

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

**SECURITY ASSISTANCE IN NIGERIA: SHAPING THE INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENT
TO MEET U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY OBJECTIVES IN THE GLOBAL ERA**

by

Lieutenant Colonel Kenneth Lee Michael Prendergast, Jr.
United States Army

Mr. Reed Fendrick
Project Advisor

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the U.S. Government, the Department of Defense, or any of its agencies.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved OMB No.
0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 07-04-2003		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED (FROM - TO) xx-xx-2002 to xx-xx-2003	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Security Assiatance in Nigeria Shaping the International Environment to Meet U.S. National Security Objectives in the Global Era Unclassified				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Prendergast, Kenneth L. ; Author				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army War College Carlisle Barracks Carlisle, PA17013-5050				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS ,				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT APUBLIC RELEASE ,					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT See attached file.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:		17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON	
		Same as Report (SAR)	37	Rife, Dave RifeD@awc.carlisle.army.mil	
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	c. THIS PAGE Unclassified		19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER International Area Code Area Code Telephone Number DSN	
				Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98) Prescribed by ANSI Std Z39.18	

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Kenneth Lee Michael Prendergast, Jr.
TITLE: Security Assistance in Nigeria: Shaping the International Environment to Meet National Security Objectives in the Global Era
FORMAT: Strategy Research Project
DATE: 07 April 2003 PAGES: 37 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The threat to U.S. national security posed by the asymmetrical threat demands policy innovations that go beyond the boundaries of the past ten years. While American interests in Sub-Saharan Africa are significant and growing, there are also important transnational security threats, infectious diseases, organized international criminal activities, and environmental concerns that emanate from within Sub-Saharan Africa. Left unattended, these transnational issues can arrive on American shores with devastating consequences for our nation. Although the U.S. has enjoyed foreign policy successes in Sub-Saharan Africa, policymakers must not allow themselves to become complacent. Instead, they must continue to seek new and more substantive opportunities throughout the region to enhance security, promote prosperity, and promote democracy and human rights.

Nigeria is a nation with nearly one sixth of the African continent's population, a significant strategic ally of the U.S. in the war on terrorism, an exporter of 10% of all U.S. oil imports, and a significant trading partner with the U.S. The country's rapid change from an autocratic, military regime to a civilian, democratically elected government has afforded the U.S. the opportunity to build a promising security, political, and economic relationship with the most populous country in Africa.

"The fundamental purpose of the United States Security Assistance program is to promote United States foreign policy and national security interests." Therefore, it is in U.S. national interests to enhance the Security Assistance program in Nigeria and take advantage of this unique opportunity to strengthen ties with the most dominant economic and political power in West Africa.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
PREFACE.....	vii
SECURITY ASSISTANCE IN NIGERIA: SHAPING THE INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENT TO MEET U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY OBJECTIVES IN THE GLOBAL ERA.....	1
THE CONCEPT OF FOREIGN AID.....	2
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE.....	4
FOREIGN AID: A U.S. PERSPECTIVE.....	4
MISSION OF U.S. FOREIGN AID TODAY.....	7
SECURITY ASSISTANCE DEFINED.....	8
THE ROLE OF SECURITY ASSISTANCE IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY.....	8
SPECIFIC GUIDELINES FOR THE SECURITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.....	9
POST COLD WAR ENVIRONMENT.....	10
BACKGROUND TO THE COUNTRY OF NIGERIA.....	12
THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN NIGERIA.....	13
PROBLEMS RELATED TO NIGERIAN DEVELOPMENT.....	15
ANALYSIS.....	16
OPTIONS/COURSES OF ACTION.....	18
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	19
CONCLUSION.....	20
ENDNOTES.....	21
BIBLIOGRAPHY	25

PREFACE

I am personally grateful to Mr. Reed Fendrick, Faculty Instructor, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania for serving as my Project Advisor for this Strategy Research Project. His suggestions and advice were indispensable to me as I put this project together and prepared it for submission. I would also like to thank Lieutenant Colonel (Retired) Steven Lovasz, an Army Infantry Officer and Sub-Saharan Africa Foreign Area Officer (FAO), for his phenomenal contributions to the Army's FAO community. His peerless leadership, outstanding dedication, and masterful mentorship served as a sterling role model for a significant number of Sub-Saharan Africa FAOs still serving our nation today. Finally, I would like to thank my family for enduring the many personal sacrifices, trials and tribulations brought upon them by my Army career. Soldiering is never easy, but with the strength and support of the family, any obstacle can be overcome.

SECURITY ASSISTANCE IN NIGERIA: SHAPING THE INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENT TO MEET U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY OBJECTIVES IN THE GLOBAL ERA

“In recent years, the United States has engaged in a concerted effort to transform our relationship with Africa. We have supported efforts by many African nations to move toward multi-party democracy, hold free and fair elections, promote human rights, allow freedom of the press and association, enhance civil and judicial institutions, and reform their economies. A new, post-Cold War political order is emerging in Africa, with emphasis on democratic and pragmatic approaches to solving political, economic, and environmental problems, and developing human and natural resources. United States-Africa ties are deepening, and U.S.-Africa trade is expanding.”¹

—National Security Strategy of the United States

Sub-Saharan Africa is a diverse and geographically immense region with significant economic, political, cultural, ethnic, and development differences. These and the other well-catalogued differences have bred regional conflict, political instability, social dysfunction, ethnic tension, and transnational terrorism, all of which present significant challenges to the policymakers within the interagency. Although the interagency has answered these challenges in the past with policies that meet long-term U.S. objectives, the threat to U.S. national security posed by the asymmetrical threat of terrorism demands policy innovations that go beyond the boundaries of the past ten years. While American interests in Sub-Saharan Africa are significant and growing, there are also important transnational security threats, infectious diseases, organized international criminal activities, and environmental concerns that emanate from within Sub-Saharan Africa. Left unattended, these transnational issues can develop into threats to U.S. national security interests and arrive on American shores with devastating consequences for the nation. Although the U.S. has enjoyed past foreign policy successes in Sub-Saharan Africa, such as partnerships with African nations in response to regional crises, improvements to trade and investment, increased counter-terrorism capabilities, and enhanced responses to tropical diseases, HIV and AIDS, policymakers must not allow themselves to become complacent and rest upon their “laurels.” Instead, U.S. policymakers must continue to seek new and more substantive opportunities throughout the region to enhance security, promote prosperity, and advance democracy and human rights.

“The fundamental purpose of the United States Security Assistance program is to promote United States foreign policy and national security interests.”² According to General Ralston, former Combatant Commander of the United States European Command (USEUCOM), “Security Assistance programs are vital to attaining foreign policy and national security

objectives.³ Additionally, they enhance U.S. military interoperability and support development of professional and more capable militaries in nations that share common interests with the U.S.

Nigeria, a Sub-Saharan African nation of strategic significance and increasing importance within USEUCOM's area of responsibility, is the "most influential country in western Africa."⁴

"While U.S. President George W. Bush has not detailed his Nigeria policy, it appears that at the top of the U.S. agenda, will be the expansion of the Nigerian oil industry, followed by increased stability and decreased corruption. In the wake of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, the Bush administration began to show greater interest in the developing world, including Nigeria. In this regard, officials of the U.S. Defense Department have stated that cooperation on security interests in the region is of importance and will benefit both the U.S. and Nigeria. In this regard, a number of cooperative efforts have been implemented, including a defense assistance and training program in Nigeria, which is the largest of its kind in Africa."⁵

Based upon General Ralston's assessment and the findings of other policymakers within the interagency, the data reveal that an enhanced Security Assistance program in Nigeria could yield a strong, democratic ally in Sub-Saharan Africa. Therefore, it is in the national interests of the United States to enhance the Security Assistance program in Nigeria.

The purpose of this strategy research paper is to conduct a policy review and provide a critical analysis of United States Security Assistance policy in Nigeria. In addition, the paper will review the policy alternatives and then conclude with a recommendation for the future. In order to properly frame this subject, the evaluation will consist of: a brief examination of the concept of foreign aid, an historical perspective of development assistance, a discussion of the U.S. perspective of foreign aid and its mission today, a review of the fundamentals of the U.S. security assistance program and a discussion of the post -"Cold War" environment. Upon setting the stage for further discussion, the paper will review background information on Nigeria and discuss the current U.S. Security Assistance program and its application in Nigeria. The paper will conclude with an analysis of the ends, ways and means, options available, and policy recommendations for the future.

THE CONCEPT OF FOREIGN AID

Foreign aid is the extension, from numerous sources and in a variety of forms, of economic, informational, military, and technical assistance from one nation to another. Foreign aid is a policy instrument employed by most of the world's industrialized nations to achieve a

variety of political, economic, and military purposes, as well as to address humanitarian concerns.⁶ The various stated objectives of U.S. foreign aid include:

- Build democratic institutions in stable, peaceful countries.
- Win friends for the U.S. among governments of developing nations.
- Prosecute the global war on terrorism.
- Cut infant mortality and improve health care.
- Alleviate poverty and promote micro enterprises.
- Promote economic growth and establish conditions favorable for U.S. trade.

While the United States ranks as the largest net contributor of foreign assistance funds, it actually contributes a very small portion - far less than 1/2 of 1-% of its GNP - to the various foreign aid programs.⁷ Many of the other industrialized nations make similar contributions to meet diverse objectives of their own.⁸ Russia, for example, continues to provide extensive economic support to the communist government of Cuba each year in order to maintain their influence in what once was one of their most important "Cold War" allies. Saudi Arabia, as another example, uses its vast oil wealth to spur economic development and maintain close ties in neighboring Muslim nations. European countries, especially the Scandinavian countries of Norway and Sweden, dedicate a relatively high percentage of their GNP, approximately 1-%, to foreign aid because of their widespread humanitarian concerns and their desire to build and maintain ties with developing nations.⁹

There are, theoretically, as many types of foreign aid programs as there are reasons for its use. Some foreign aid is extended directly by donor nations to a number of multilateral international development programs. The U.S., for example, through multilateral institutions such as the World Bank and the various regional development banks like the Asian Development Bank, the African Development Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank in Latin America, makes contributions that amount to a very large portion of the operating budgets of the regional banks.¹⁰ Another type of foreign aid is a bilateral loan or grant. The purpose of bilateral aid is to provide funds for development assistance projects or military construction and equipment.¹¹ Often referred to as "tied" aid, bilateral aid generally requires recipients to buy products and services from the donor nation with the funds provided. Technical assistance is another form of foreign aid. It involves the direct and indirect payments for management training, technical training of personnel, technical information, hardware, and

project supervision by a contributing country as a form of assistance to a developing country. Also, volunteer work such as the Peace Corps contributes to the goals of the U.S. foreign aid program.

Other forms of U.S. foreign aid include the contributions of religious organizations, civic groups, private voluntary organizations (PVO), philanthropic foundations, and U.S. universities. American based religious organizations contribute approximately \$6 billion dollars per year to overseas projects. Their contributions include missionary work, social work, and direct cash payments. In addition to religious organizations, non-religious PVOs contribute an additional \$4 billion dollars per year for their development initiatives. Finally, philanthropic foundations and U.S. universities provide an additional \$2 billion dollars per year to overseas projects. The above examples include familiar donor organizations such as CARE, Save the Children, the Christian Children's Fund, and Catholic Relief Services.¹²

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The present generation of American foreign aid traces its beginnings back to March 12, 1947, when President Harry S. Truman asked Congress to provide aid to Greece and Turkey who both found themselves involved in a struggle to thwart the spread of Communism in the region.¹³ The most impressive example, by far, of the use of foreign aid to meet a wide variety of U.S. foreign policy objectives was the European Recovery Program. Commonly known as the Marshall Plan, the proposals to extend massive amounts of U.S. aid to European countries were made by Secretary of State George C. Marshall on June 5, 1947.¹⁴ This U.S. economic assistance to World War II (WWII) ravaged Western Europe, which authorized \$12 billion dollars over the succeeding four years, successfully aided in the reconstruction of important allied nations, while simultaneously spurring global economic development.¹⁵ The infusion of U.S. foreign aid improved international trade, promoted fundamental U.S. policy objectives, and met the real human needs of many people who previously had little hope of improving their situation through their own national resources. In addition to aiding in the reconstruction of Europe and spurring global economic development, the aid provided by the Marshall Plan proved to be highly beneficial to the rapidly growing U.S. national economy.¹⁶

FOREIGN AID: A U.S. PERSPECTIVE

Foreign aid, in all of its various forms, has remained an important instrument of U.S. foreign policy since the Marshall Plan.¹⁷ The emphasis of foreign aid today, however, is no

longer on aid to Western European nations; the bulk of U.S. foreign aid goes to countries deemed as strategic political allies on the Mediterranean Sea, on the Pacific Ocean, throughout Asia, and in the Middle East, such as Turkey, Greece, Egypt, and Israel. Among the many other recipients of significant amounts of U.S. aid are Bangladesh, Pakistan, India, Nigeria, South Africa, Kenya, Ethiopia, Indonesia, the Philippines, El Salvador, Honduras, Peru, and Nicaragua.¹⁸ The U.S. also provides substantial funding via various aid mechanisms to assist International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement programs, Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union, Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States, Security Assistance via its various subprograms, and Nonproliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining and Related Programs.¹⁹

Today, the U.S. provides foreign aid in its many forms in support of vital political, economic, and humanitarian interests throughout the global community. Commercial advantage is an additional reason why the U.S. promotes economic growth through the provision of foreign aid to underdeveloped countries. Delivery of foreign aid can occur in the form of a grant or a loan, and it can involve concessional sales of military hardware, subsidized agricultural training, or subsidized technical training. Further, delivery of foreign aid can also be made in the form of contributions to the World Bank that are paid into a general multilateral fund or bilateral aid to a specific nation to purchase a specific product made in the U.S. or a specific service provided by a U.S. business firm.²⁰

The type and amount of foreign aid offered varies according to the recipient and the U.S. objectives involved. Disaster relief from the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance to a nation recovering from an earthquake, for example, is usually made on a strict grant basis. Military aid from the Department of Defense, delivered under the Department of State's International Affairs (Function 150) program, to a nation with legitimate security needs is often in the form of subsidized loans or sales credits used to purchase American manufactured supplies and equipment. The U.S. has employed this latter type of foreign aid extensively in nations of major military significance, such as Saudi Arabia, Israel, Egypt, Greece, Turkey, the Philippines and South Korea.²¹ The U.S. has also offered sales credits in partial compensation for the right to maintain important U.S. military bases in these nations. For example, this was specifically the case for the Philippines throughout the period that the U.S. maintained a significant presence at Clark Air Base and the Subic Bay Naval Base.

Approximately one-fifth of U.S. foreign aid is in the form of bilateral development assistance.²² These are commonly grants made to relatively poor developing nations. The intent of these bilateral projects, administered by the U.S. Agency for International Development

(USAID), is to contribute to economic growth generally and agricultural self-sufficiency specifically. Constant congressional criticism of foreign aid in the early 1970s resulted in the establishment in 1974 of a "new directions" program designed to put additional emphasis within USAID on small-scale rural projects that help to build an economic infrastructure in recipient nations.²³ In addition to USAID and other previously mentioned aid providers, the following U.S. agencies²⁴ also play a role in providing foreign aid, via a variety of functions, to developing countries:

- Department of Agriculture.
- Foreign Agricultural Service.
- Commodity Credit Corporation.
- Office of International Cooperation and Development.
- Department of Commerce.
- Foreign Commercial Service.
- National Technical Information Service.
- Office of the U.S. Trade Representative.
- Overseas Private Investment Corporation.
- Department of the Treasury.
- Department of State.

The critics of U.S. foreign aid have largely focused on contributions to multilateral institutions and development assistance projects, charging that these amount to nothing more than giveaway programs that waste American taxpayer's dollars.²⁵ The defenders of U.S. foreign aid stress that the aid budget meets numerous, far-reaching U.S. security objectives as well as humanitarian needs at a very low cost to the taxpayers. The President's FY 2003 request for International Affairs (Function 150 of the Federal Budget) totaled \$25.4 billion dollars.²⁶ The budget included funding for all international assistance programs as well as all funding required to operate the Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development. As stated earlier, as a percentage of U.S. GNP, this is an insignificant figure. Even if the various U.S. "investments" not represented in the above total are included, the total amount of U.S. foreign aid remains far less than four-tenths (0.4) of 1% of federal government outlays.²⁷

MISSION OF U.S. FOREIGN AID TODAY

Although the U.S. has provided foreign aid since the beginning of this country's history, government sponsored aid did not really start in earnest until the Marshall Plan sought to rebuild Western Europe following WWII. With the "Cold War" looming just over the horizon, the U.S. government saw a connection between provision of aid and the security of the free world, over and above humanitarian efforts. As previously stated, the Marshall Plan of 1947, a \$12 billion dollar foreign aid program authorized by Congress, was a major instance of aid for foreign nations.²⁸ The justification given for this program, considering the traditional American tendency to isolationism, was that the Marshall Plan was critical for national security to oppose the appeal of Communism to impoverished citizens of war ravaged Europe. This convinced the reluctant skeptics of the necessity to use foreign aid as a foreign policy tool and a broad, bipartisan coalition subsequently accepted the plan. Moreover, the Marshall Plan was an instant success, and the vibrancy of Western Europe today is testimony to this first post-WWII major effort at foreign assistance by the U.S.

The success of the Marshall Plan bred favorable sentiment for doing the same for the undeveloped, newly emerging nations of Asia, Latin America, and Africa. The same interest in humanitarian assistance, economic growth, and countering the appeals of Communism and the spreading of "Cold War" rivalry between the Soviet Union and the U.S. motivated this new effort to provide foreign aid to the developing countries of the world. However, a critical problem emerged in that the Marshall Plan aided solely the European countries heavily damaged by war. Although heavily damaged by the effects of the war, these countries had already achieved significant levels of development, so the aim of the Marshall Plan was on reconstruction. The problem with the developing countries of the Third World was that they had yet to achieve development. Thus, a requirement for a new approach emerged. The U.S. created the Agency for International Development specifically for this purpose.²⁹

All actions in the foreign policy arena, taken both bilaterally and multilaterally, have the potential to lead to second and third order effects with repercussions well beyond what the potential for their immediate boundaries seem to indicate. The provision of material resources to country "A", for example, may lead to both friendlier relations with that country as well as that nation being more open to U.S. values, institutions, trade relations, and foreign policy matters of interest. However, it may also lead to unintended consequences, such as an arms race, regional conflict, or acts of terrorism, with rival country "B" and possibly draw the U.S. into a regional conflict it did not desire. Foreign aid can thus be a double-edged sword. The

multitudinous linkages that exist between geostrategic concerns, national security requirements, economic interests, domestic pressure groups, and genuinely humanitarian concerns must all remain part of the equation as policymakers contemplate construction of new foreign aid programs. Yet a carefully constructed foreign development program must be commensurate with U.S. security concerns and aim for the recipient country's economic development by providing it with the technology and skills to develop rather than just relief which requires constant replenishment. Cost is also a critical factor that remains a constant for policymakers to consider, especially during periods of tight budgetary constraints.

The challenges for the foreseeable future that U.S. foreign aid can meet include fostering global growth by promoting market principles, working against new transnational threats such as terrorism, environmental degradation and narcotics, promoting global peace, reshaping and renewing U.S. alliances and other important ties, and promoting democratic values. Given the previously mentioned links existing between these seemingly disparate policies, a carefully crafted U.S. foreign aid program that leverages the potential synergy of all U.S. agencies would aid these objectives immensely. Foreign aid can succeed in transforming the undeveloped world into economically vibrant democracies if given the chance.

SECURITY ASSISTANCE DEFINED

Security Assistance is a "group of programs authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) of 1961, as amended, and the Arms Export Control Act (AECA) of 1976, as amended, and other related statutes by which the United States provides" economic support and military assistance to sovereign nations with similar values and interests vis-à-vis "defense articles, military training and other defense related services by grant, loan, credit, or cash sales in furtherance of national policy objectives" and common defense goals.³⁰ The Department of State is the U.S. agency responsible for the general direction, program determination and program integration for all U.S. Security Assistance programs. However, the Department of Defense is the U.S. agency responsible for program supervision, requirement determination, procurement of equipment and services, movement and delivery of military end-items and establishment of priorities.³¹

THE ROLE OF SECURITY ASSISTANCE IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Security Assistance has been a part of U.S. history since the Revolutionary War. Since WW II, it has evolved into a useful and proven tool of U.S. foreign policy that will continue to

enhance U.S. national security and economic prosperity well into the 21st century. The U.S. government has provided substantive assistance to other nations through a variety of foreign aid mechanisms, to include the Security Assistance program. The program has included the direct sales of weapons by the U.S. government, subsidized sales by private manufacturers in the U.S., direct cash assistance, and training of foreign military personnel and their civilian leadership. At the height of the “Cold War”, the U.S. security assistance program was a major component of the nation’s strategy of containment. Although the “Cold War” ended more than a decade ago, the U.S. still provides in excess of \$4 billion dollars per year for security assistance programs (including International Military Education and Training, Foreign Military Financing, Peacekeeping Operations and International Peacekeeping Activities) in more than 80 nations.³²

SPECIFIC GUIDELINES FOR THE SECURITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act (AECA) of 1976 govern the execution of the U.S. Security Assistance program.³³ The AECA consolidated and refined several pieces of legislation that governed U.S. government and commercial arms sales. Other sources of Security Assistance legislation include the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Appropriations Acts, the International Narcotics Control Act, the National Defense Authorization Act, the Defense Appropriations Act, the Freedom Support Act, the Support of East European Democracy Act, Emergency or Supplemental Funding Acts and Continuing Resolutions. Congress appropriates funds for the Security Assistance Program in the annual Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act.³⁴

Although there are certain Security Assistance sales programs, such as foreign military cash sales and commercial sales, which do not involve funding authorizations or appropriations, Congress nevertheless maintains an interest in these programs. To ensure accountability and oversight over the U.S. Security Assistance program, Congress has passed legislation that requires control measures and notification to Congress when a sale is \$50 million dollars in total value or is \$14 million dollars in major defense equipment. If Congress objects to the sale, they can pass a joint resolution objecting to the sale.

Within the Executive Branch itself, the President and his cabinet promulgate further day-to-day guidance for the Security Assistance program in a variety of sources. Examples include presidential policy statements or directives, memoranda coming from cabinet members, such as the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense and their principal deputies, and departmental directives, manuals, publications and other correspondence.

The Congressional Presentation Document (CPD), prepared annually and presented to Congress, specifies the projected U.S. Security Assistance programs for the forthcoming fiscal year (FY). The CPD contains information of substantial interest to the Congress, for it provides an extensively detailed supporting and justifying document which accompanies the Executive Branch's proposed security assistance authorization and appropriation legislation. The FAA stipulates: "None of the funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act ... or the AECA may be obligated for any activities, programs, projects, types of materiel assistance, countries, or other operations not justified, or in excess of the amount justified, to the Congress... unless the Congress is notified fifteen days in advance of such obligation." In summary, the CPD provides the detailed supporting information prepared by the administration in its justification to the Congress of the proposed annual U.S. Security Assistance program. The document is a critical tool in the program development process, as it brings together the total planning and programming efforts of the administration and provides the basis for the authorization and appropriations processes conducted by Congress.³⁵

Finally, the process by which the U.S. develops its Security Assistance program is a complex but systematic approach to assuring the establishment of an effective annual program. Most importantly, the extensive consultation and coordination which occurs within the higher levels of the U.S. government during this process serves the critical strategic, political and economic objectives for which Security Assistance is intended. Security Assistance has played an enduring, positive role throughout the history of the U.S. If employed properly, and in concert with consistent foreign policy goals, it will continue to make significant contributions to U.S. national security and economic prosperity in the future.

POST COLD WAR ENVIRONMENT

Prior to the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the National Security Strategy (NSS) of the U.S. centered upon containment strategy. The U.S. maintained massive, forward based military forces with a global nuclear war focus determined to deter, defend and, if necessary, defeat a massive "Cold War" enemy comprised of the Soviet Union and its satellite states within the Warsaw Pact. The subsequent consequences of this rapid and unexpected change from the status quo we knew as the "Cold War" led to a significant surge in regional instability in the Balkans, Russia and the Former Soviet Republic of Georgia, Mozambique, Angola, Somalia, India – Pakistan, Haiti, and Indonesia; an economic decline that rippled throughout the economies of Japan and Korea, unforeseen transnational dangers such as global terrorism, environmental degradation, mass migrations, drug trafficking,

and organized crime, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Engagement, CONUS and OCONUS based forces, power projection, regional conflict focus, peacetime engagement, and preventive defense were the tools the Department of Defense employed to offset these changes and challenges.

In recognition of the changed landscape, the National Security Strategy of the United States evolved to meet the changes and new challenges brought about by the end of the “Cold War”. The new, post “Cold War” strategy emphasizes worldwide engagement and the enlargement of the community of free market democracies. The characteristics of the strategic landscape include four principal dangers that the U.S. military must address: regional instability, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, transnational dangers such as terrorism and drug trafficking, and the dangers to democracy and reform in the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and elsewhere.

Based on the recent history of the past 13 years, it appears that the world will continue to be an uncertain and dangerous place over the next several decades. Consequently, the U.S. military will continue to face a variety of threats, challenges, and opportunities that will stretch and pull its personnel and materiel resources to meet a variety of operational requirements around the world. Current and future generation threats will be both conventional and unconventional, and U.S. adversaries will employ a wide variety of resources in an attempt to offset U.S. strengths brought about by way of technological leaps ahead and strategic alliances. The foresight of President George Washington bears repeating.

“There is a rank due to the United States among Nations, which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.”³⁶

-- President George Washington
December 3, 1793

The geo-strategic environment out to the year 2020, and perhaps beyond, will continue to be volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous. The key is that there will be no single threat confronting the U.S. Rather, the U.S. will continue to confront challenges and concerns about terrorism, emerging regional powers, and the potential emergence of a peer competitor. Unlike the bygone era of George Washington, the U.S. is no longer secure within its borders with the benefits of the protection afforded by the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

The deployment and employment of the U.S. military as an instrument of national power will likely continue apace as recorded in the most recent history. Therefore, the NSS/NMS guidance requires the U.S. armed forces to remain prepared to perform the full range of missions from Homeland Defense, to peacetime engagement, to disaster assistance, to major theater war. U.S. strategy requires a military that has both the proactive and responsive elements as components of its force structure. It demands a force that can provide continual engagement in shaping the world – continually engaged around the world to preclude major-armed conflict. At the same time, the U.S. military must be so capable and lethal that it can deter conflict or rapidly bring it to successful termination on terms acceptable to the nation’s leadership and to the American people. Therefore, the U.S. must maintain a full range of capabilities that address the full range of threats and requirements. In short, the U.S. military instrument of power must be ready, robust and versatile while it remains capabilities based; a force strategically positioned forward with substantial power projection capability. However, the U.S. military can no longer conduct its full range of missions throughout the world without the support and assistance of strong allies and friends. Today, the U.S. military must leverage the capabilities brought to the warfighter via the sub-elements of the Security Assistance program. .

Achieving outcomes favorable to U.S. objectives in today’s volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous geo-strategic environment requires foresight, determination, versatility, and a strong commitment to remain engaged around the world as a leader. For policymakers, this is not an insignificant or easy task to undertake without a great deal of trepidation. Yet, this is the role the U.S. finds itself in the position of filling. While the Department of Defense will continue to make a vital contribution to the safety and defense of the nation, the present situation requires strong allies and partners as the U.S. confronts the various conventional and unconventional threats posed by international terrorist organizations. As General Ralston stated above, “Security Assistance programs are vital to attaining foreign policy and national security objectives.”³⁷

BACKGROUND TO THE COUNTRY OF NIGERIA

Nigeria is a nation with nearly one sixth of the African continent’s population, a significant strategic ally in the war on terrorism, an exporter of 10% of all U.S. oil imports, and a significant trading partner with the U.S. On the economic front alone, the U.S. is second in trade only to Great Britain.³⁸ “Nigeria’s rapid change from an autocratic, military regime to a civilian, democratically elected government has afforded us the opportunity to build a promising security,

political, and economic relationship with the most populous country in Africa.”³⁹ In sum, Nigeria possesses outstanding potential to become a closer, more significant ally of the U.S.

“Nigeria is the dominant economic and political power in West Africa.”⁴⁰ In 1999, following nearly 16 years of autocratic military rule by General Sani Abacha and a brief period military rule under General Abdulsalami Abubakar, Olusegun Obasanja was elected to the presidency of the country. An insightful and charismatic civilian leader, he immediately set about to establish a functional bureaucracy, create meaningful infrastructure, investigate human rights abuses, exercise civilian control over the military, and to recover funds in overseas bank accounts expatriated by the previous regime.

“The overarching U.S. national interest in Nigeria is promoting democracy.”⁴¹ While the country possesses significant human and economic potential, the legacy of the Abacha regime has made completion of the nation’s transition to sustainable and uninterrupted democracy difficult and tenuous. The administration believes that democratic governance will lead to lasting solutions to Nigeria’s problems and, in turn, will spur the development of an economic system that will make Nigeria a “reliable and increasingly important trading partner.”⁴²

The President’s National Security Strategy singles out Nigeria as a country of enormous potential. Following the Al Qaeda-led terrorist attacks on America last September, Nigeria “voiced strong support for U.S. operations in Afghanistan and has been at the forefront of African counter-terrorism efforts.”⁴³ Considering Nigeria’s fragile democracy, its membership in the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), an organization of eleven developing countries reliant on oil revenues as their main source of income; its membership in the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), an inter-governmental organization including 56 Islamic states; and its Muslim population which amounts to 50% of its total population, this is a significant stand for the country’s leadership to take.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN NIGERIA

When Nigeria discovered oil and the extent of its petroleum reserves, most people in the country thought that it was the end of their development problems and the best thing that had happened to the country since it gained its political independence. After several coups d’etat, a civil war, plummeting world oil prices, and other forms of internal instability, not everyone remains convinced to this day that the exploitation of the country’s crude oil reserves was a total blessing.

Nigeria is, in many ways, a unique country within the context of political development. The country emerged from colonial status in the post-World War II era with a greater reservoir of administrative and political expertise than was to be found in most of the other newly emerging independent countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. Ultimately, within seven years of Nigeria gaining its independence, the country was plunged into civil war, followed by a series of military governments, assassinations, and changes in governmental form.⁴⁴ Following twelve years of turmoil, a freely elected civilian government returned to power in 1979 only to be overthrown again in 1983. In sum, internal political instability has continued to plague the country.

In the midst of the political turmoil, development of the country's petroleum resources established Nigeria as a world leader in the production and export of crude oil. The state-owned Nigerian National Oil Company was formed to manage petroleum resource development. Although the company operates in a semi-autonomous manner; clearly, it functions under very close scrutiny of government ministries.

A major consequence of petroleum resource development is that Nigeria has relied on crude oil export earnings to support its domestic development in the past. Due in large part to the significant earnings generated by the oil industry, the country experienced an average annual growth rate of 3.7-% in per capita GNP from 1960 through 1981.⁴⁵ During the worldwide economic recession of the early 1980's, the Nigerian economy declined as the world crude oil market shrunk. Simultaneously, development capital essential for expansion of domestic activities failed to be generated. Although Nigeria continues to pump oil and generate significant income, the passage of time over the past 20 years has not resulted in significant improvements to the nation's development situation. Consequently, while Nigeria still had critical developmental capital needs, others often perceived the country as neither needing nor deserving of any type of development assistance because of its petrochemical resources. Therefore, the country was confronted with the problem of both providing for as well as financing its own economic development with little outside assistance and with significantly reduced crude oil export earnings.

The country's rapid and unyielding population growth, the collapse of agricultural production, poor industrial development outside of petrochemicals, and environmental damage leading to instability in the country's interior further exacerbated the aforementioned problems. Nigeria contains the largest and the fastest growing population in Africa. The country has an estimated population of 129.9 million, with a crude birth rate that is triple the death rate.⁴⁶ There is an overabundance of development needs requiring national and international attention in order to meet even the most minimum essential needs and demands of the population.

Unfortunately, however, since Nigeria gained independence from the United Kingdom on October 1, 1960, economic development in the country has never quite caught-up with population growth. Further compounding the problem is the current population growth estimate that predicts that the Nigeria's population will reach approximately 162.7 million by the year 2013.⁴⁷ Providing for the development needs of a large and rapidly growing population is a continual problem and one that will not go away anytime soon in Nigeria.

In this somewhat chaotic situation, policy decisions made by the Nigerian government have not, upon review of the literature, always appeared to be the best. A significant reason for this situation appears to be that the recurring periods of political instability in the country led to policy decisions in economic and other spheres which, while they may have appeared to be expedient routes to solving problems in the short-term, did not sufficiently serve the country's long-term development needs.

PROBLEMS RELATED TO NIGERIAN DEVELOPMENT

The Biafran revolution in 1966, and the ensuing civil war in Nigeria, are both partially attributable to ethnic problems. The Hausa and the Yoruba were determined to wrest effective control of the central government from the Ibo. In turn, the Ibo were determined to secede from Nigeria and form their own independent state in the southeast part of the country, the location of Nigeria's most significant oil reserves. On the surface, it might appear that the formation of a separate Ibo state was a rational solution to a part of Nigeria's ethnic problem. It was not, however, acceptable to either the Hausa or the Yoruba, and their motivations were not in any sense altruistic: the discovery of major crude petroleum reserves in the Eastern (Ibo) Region would soon transform that region from Nigeria's poorest to its richest.⁴⁸ Thus, while ethnic friction led to political instability in Nigeria, the two largest ethnic groups were not prepared to permit the Ibo to secede with their oil. The end result of the friction was a devastating civil war which ripped the country apart.⁴⁹

To compound matters further, Nigeria's population has nearly tripled from approximately 46 million at the time of independence in 1960, to its estimated total of 129.9 million in 2002. This staggering rate of population growth has created enormous social and economic problems for the country. First, in order to maintain political stability by any measure of the term, it was necessary to create enough jobs for the burgeoning population, which, incidentally is unevenly distributed with urban states having the largest populations. Second, it was necessary to develop the infrastructure to accommodate the population growth. It was particularly important

for the government to develop areas outside of Lagos as a means of precluding a massive migration of the population to the former capital area.

The only hope that the central government had of financing the necessary job creation and infrastructure development necessary to address social and economic problems was to exploit the country's newly discovered petroleum reserves and to employ the revenues from that exploitation in domestic development schemes.⁵⁰ When the Ibo attempted to secede in 1967 and form an independent Biafran state in the southeast part of the country, the action threatened the economic and political stability of the entire country.⁵¹

The military officers who first seized control of the government in Nigeria in 1966 proved to be weak and ineffective as national leaders.⁵² Consequently, their operation of the country and their control over the economy proved to be no better than that of the civilian leaders. Following a series of coups and elections, Sani Abacha emerged out of the chaos in 1993. "Abacha dissolved all democratic political institutions and replaced elected governors with military officers."⁵³ Following Abacha's death in 1998, General Abdulsami Abubakar succeeded him as president.⁵⁴ Following his release from prison, former military head of state Olusegun Obasanja ran as a civilian candidate and won the presidency in a hotly contested election in 1999.⁵⁵

An overwhelming conclusion that can be made from the brief survey of Nigeria's first forty years of independence is that the existence of oil revenues created significant social, cultural, and economic tensions and was a major factor that contributed to some of the ill conceived decisions made by various segments of Nigeria's national leadership. Without the benefit of the oil revenues, however, the country would most likely find itself in an even worse position than it is today.

ANALYSIS

"Nigeria is the dominant economic and political power in West Africa" and, as a regional power, Nigeria "has played a major role in maintaining stability in many African countries."⁵⁶ The U.S. has a number of vital, important, and peripheral interests in Nigeria. The vital national interests include: support for the global war on terrorism, protection against weapons of mass destruction (WMD), ensuring regional stability and security, prevention of the spread of war and regional conflicts in West Africa, promotion of democracy, economic well being of a trading partner, and safety of U.S. citizens abroad. Important interests include: sustainable development, combating organized crime and drug trafficking, promotion of values,

environmental degradation, disaster relief, and humanitarian concerns. Peripheral national interests include disease prevention and education. The ends we strive to achieve in Nigeria include:

- Promotion of democracy and regional stability.
- Support for the global war on terrorism.
- A stable trading relationship with free and open access to markets.
- Shared values.

The overarching U.S. foreign policy objective in Nigeria is to promote democracy which, in turn, will serve as a catalyst to:

- Maintain support for the global war on terrorism.
- Protect the U.S. against the proliferation of WMD.
- Ensure regional stability and security.
- Prevent the spread of war and regional conflicts in West Africa.
- Protect U.S. citizens living abroad.
- Sustainable development.
- Combat organized crime and drug trafficking.
- Address environmental and humanitarian concerns.
- Promote American values.
- The development of a reliable and important trading partner in West Africa, including access to oil.

The U.S. should employ all elements of national power, diplomatic, informational, military, and economic, in pursuit of this objective and leverage the synergy that the combined elements of national power can bring to bear on the problem. The resources at the disposal of the policymakers responsible for developing U.S. strategy can be brought to bear to assist Nigeria in achieving sustainable development in the future. Additionally, the Nigerian Armed Forces play a key role in maintaining regional stability in West Africa. Since Nigeria has spent a significant number of years under military rule since independence, a concerted effort should be made to employ all aspects of the Security Assistance program to embed the principles of civilian control over the military in a democracy.

The State Department's FY 2003 budget request for Security Assistance to Nigeria includes \$73,035,000. Although this is an \$11,000,000.00 increase over FY 2002, this amount represents only 84% of the budget requested for FY 2001.

The International Military Education and Training (IMET) program currently projects \$800,000.00 for training in FY 2003, which will train 27 Nigerian officers during the FY. This figure represents a slight, \$50,000.00 increase over FY 2002. "IMET is particularly important as it provides educational opportunities that emphasize and reinforce civilian control of the military, which contributes to domestic stability."⁵⁷ The FY 2003 budget request also contains \$66,235,000.00 for the Development Assistance (DA) program, which is a threefold increase over FY 2002. DA funds designated for Nigeria target improvements to economic reform, expand health infrastructure, agricultural development, environmental sustainability, and education. Finally, the Foreign Military Financing (FMF) Program projects \$6,000,000.00 for FY 2003. Nigeria will use the \$6,000,000.00 budgeted for FMF to improve military management and training, refurbish their C-130 fleet, and improve maritime security.

The potential risks of a U.S. failure to engage in Nigeria include increased potential for further regional instability, civil war, potential requirements for U.S. intervention in regional crises, humanitarian crises, and loss of an important strategic ally. However, the potential long-term benefits to the U.S. warrant taking these prudent risks.

OPTIONS/COURSES OF ACTION

The most common critique of U.S. foreign policy is that the U.S. does not spend enough on international development and humanitarian assistance. As a percentage of the federal budget, the U.S. spends less than ½ of 1-% of the total federal budget on foreign affairs. This percentage includes all aspects of foreign operations, to include the cost of operating all of the U.S. embassies and consulates abroad and the costs of funding the Security Assistance program. Since 1980, this amount as a percentage of total U.S. budget authority, has fallen from 2.1% to 0.9% in 2000, which represents a greater than 50% drop in 20 years. In sum, most critics believe that the US does not do enough to support the less fortunate nations in the world.⁵⁸

While the potential for increased budgetary authority is low, an opportunity remains available for policymakers to explore. Nigeria is that opportunity. There are three courses of action suitable for application as U.S. Security Assistance policy toward Nigeria:

- Maintain the status quo.
- Enhance the Security Assistance program through increased and leveraged funding.
- Reduce funding to the program and apply the saved resources in a different region with greater needs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Security Assistance program is only one tool within the U.S. foreign aid arsenal. However, it is an important tool with the potential to yield significant strategic outcomes favorable to U.S. policy objectives. With Nigeria's importance as a strategic ally in the global war on terrorism increasing and, in recognition of its continuing support, the U.S. should seek additional opportunities to leverage and enhance all aspects of the Security Assistance program in Nigeria.

Additionally, as Nigeria attempts to address its growing social problems brought about by years of neglect, widespread diseases, and a general lack of basic healthcare, greater attention must be paid to the Development Assistance (DA) program. Emphasis on DA will yield improvements in basic education, agricultural productivity, and health care. The administration should also seek opportunities to expand ties with the military via joint U.S. – Nigerian exercises and training events. As democracy took hold in the U.S., the military played an increasing role in supporting the nation's growth and development. In similar fashion, the Nigerian military can play a significant role in supporting the civilian leadership's goal of improving infrastructure, health care, education, and rural development.

Specific recommendations to shape the international environment to meet U.S. national security objectives in the global era include:

- Expansion of the IMET Program to provide greater opportunities to train Nigeria's future leaders now serving in the company and field grades. This will lead to the re-establishment of professionalism within the Nigerian Armed Forces.
- Transfer of excess U.S. intra-coastal maritime patrol capable assets. This action will improve maritime security and increase regional stability.
- Release selected excess major end items. In addition to FMF, the Excess Defense Articles (EDA) program has significant potential to yield direct and indirect benefits while simultaneously addressing long term needs of the Nigerian Armed Forces. With ongoing transformation initiatives creating opportunities to retire previous generation major end

items, the Defense Security Cooperation Agency should explore opportunities to release selected inventory to Nigeria.

- Seek opportunities to expand ties with the military via joint U.S.-Nigerian exercises and training events.
- Facilitate improvements in basic education, agricultural productivity, and health care.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this strategy research paper was to conduct a policy review and provide a critical analysis of U.S. Security Assistance policy in Nigeria. In addition, the paper conducted a: brief examination of the concept of foreign aid, an historical perspective of development assistance, a discussion of the U.S. perspective of foreign aid and its mission today, a review of the fundamentals of the U.S. security assistance program and a discussion of the post -“Cold War” environment. Upon setting the stage for further discussion, the paper also reviewed background information on Nigeria and discussed the current U.S. Security Assistance program and its application in Nigeria. The paper concluded with an analysis of the ends, ways and means, discussed the options available to policymakers, and made policy recommendations for the future.

As stated at the beginning of this paper, the threat to U.S. national security posed by the asymmetrical threat demands policy innovations that go beyond the boundaries of the past ten years. Transformation of policy and execution of an enhanced Security Assistance program in Nigeria is a significant policy innovation over the policies of the present. Moreover, it can yield a strong, democratic ally in Sub-Saharan Africa and serve as the cornerstone of a foundation for a safer, more secure future for America and her national interests, not only in Nigeria, but also throughout the entire region. Therefore, it is in U.S. national interests to expand the Security Assistance program in Nigeria.

In conclusion, “Nigeria’s rapid change from an autocratic, military regime to a civilian, democratically elected government has afforded us the opportunity to build a promising security, political, and economic relationship with the most populous country in Africa.” The U.S. must act upon this rare opportunity to set favorable conditions for a new, post-“Cold War” order in Africa, and Nigeria is the logical first step in the process.

WORD COUNT = 7904

ENDNOTES

¹ President William J. Clinton, A National Security Strategy for a Global Age. (Washington, D.C.: The White House, 2000), 61-62. Although the Bush Administration released a new National Security Strategy (NSS) in September 2002, the principal goals outlined for Africa in the previous administration's NSS remain valid.

² Mr. Christopher F. Akins, "Security Assistance and National Security in the Global Economy." DISAM Journal of International Security Assistance Management, (Wright Patterson AFB, OH: U.S. Department of Defense, 1999).

³ Joseph W. Ralston, General, U.S. Air Force, Defending Freedom, Fostering Cooperation and Promoting Stability, available from <<http://www.house.gov/hasc/openingstatementsandpressreleases/107thcongress/02-03-20ralston.html>>; Internet; accessed February 14, 2003.

⁴ Robert C. Kelly, ed., Nigeria 2003 Country Review, available from <<http://www.countrywatch.com/pdfs/reviews/B3Z95MZL.01b.pdf>>; Internet; accessed November 25, 2002.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), A History of Foreign Assistance, available from <<http://www.usaid.gov/about/usaidhist.html>>; and Foreign Aid in the National Interest, available from <<http://www.usaid.gov/fani/index.htm>>; Internet; accessed November 25, 2002.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Stephen Hellinger, Douglas Hellinger, and Fred M. O'Regan, Aid for Just Development, (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1988), 10.

¹¹ Ibid., 14.

¹² USAID, A History of Foreign Assistance and Foreign Aid in the National Interest.

¹³ Robert Famighetti, ed., The World Almanac and Book of Facts, (Mahwah, NJ: Primedia Reference, Inc., 1999), 520.

¹⁴ John W. Spanier, Games Nations Play. (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1990), 125 and 393-394. See also Myron Weiner and Samuel P. Huntington, editors, Understanding Political Development. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1987), 40.

¹⁵ Famighetti, 520.

¹⁶ Stephen Gill and David Law, The Global Political Economy: Perspectives, Problems, and Policies, (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982), 96-99 and 140-143.

¹⁷ David H. Blake and Robert S. Walters, The Politics of Global Economic Relations, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1987), 139-150.

¹⁸ U.S. Department of State, FY 2003 International Affairs (Function 150) Budget Request, Account Tables for: Development Assistance/Child Survival and Health Programs; Economic Support Fund (ESF); Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States (SEED); Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union (Freedom Support Act, or FSA); International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE); Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining, and Related Programs (NADR); International Military Education and Training (IMET); Foreign Military Financing (FMF); Peacekeeping Operations (PKO); International Organizations and Programs (I&OP); Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (CIPA); Contributions to International Organizations (CIO); available from <http://www.state.gov/m/rm/rls/iab/2003/7809.htm>; Internet; accessed on December 29, 2002.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Gill, 112 and 296.

²¹ Blake 1987,141-8.

²² USAID.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ U.S. Department of State.

²⁷ Executive Office of the President of the United States, Budget of the United States Government, Historical Tables in Spreadsheet Format, table 4.2, Percentage Distribution of Outlays by Agency: 1962-2005; available from <http://w3.access.gpo.gov/usbudget/fy2001/hist.html#h3>; Internet; accessed December 17, 2002.

²⁸ Famighetti, 520.

²⁹ USAID.

³⁰ The Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management, The Management of Security Assistance, (Wright Patterson Air Force Base, OH: The Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management, 2000), 57.

³¹ Ibid.

³² U.S. Department of State, FY 2003 International Affairs (Function 150) Budget Request.

³³ The Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management, The Management of Security Assistance, 57-63.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ "The Army – A Strategically Responsive Force." Army Magazine. February 2003, page 41, published by the Association of the U.S. Army.

³⁷ Ralston.

³⁸ U.S. Department of State, Background Note: Nigeria, Bureau of African Affairs, June 2002, available from <<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/2836.htm>>; Internet; accessed September 6, 2002.

³⁹ Clinton, 61-62.

⁴⁰ U.S. Department of State, FY 2003 International Affairs (Function 150) Budget Request

⁴¹ Akins.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ U.S. Department of State, Background Note: Nigeria.

⁴⁵ The World Bank Group, Nigeria Country Profile, Economic Tables, available from <<http://devdata.worldbank.org/external/CPProfile.asp?SelectedCountry=NGA&CCODE=NGA&CNAME=Nigeria&PTYPE=CP>>; Internet; accessed September 6, 2002.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ U.S. Department of State, Background Note: Nigeria.

⁴⁹ J. A. A. Ayoade, Ethnic Management in the 1979 Nigerian Constitution, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1986), 73-90.

⁵⁰ Nelson Kasfir, Prismatic Theory and African Administration. (New York: Longman Press, 1982), 162-172.

⁵¹ I. William Zartman, Organizations: From Development Aid to Development, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), 197.

⁵² Rex Niven, The War of Nigerian Unity, 1967-1970, (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1977), 137.

⁵³ U.S. Department of State, Background Note: Nigeria.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ U.S. Department of State.

⁵⁷ Ralston.

⁵⁸ "Foreign Aid a Secure Investment." Atlanta Journal-Constitution December 21, 2001, sec. A, p. 25.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achebe, Chinua. The Trouble with Nigeria. Exeter, NH: Heinemann Educational Books, 1984.
- _____. Things Fall Apart. New York: Anchor Books, 1994.
- Akins, Christopher F. "Security Assistance and National Security in the Global Economy." DISAM Journal of International Security Assistance Management, Summer 1999, Vol. 21, Issue: 4. Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed 16 September 2002.
- Albright, Madeline K. "U.S. Policy Toward Africa." Lecture. George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia. 19 March 1998. Available from <<http://www.hri.org/news/usa/std/1998/98-03-16.std.html>>. Internet. Accessed September 16, 2002.
- Ayoade, J. A. A. Ethnic Management in the 1979 Nigerian Constitution. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1986.
- Blake, David H. and Robert S. Walters. The Politics of Global Economic Relations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1987.
- Burgess, Lisa. "Critics Say Allies Should be Footing More of the Bill in War on Terrorism." 8 February 2002. Available from <<http://www.stripesonline.com/article.asp?section=104&article=6650>>. Internet. Accessed September 9, 2002.
- Bush, George W. "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the United States Response to the Terrorist Attacks of September 11." Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents 37 (24 September 2001): 1347-1351.
- _____. "Executive Order on Terrorist Financing." 24 September 2001. Available from <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010924-1.html>>. Internet. Accessed September 9, 2002.
- _____. "Remarks at the Citadel in Charleston, South Carolina." Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents 37 (17 December 2001): 1775-1779.
- _____. "State of the Union Address." January 29, 2002. Available from <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html>>. Internet. Accessed September 16, 2002.
- _____. The National Security Strategy of the United States of America. Washington, D.C.: The White House, September 2002.
- _____. National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction. Washington, D.C.: The White House, December 2002.
- _____. National Strategy for Combating Terrorism. Washington, D.C.: The White House, February 2003.

- Chen, Edwin. "US Widens its Financial Terror List." 21 December 2001. Available from <<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-122101war.story>>. Internet. Accessed September 9, 2002.
- Clinton, William J. A National Security Strategy for a Global Age. Washington, D.C.: The White House, December 2000.
- Crowder, Michael. The Story of Nigeria. London: Faber, 1978.
- _____, ed. The Cambridge History of Africa, Volume 8, From c. 1940 to c. 1975. New York: The Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Cutter, Charles H. Africa 2000. Baltimore, MD: United Book Press, Inc., 2000
- Deans, Bob. "US Warming to Former Foes in Rush to Fight Terror." Atlanta Journal-Constitution. 1 October 2001, sec. A, p. 6. Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed September 9, 2002.
- DeLeon, Rudy. "Remarks Delivered to the Second Annual Security Cooperation Conference." DISAM Journal of International Security Assistance Management, Summer 2000, Vol. 22, Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed September 16, 2002.
- Dettmer, Jamie. "Companies Antsy for Administration to Lift Sanctions," Insight on the News, Vol. 17, Issue: 34. Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed September 10, 2002.
- DeYoung, Karen, "Bush Seeks Power to Lift Arms Curbs," Washington Post, 24 September 2001, sec. A, p. 1. Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed September 10, 2002.
- Executive Office of the President of the United States. Budget of the United States Government, Historical Tables Spreadsheet Format, Table 4.2, Percentage Distributions of Outlays by Agency: 1962-2005. Available from <<http://w3.access.gpo.gov/usbudget/fy2001/hist.html#h3>>. Internet. Accessed December 17, 2002.
- Famighetti, Robert, ed. The World Almanac and Book of Facts. Mahwah, NJ: Primedia Reference, Inc., 1999.
- "Foreign Aid a Secure Investment." Atlanta Journal-Constitution, 21 December 2001, sec. A, p. 25. Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed September 9, 2002.
- Gill, Stephen and David Law. The Global Political Economy: Perspectives, Problems and Policies. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.
- Gill, Stephen, ed. Atlantic Relations: Beyond the Reagan Era. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989.
- Grimmett, Richard F. "Conventional Arms Transfers to Developing Nations," DISAM Journal of International Security Assistance Management, Fall 2001, Vol. 24, Issue: 1. Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed September 10, 2002.

- Hanlon, Joseph. "Dictators and Debt." Jubilee Research, New Economics Foundation. Available from <<http://www.jubileeplus.org/analysis/reports/dictatorsreport.htm>>. Internet. Accessed on December 19, 2002.
- Hazlitt, Christine. "Foreign Military Sales Policy, Changes, Clarifications and Initiatives." DISAM Journal of International Security Assistance Management, Winter 1999/2000, Vol. 22, Issue: 2. Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed September 10, 2002.
- Hellinger, Stephen, Douglas Hellinger, and Fred M. O'Regan. Aid for Just Development. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1988.
- Hyden, Goran. Development Administration the Kenyan Experience. Nairobi: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Jones, Walter S. The Logic of International Relations. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co, 1985.
- Kasfir, Nelson. Prismatic Theory and African Administration. New York: Longman Press, 1982.
- Keeter, Hunter. "Gov't Should Strengthen Support for FMS, Army Official Says." Defense Daily, 9 July 1999, Vol. 203, Issue: 6. Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed September 10, 2002.
- Kelly, Robert C., ed., Nigeria 2003 Country Review, available from <<http://www.countrywatch.com/pdfs/reviews/B3Z95MZL.01b.pdf>>; Internet; accessed November 25, 2002.
- Mbaku, John Mukum. "Governance, Wealth Creation and Development in Africa: The Challenges and the Prospects". Journal of African Studies, (Fall 2000), University of Florida. Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed September 20, 2002.
- Meyer, Josh. "US Presses Terror War in 7 Nations." 2 December 2001. Available from <<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-120201nextstep.story>>. Internet. Accessed September 9, 2002.
- Migdal, Joel S. Strong Societies and Weak States. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Myers, Steven Lee. "Congress Expands Choices on Punishing Pakistan." New York Times, 14 October 1999, sec. A, p. 12. Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed September 10, 2002.
- Niven, Rex. The War of Nigerian Unity, 1967-1970. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1977.
- Olorumfemi, M.S. Managing Nigeria's Petroleum Resources. New York: Longman Press, 1985.
- Perlez, Jane. "U.S. Sanctions on Islamabad Will Be Lifted," New York Times, 22 September 2001, sec. A, p. 1. Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed September 10, 2002.

- Rake, Alan, ed. New African Yearbook 2001. London, UK: IC Publications, Inc., 2001.
- Ralston, Joseph W., General, U.S. Air Force, Defending Freedom, Fostering Cooperation and Promoting Stability, available from <<http://www.house.gov/hasc/openingstatementsandpressreleases/107thcongress/02-03-20ralston.html>>; Internet; accessed February 14, 2003.
- Reynolds, Andrew, "South Africa: Election Systems and Conflict Management". September 22 1998. Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed September 10, 2002.
- Rumsfeld, Donald H. Quadrennial Defense Review Report. Washington, D.C.: The Pentagon, September 30, 2001.
- _____. "NATO North Atlantic Council (NAC-D)," 18 December 2001. Available from <<http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/2001/s20011218-secdef1.html>>. Internet. Accessed September 10, 2002.
- _____. "2003 Defense Budget Testimony." Testimony presented to the U.S. House and Senate Armed Services Committees. February 5-6, 2002. Available from <<http://www.dod.gov/speeches/2002/s20020205-secdef.html>>. Internet. Accessed September 9, 2002.
- Sachs, Jeffrey D. "One-Tenth of 1 Percent to Make the World Safer," Washington Post, 21 November 2001, sec. A, p. 23. Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed September 10, 2002.
- Schulzinger, Robert D. US Diplomacy Since 1900. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Self, Peter. Administrative Theories and Politics. London: Allen and Unwin, 1972.
- Sipress, Alan and Steven Mufson. "U.S. Readies Financial Aid for Allies," Washington Post, 2 October 2001, sec. A, p. 12. Database on-line. Available from ProQuest. Accessed September 10, 2002.
- Skinner, Elliott P. "African Political Cultures and the Problems of Government". Journal of African Studies, Fall 2000, University of Florida, Available from <<http://web.arica.ufl/asq/v2/v2i3a3.html>>. Internet. Accessed September 9, 2002.
- Spanier, John W. Games Nations Play. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1990.
- The World Bank Group, Nigeria Country Profile, Economic Tables. Available from <<http://devdata.worldbank.org/external/CPProfile.asp?SelectedCountry=NGA&CCODE=NGA&CNAME=Nigeria&PTYPE=CP>>. Internet. Accessed September 6, 2002.
- U.S. Agency for International Development, A History of Foreign Assistance. Available from <<http://www.usaid.gov/about/usaidhist.html>>. Internet. Accessed November 25, 2002.
- _____. Foreign Aid in the National Interest. Available from <<http://www.usaid.gov/fani/index.htm>>. Internet. Accessed November 25, 2002.

- U.S. Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management. The Management of Security Assistance. 20th ed. Wright Patterson Air Force Base: U.S. Department of Defense, 2000.
- U.S. Department of Defense. Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales and Military Assistance Facts. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Defense Security Cooperation Agency. September 30, 2000.
- U.S. Department of State. "FY 2003 Congressional Budget Justification for Foreign Operations." July 2, 2002. Available from <<http://www.state.gov/m/rm/rls/iab/2004/>>. Internet. Accessed September 9, 2002.
- _____. "FY 2003 International Affairs (Function 150) Budget Request Account Tables." April 9, 2002. Available from <<http://www.state.gov/m/rm/rls/iab/2003/7809.htm>>. Internet. Accessed September 9, 2002.
- _____. Bureau of African Affairs. "Background Notes: Nigeria". June 2002. Available from <http://www.state.gov/www/background_notes/nigeria_004_bgn.html#gov>. Internet. Accessed September 9, 2002.
- U.S. Office of Management and Budget. Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2002. Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 2001.
- Weiner, Myron and Samuel P. Huntington, eds. Understanding Political Development. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1987.
- "White House Marks 100 Days in War on Terrorism: Bush Targets Two Additional Organizations." CNN.COM/US. 20 December 2001. Available from <<http://www.cnn.com/2001/US/12/20/ret.100.days/>>. Internet. Accessed September 9, 2002.
- Wolfowitz, Paul. "Munich Conference on European Security Policy." 2 February 2002. Available from <<http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/2002/s20020202-depsecdef1.html>>. Internet. Accessed September 9, 2002.
- Woods, Alan. Development and the National Interest: U.S. Economic Interest in the 21st Century. Washington, DC: U.S. Agency for International Development, 1989.
- Zartman, I. William. Organizations: From Development Aid to Development. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.