. Therefore, both governments still have much to do in order to improve their relations. The following recommendations are hereby made for consideration:

- The Heads of the State of both countries should encourage regular bilateral annual or biennial summit in where discussions for growth and progress are carried out. There should not be a wait only for problems before such summit is convened. Put differently, their summit ought to be conventional and not ad hoc.

- Both governments should ensure that the bilateral agreements proffered in such summits as above (which should guide their relation) are highly observed and implemented. Each government should consider such agreements or treaties with adequate seriousness they require to ensure implementation in their various states.

- Again, the use of trade, sports, membership in regional and international organization, and other forms of assistance should be encouraged too.
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