

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE FOR INSTITUTE OF
ADMINISTRATION (ICIA 2025)**

AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY ZARIA – NIGERIA

Website: <https://icia.org.ng> ISBN: 978-978-695-265-9 Volume II, 2025

**THE AFRICAN AGENDA: A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF NIGERIA AND SOUTH
AFRICA'S ROLES IN SHAPING THE CONTINENT'S POSITION ON UNSC REFORM
AND THE QUEST FOR PERMANENT REPRESENTATION**

¹Mohammed Kabeer Garba

ECOWAS Parliament, Abuja

Email: kabirmashi@gmail.com. +234 803 659 0281

²Jibrin Hussaini Abubakar

[Kaduna State University, Department of Political Science](#)

Vistap.page@gmail.com. +234 803 530 3749

ABSTRACT

The debate over United Nations Security Council (UNSC) reform has been a longstanding issue in global governance, particularly concerning the representation of African States in the security council. Africa, despite being home to 54 UN member states and playing a significant role in global peacekeeping, economic development, and international diplomacy, remains underrepresented in the UNSC. Against this backdrop, Nigeria and South Africa have emerged as leading advocates for Africa's quest for permanent representation, actively shaping the continent's collective position on UNSC reform. This study examines the diplomatic strategies, policy approaches, and geopolitical influences of both nations in advocating for Africa's position within the broader UN reform agenda. This study employs a multi-theoretical approach, integrating realism, constructivism, and regionalism to critically analyze Nigeria and South Africa's roles in shaping Africa's position on UNSC reform. This research critically assesses the effectiveness of Nigeria and South Africa's diplomatic engagements, coalition-building efforts, and lobbying strategies within the UN General Assembly, AU, and other international forums. It evaluates their roles in advancing the Ezulwini Consensus, a 2005 AU position that demands two permanent seats for Africa with full veto powers and increased non-permanent representation. The findings reveal that Nigeria and South Africa's in advocating for Africa's permanent representation have been constrained by internal African divisions, global power politics, and structural limitations within the UN reform process. The study concludes with recommendations for strengthening Africa's diplomatic strategy, unity, and bargaining power in its quest for greater representation in global governance institutions.

Keywords: *United Nations Security Council (UNSC). Economic Development. Diplomatic Engagements. Ezulwini Consensus*

Introduction

The quest for United Nations Security Council (UNSC) reform has been a subject of international debate for decades. Central to this discourse is the demand for greater representation of Africa, a continent historically marginalized in global governance despite its vast population, economic potential, and strategic significance. Nigeria and South Africa, as two of Africa's leading powers, have played prominent roles in advocating for the continent's permanent representation in the UNSC. This study critically examines the efforts of both nations in shaping Africa's collective position on UNSC reform, analyzing their diplomatic strategies, challenges, and competing interests.

The African continent has long been underrepresented in global decision-making bodies, with the current UNSC structure granting only two non-permanent seats to Africa in a rotating manner. This exclusion has led to calls for the expansion of the Council to better reflect contemporary geopolitical realities. Nigeria and South Africa, both of which have held non-permanent seats multiple times, have positioned themselves as frontrunners in lobbying for Africa's permanent membership. Their efforts have been instrumental in shaping the African Union's (AU) Common African Position on UNSC reform, as articulated in the Ezulwini Consensus. However, internal competition, regional politics, and the reluctance of permanent UNSC members to accommodate such reforms have posed significant challenges. (Landsberg, 2010)

This study seeks to critically analyze the diplomatic engagements, strategies, and limitations of Nigeria and South Africa in advancing Africa's position on UNSC reform. By examining their historical efforts, policy approaches, and regional dynamics, the study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of Africa's ongoing struggle for equitable representation in global governance. The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) is the principal body responsible for maintaining international peace and security. Since its establishment in 1945, its structure has remained largely unchanged, despite significant shifts in global power dynamics. The Council consists of five permanent members China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States each with veto power, alongside ten non-permanent members elected for two-year terms. Africa, despite being home to 54 nations and representing over 1.4 billion people, remains excluded from permanent membership. The demand for UNSC reform stems from criticisms of its

lack of representativeness, outdated power structures, and inefficacy in addressing contemporary security challenges. African states, through the African Union (AU), have consistently advocated for two permanent seats with full veto powers and five non-permanent seats. This position is encapsulated in the Ezulwini Consensus, adopted by the AU in 2005, which serves as the continent's official stance on UNSC reform.

Nigeria and South Africa, as Africa's largest economies and diplomatic heavyweights, have played leading roles in advancing this agenda. Both countries have served multiple terms as non-permanent members of the UNSC, using their positions to push for African interests. Nigeria, with its vast diplomatic influence in West Africa and contributions to peacekeeping operations, has emphasized the need for greater African representation. Similarly, South Africa, leveraging its economic strength and historical role in global diplomacy, has positioned itself as a leader in continental and multilateral engagements. However, while both countries share the goal of securing permanent African representation on the UNSC, their national interests and regional rivalries have occasionally led to tensions. Questions regarding which nation would ultimately represent Africa, the need for a rotational African seat, and the willingness of existing permanent members to endorse such reforms continue to complicate the process.

The issue of UNSC reform remains a crucial aspect of global governance debates. Nigeria and South Africa, as Africa's leading diplomatic forces, have been at the forefront of advocating for permanent representation on the Council. While their efforts have shaped the African Union's position and brought attention to the continent's exclusion, significant challenges remain. (Stuenkel, 2015) Understanding the historical context, diplomatic engagements, and strategic interests of these nations provides critical insight into Africa's ongoing quest for equitable representation in international security governance.

Theoretical Framework

Realism, a dominant theory in international relations, provides a framework for understanding the power dynamics, national interests, and strategic calculations of Nigeria and South Africa in advocating for UNSC reform. According to Realism, states act primarily in pursuit of power and national interest, often prioritizing their own strategic advantages over collective goals. While both

Nigeria and South Africa champion Africa's collective demand for permanent UNSC representation, their diplomatic efforts are also influenced by their individual aspirations for global recognition. The competition between Nigeria and South Africa for African leadership, their bilateral tensions, and their distinct diplomatic strategies reflect the Realist logic of power politics and state-centric interests. This theory helps explain why achieving a unified African position on UNSC reform has been challenging, as national interests often compete with regional solidarity.

Constructivism, which emphasizes the role of ideas, identities, and norms in shaping international relations, offers a valuable perspective on how African unity, historical legacies, and continental solidarity influence Nigeria and South Africa's advocacy for UNSC reform. Unlike Realism, which focuses on material power, Constructivism highlights how shared historical experiences of colonialism, underrepresentation, and marginalization shape Africa's collective demand for greater inclusion in global governance. Nigeria and South Africa's diplomatic rhetoric often invokes Pan-Africanism, historical injustices, and the need for a more equitable international order, framing their advocacy within broader African narratives of self-determination and post-colonial agency. This theory helps explain why African states continue to push for a collective reform agenda despite the structural constraints and power imbalances within the UN system.

Regionalism theory provides insights into the institutional mechanisms and regional governance structures that Nigeria and South Africa have leveraged in their advocacy for UNSC reform. The African Union (AU), through the Ezulwini Consensus, has articulated a common African position, but the effectiveness of regional institutions in influencing global governance remains debatable. Nigeria and South Africa's roles within ECOWAS, SADC, BRICS, and the AU illustrate how regional organizations can serve as platforms for coalition-building, diplomatic negotiations, and international lobbying. However, the lack of a unified African stance and disagreements over the selection of potential African candidates for permanent seats have weakened the continent's position. Regionalism theory helps explain the institutional constraints and opportunities that shape Africa's collective efforts to reform the UNSC.

Literature Review

The quest for United Nations Security Council (UNSC) reform has been a persistent agenda in global governance, with African states advocating for greater representation and influence. (Murithi, 2014) Nigeria and South Africa, as two of the continent's leading economies and diplomatic actors, have played central roles in advancing Africa's position on the matter (Adebajo, 2016). This literature review critically examines their roles, highlighting historical context, policy frameworks, diplomatic engagements, and the challenges facing the realization of Africa's aspirations for permanent representation. The reform of the UNSC has been analyzed through various theoretical lenses, including realism, liberal institutionalism, and constructivism. Realists argue that power dynamics among states dictate the likelihood of reform, with established powers reluctant to cede influence. (Paul & Nahory, 2019) Liberal institutionalists, on the other hand, emphasize the potential for diplomatic negotiations and multilateralism in achieving reform (Luck, 2006). Constructivists highlight the role of African identity and historical injustices in shaping the continent's demands. (Adler & Barnett, 1998)

Africa's stance on UNSC reform has been framed within the Ezulwini Consensus, adopted by the African Union (AU) in 2005, which demands at least two permanent seats with full veto powers for African states. (Murithi, 2014) This position is based on the argument that Africa, despite being the most represented region in UN peacekeeping missions, remains structurally marginalized in global decision-making. (Zondi, 2020) Nigeria, as Africa's most populous nation and a leading economic and military power, has positioned itself as a contender for permanent UNSC membership. (Adebajo, 2016) Through active participation in peacekeeping missions and diplomatic lobbying, Nigeria has sought to leverage its status to advocate for broader African representation. (Olonisakin, 2015) However, internal governance challenges, economic instability, and inconsistent foreign policy priorities have at times undermined its credibility. (Ogunnubi & Okeke-Uzodike, 2016)

South Africa has similarly pursued UNSC reform, aligning itself with the African consensus while also leveraging its membership in BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) to advocate for broader Global South representation (Nathan, 2013). South Africa's diplomatic engagements at the UN have underscored its commitment to multilateralism, although its position has sometimes been perceived as overly aligned with emerging powers rather than purely Pan-African interests (Zondi, 2020). Despite the clear articulation of Africa's demands, several

challenges hinder UNSC reform. First, the reluctance of existing permanent members to dilute their influence poses a structural barrier (Paul & Nahory, 2019). Second, intra-African rivalries between Nigeria, South Africa, and other regional powers such as Egypt and Ethiopia have prevented a unified candidate from emerging (Murithi, 2014). Lastly, the broader question of veto power and its implications for global governance remains a contentious issue. (Luck, 2006)

Nigeria's foreign policy under military and civilian governments during this period was defined by its strong opposition to apartheid. The country was among the most vocal African nations advocating for economic, political, and diplomatic measures to pressure the apartheid regime. Nigeria played a key role in the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the United Nations in advocating for sanctions against South Africa. (Adebajo, 2008) Nigeria contributed funds and military aid to the African National Congress (ANC) and the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC), providing scholarships for South African students and hosting exiled activists. (Adisa, 2018) The Nigerian government nationalized British Petroleum (BP) assets in 1979 for continuing business with South Africa and imposed a ban on South African goods (Osaghae, 2002)

The post-apartheid period (1994–2010) marked a significant shift in Nigeria-South Africa relations, transitioning from Nigeria's anti-apartheid activism to diplomatic engagement with a democratized South Africa. As Africa's two largest economies and regional powers, both countries played crucial roles in shaping continental policies, economic integration, and political cooperation. However, their bilateral relationship was marked by both strategic collaboration and occasional tensions, reflecting their competing interests and domestic political dynamics.

Economic relations between Nigeria and South Africa grew significantly in the post-apartheid period. South African companies expanded into Nigeria, particularly in the telecommunications, banking, and retail sectors. Major firms such as MTN, Shoprite, and Standard Bank established a strong presence in Nigeria. (Adeoye, 2012) While South African investment in Nigeria grew, trade remained imbalanced, with Nigeria primarily exporting crude oil and South Africa exporting manufactured goods. (Onyekwena & Ekeruche, 2019) Nigerian businesses sometimes criticized South African firms for dominating sectors and repatriating profits, leading to tensions in economic relations. (Akinboye, 2013) The movement of people between the two nations increased, leading to both cultural exchange and tensions. South Africa experienced multiple waves of xenophobic attacks against African migrants, including Nigerians, in the late 2000s. (Crush et al., 2008)

Nigerian authorities criticized South Africa's strict visa policies and deportation of Nigerian citizens, causing periodic diplomatic disputes. (Adebayo, 2016)

Africa remains the only continent without permanent representation on the UNSC, despite accounting for over a quarter of UN member states and being a focal point of many Council deliberations. (Kuwali & Viljoen, 2018) Nigeria argues that this lack of representation undermines the legitimacy of the UNSC and prevents the interests of African nations from being adequately addressed. (Ogunnubi & Okeke-Uzodike, 2016)

Nigeria has played a leading role in peacekeeping efforts across Africa, contributing troops to missions in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Sudan, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The country's commitment to global security, demonstrated through its involvement in Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and African Union (AU) peacekeeping missions, strengthens its claim for a permanent seat on the UNSC. (Ade-Ibijola, 2020) Nigeria aligns with the Ezulwini Consensus, an AU-backed framework that calls for at least two permanent seats for Africa, with full veto powers, and additional non-permanent seats on the UNSC. Nigeria has actively engaged in diplomatic efforts to push for this position in UN General Assembly debates. (Murithi, 2020)

Despite her strong advocacy, Nigeria faces several challenges in its push for UNSC reform. The permanent members of the UNSC (P5: the United States, China, Russia, the United Kingdom, and France) are reluctant to support structural changes that would dilute their influence. Veto-wielding members have been resistant to expanding the Council in a way that would grant new states similar powers. (Weiss, 2020) Nigeria faces competition from other African contenders, particularly South Africa and Egypt, both of which also seek permanent representation. The lack of a unified African consensus on which nations should occupy the proposed permanent seats weakens Africa's bargaining position. (Ogunnubi, 2021) UNSC reform has been on the UN agenda for decades without significant progress. Procedural hurdles, including the requirement that any changes be ratified by two-thirds of the UN General Assembly and all P5 members, make meaningful reform difficult. (Zartman, 2019)

To advance its advocacy for UNSC reform, South Africa has employed several diplomatic strategies. South Africa is an active member of the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) bloc, which collectively supports reforming global governance institutions. (Stuenkel,

2017) South Africa continues to play a leadership role within the AU, ensuring that Africa's position on UNSC reform remains a priority in global discussions. (Murithi, 2020) Through its membership in the G20 and other international organizations, South Africa has consistently raised the issue of UNSC reform. (Fabricius, 2020) Despite the challenges, South Africa remains committed to pushing for a more representative UNSC. Its diplomatic efforts, along with those of other African nations, will continue to shape the global conversation on UN reform.

Methodology

Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative, interpretive research design to critically examine the roles of Nigeria and South Africa in shaping Africa's collective position on United Nations Security Council (UNSC) reform and the pursuit of permanent African representation. Given the normative, diplomatic, and political nature of UNSC reform debates, a qualitative approach is most appropriate for capturing the complexity of state preferences, regional leadership dynamics, and evolving African diplomatic strategies.

The research is guided by a comparative case study framework, focusing on Nigeria and South Africa as Africa's most influential diplomatic and economic actors and leading claimants for permanent UNSC representation. This design enables an in-depth analysis of both convergences and divergences in their foreign policy strategies, leadership styles, and engagement with continental and global governance institutions.

Theoretical and Analytical Framework

The study is informed by a **hybrid theoretical framework** drawing on:

Realism, a dominant theory in international relations, provides a framework for understanding the power dynamics, national interests, and strategic calculations of Nigeria and South Africa in advocating for UNSC reform.

- Constructivist international relations theory, to analyze how identity, norms, and historical narratives shape African positions on UNSC reform;
- Regional leadership and hegemonic stability theory, to assess how Nigeria and South Africa project leadership within the African Union (AU);

These frameworks facilitate critical examination of how ideas, institutions, and material power interact in shaping Africa's reform agenda.

Data Collection Methods

Document and Textual Analysis

Primary and secondary documents form the core empirical material. These include: official AU documents such as the Ezulwini Consensus, Sirte Declaration, and communiqués of the AU Peace and Security Council, Statements, speeches, and policy documents from the Nigerian and South African Ministries of Foreign Affairs, UN General Assembly debates, UNSC reform working group records, and voting patterns and reports and policy briefs from international organizations, think tanks, and academic institutions. These materials were selected to trace official positions, diplomatic narratives, and shifts in strategy over time.

Comparative Analysis Strategy

The study employs a most-similar systems design, comparing Nigeria and South Africa as: Regionally dominant states, leading financial contributors to the AU and key participants in peacekeeping and multilateral diplomacy.

Comparison is structured around four analytical dimensions:

1. Diplomatic Strategy – engagement with the AU, UN, and global partners;
2. Normative Leadership – commitment to African consensus versus national ambition;
3. Material Contributions – peacekeeping, mediation, and financial support;
4. Coalition-Building – relations with other African states and global powers.

This structured comparison highlights how different leadership approaches affect Africa's collective bargaining power.

Data Analysis Techniques

Data are analyzed using qualitative content analysis and process tracing. Content analysis identifies recurring themes, discursive frames, and policy priorities in official statements and

documents. Process tracing is used to map critical diplomatic moments, such as UNSC reform negotiations, AU summits, and global reform initiatives, to assess causality and strategic evolution.

The analysis pays particular attention to moments of consensus breakdown, competing ambitions, and external influence.

Validity, Reliability, and Ethical Considerations

To enhance validity, the study triangulates multiple data sources, including official documents, academic literature, and expert interviews. Reliability is strengthened through transparent coding procedures and consistent analytical categories applied across both case studies. Ethical considerations include informed consent for interviews, anonymity where requested, and careful representation of sensitive diplomatic positions.

Limitations of the Study

The research acknowledges limitations related to restricted access to confidential diplomatic negotiations and potential bias in official state narratives. Additionally, while Nigeria and South Africa are central actors, the study does not claim to represent all African perspectives, but rather focuses on leadership dynamics within the broader continental framework.

Conclusion

This methodology provides a rigorous and systematic approach to examining Africa's UNSC reform agenda through the lens of Nigeria and South Africa. By combining comparative analysis, qualitative data, and theoretical pluralism, the study offers nuanced insights into the opportunities and challenges facing Africa's quest for permanent representation in global governance.

Discussion of Empirical Findings

This section presents the key empirical findings from the comparative analysis of Nigeria's and South Africa's roles in shaping Africa's position on United Nations Security Council (UNSC) reform. Drawing on official documents, diplomatic statements, multilateral records, and elite perspectives, the findings reveal both convergence and deep-seated tensions within Africa's reform agenda.

Empirical evidence demonstrates that Nigeria and South Africa consistently affirm support for permanent African representation on the UNSC, aligning formally with the African Union's Ezulwini Consensus and the Sirte Declaration. Both states publicly endorse the demand for at least two permanent African seats with veto powers. However, beneath this shared rhetoric lies strategic divergence. Nigeria has emphasized procedural unity and strict adherence to AU consensus mechanisms, positioning itself as a guardian of collective African diplomacy. South Africa, by contrast, has adopted a more pragmatic and flexible approach, engaging selectively with global powers and reform coalitions even when such engagement risks diluting continental consensus. This divergence has weakened Africa's negotiating coherence, as external actors increasingly exploit differences in emphasis between the two states.

Empirical data indicate that Nigeria's claim to leadership is grounded primarily in normative and historical legitimacy. Nigeria consistently frames its UNSC reform position around: Its long-standing peacekeeping contributions across Africa, its early leadership in anti-apartheid and decolonization movements and its financial and political investment in ECOWAS and AU peace operations. Nigeria's diplomatic discourse emphasizes moral authority, portraying UNSC reform as a matter of historical justice rather than power redistribution. However, findings also reveal that Nigeria's domestic governance challenges and episodic foreign policy inconsistency have diluted its credibility among some African and global partners.

South Africa's empirical profile reveals a contrasting leadership model rooted in institutional embeddedness and global integration. South Africa leverages: Its participation in BRICS, its strong ties with G20 economies and its post-apartheid moral capital. South Africa's approach prioritizes access and influence within global governance forums rather than strict continental gatekeeping. While this strategy enhances Pretoria's visibility internationally, it has also generated suspicion among some African states that South Africa prioritizes national ambition over collective African bargaining power.

A central empirical finding is that implicit competition between Nigeria and South Africa has undermined Africa's negotiating strength. Although neither state explicitly rejects continental consensus, both engage in quite diplomatic signaling to global partners that positions them as the most viable African candidate for permanent membership. This competition has contributed to: Fragmentation within the AU Committee of Ten (C-10), reduced urgency among global powers to

accommodate African demands and the persistence of Africa as the only region without permanent UNSC representation.

Empirical evidence shows that permanent UNSC members strategically engage Nigeria and South Africa bilaterally, rather than through African multilateral channels. This selective engagement reinforces fragmentation by rewarding individual diplomacy over collective positioning. Global actors frequently frame UNSC reform discussions around African readiness rather than African rights, shifting responsibility for stagnation onto African divisions rather than structural power imbalances.

Findings also reveal that UNSC reform remains largely elite-driven in both Nigeria and South Africa. Public discourse, civil society engagement, and parliamentary debate on UNSC reform are minimal, reducing domestic accountability and long-term policy continuity. This elite insulation contributes to fluctuating priorities across administrations and weakens sustained diplomatic pressure.

Finally, the empirical analysis confirms that Africa's UNSC reform agenda is normatively coherent but institutionally fragile. While principles of equity, representation, and historical redress are clearly articulated, enforcement mechanisms within the AU remain weak. Neither Nigeria nor South Africa has successfully mobilized binding commitments from other African states to present a unified negotiating front.

Gaps in Reviewed Literature

Despite an expanding body of literature on United Nations Security Council (UNSC) reform and Africa's quest for permanent representation, several critical gaps remain inadequately addressed, particularly concerning Nigeria and South Africa's roles in shaping the African agenda.

Much of the existing scholarship focuses on normative arguments supporting Africa's permanent representation, justice, historical marginalization, and equity in global governance. While these arguments are well established, there is limited empirical analysis of how Nigeria and South Africa operationalize these norms in practice, including diplomatic bargaining, coalition-building, and trade-offs within multilateral forums. This creates a gap between rhetorical commitment and actual diplomatic behavior.

Although Nigeria and South Africa are frequently discussed as leading African contenders for permanent UNSC seats, most studies analyze them in isolation rather than comparatively. There is a lack of systematic comparison of their diplomatic strategies, foreign policy instruments, peacekeeping records, economic leverage, and global alliances. This gap limits understanding of whether their approaches are complementary, competitive, or mutually undermining.

Existing literature often treats “Africa” as a cohesive actor united behind the Ezulwini Consensus. However, internal African divisions, rival candidacies (e.g., Egypt, Kenya, Algeria), and regional power struggles receive insufficient analytical attention. The political costs of Nigeria–South Africa rivalry and its implications for Africa’s collective bargaining power remain underexplored.

There is inadequate engagement with how domestic political instability, economic inequality, governance challenges, and public opinion in Nigeria and South Africa shape and constrain their global ambitions. Most studies assume state coherence, overlooking how internal legitimacy crises weaken diplomatic credibility in global reform negotiations.

Nigeria and South Africa frequently justify their UNSC aspirations through peacekeeping contributions and conflict mediation. However, few studies empirically interrogate whether peacekeeping leadership actually translates into sustained diplomatic influence within UNSC reform negotiations. The causal link between operational contribution and political reward remains largely assumed rather than demonstrated.

Summary and Recommendations

Summary

The African Agenda for United Nations Security Council (UNSC) reform represents a crucial aspect of Africa’s pursuit of greater representation in global governance. Nigeria and South Africa, as two of the continent’s most influential powers, have played central roles in shaping Africa’s position on UNSC reform and advocating for permanent representation. Both countries have engaged in diplomatic efforts within the African Union (AU), the United Nations (UN), and other international platforms to push for Africa’s demand for at least two permanent seats with full veto powers, as outlined in the Ezulwini Consensus.

Nigeria's advocacy has been driven by its historical contributions to peacekeeping, its demographic and economic weight, and its leadership in West Africa. South Africa, on the other hand, has used its post-apartheid diplomatic legitimacy, strong multilateral engagements, and its role as a bridge between Africa and global powers to advance the reform agenda. Despite these efforts, several challenges persist, including internal African divisions, geopolitical resistance from current permanent UNSC members (P5), and Nigeria and South Africa's competing national interests, which at times undermine Africa's collective position.

Recommendations

- Strengthening Nigeria-South Africa collaboration by establishing a structured bilateral framework dedicated to UNSC reform diplomacy.
- Aligning foreign policy priorities to ensure consistency in their advocacy efforts.
- Engaging with other African regional powers to prevent internal divisions that weaken Africa's common position.
- Engaging more Effectively with the P5 and emerging powers since the P5 hold the key to UNSC reform.
- Strengthening alliances with emerging powers like India and Brazil, which also seek UNSC reform, could bolster Africa's position.
- Addressing domestic political and economic challenges. Nigeria and South Africa must strengthen their domestic governance and economic stability to bolster their credibility as UNSC candidates:
- Addressing governance deficits, corruption, and internal security issues will ensure that both countries remain attractive candidates for global leadership.
- Reforming the AU's approach to UNSC advocacy as a major drive in establishing a more effective AU-led diplomatic team to lead Africa's negotiations on UNSC reform.

Reference

- Adebajo, A. (2016). *Africa's peacemakers: Nobel laureates of African descent*. Zed Books.
- Adebajo, A. (2019). *The curse of Berlin: Africa after the Cold War*. Hurst & Company.
- Adebajo, A. (2021). *The curse of Berlin: Africa after the Cold War*. Oxford University Press.
- Adler, E., & Barnett, M. (1998). *Security communities*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kuwali, D., & Viljoen, F. (2018). *Africa and the responsibility to protect: Article 4(h) of the African Union Constitutive Act*. Routledge.
- Murithi, T. (2014). *The African Union: Pan-Africanism, peacebuilding and development*. Routledge.
- Murithi, T. (2020). *The African Union and the United Nations: Crafting Africa's peace and security partnerships*. Bloomsbury.
- Olonisakin, F. (2015). *Reinventing peacekeeping in Africa: Conceptual and legal issues in the quest for sustainable peace*. Brill.
- Paul, J., & Nahory, C. (2019). *The UN Security Council: From the Cold War to the 21st century*. Oxford University Press.
- Stuenkel, O. (2017). *Post-Western world: How emerging powers are remaking global order*. Polity Press.
- Tieku, T. (2021). *Governing Africa: The African Union and the quest for unity*. Routledge.
- Weiss, T. G. (2020). *What's wrong with the United Nations and how to fix it*. Polity Press.
- Zartman, I. W. (2019). *Diplomacy and negotiation in global governance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Adebayo, B. (2016). Xenophobia and migrant relations in South Africa: The Nigerian experience. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 10(2), 21–34.
- Ade-Ibijola, A. O. (2020). Nigeria's UN peacekeeping operations and the quest for a permanent Security Council seat. *African Journal of International Affairs*, 22(1), 45–62.
- Adeoye, A. (2012). Nigeria–South Africa economic relations: Trends, challenges, and prospects. *African Development Review*, 24(2), 111–129.
- Akinboye, S. O. (2013). Nigeria's foreign policy under civilian rule: A critical analysis. *Nigerian Journal of International Affairs*, 39(1), 25–50.
- Akinyemi, B. (2019). Nigeria's diplomacy and the challenge of global governance. *African Affairs*, 118(472), 302–319.

- Akinyemi, B. (2022). Diplomacy and Nigeria's quest for a permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council. *Journal of African Political Studies*, 15(2), 119–138.
- Fabricius, P. (2020). South Africa's role in United Nations reform: Diplomacy, challenges, and opportunities. *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 27(1), 35–52.
- Graham, M. (2015). South Africa's foreign policy and the UN: The struggle for influence. *International Relations*, 29(3), 287–305.
- Kasaija, P. A. (2013). The African Union and UN Security Council reform. *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 20(2), 187–206.
- Krane, J. (2019). Energy governance in the Gulf States: Supply diversification and energy policy reform. *Energy Policy*, 129, 446–457.
- Landsberg, C. (2020). BRICS and Africa: A partnership for development. *African Security Review*, 29(1), 78–92.
- Nathan, L. (2013). South Africa's foreign policy: Between idealism and pragmatism. *Journal of International Affairs*, 88(3), 567–589.
- Ngcamu, B. S., & Tefera, D. (2021). South Africa's role in African peacekeeping and the quest for a permanent UNSC seat. *African Security Review*, 30(2), 129–145.
- Ogunnubi, O. (2021). Power politics and the African quest for permanent representation in the UNSC: Nigeria, South Africa, and Egypt in perspective. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 39(3), 321–338.
- Ogunnubi, O., & Okeke-Uzodike, U. (2016a). Can Nigeria be Africa's hegemon? *African Security Review*, 25(2), 110–128.
- Ogunnubi, O., & Okeke-Uzodike, U. (2016b). Nigeria's foreign policy and the politics of UN Security Council reform. *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 23(1), 89–109.
- Sim, N. (2021). Russia, Saudi Arabia, and the geopolitics of OPEC+. *International Affairs*, 97(3), 601–622.
- Zondi, S. (2018). The African Union and the reform of the United Nations Security Council: A critical analysis. *African Affairs*, 117(466), 556–578.
- Zondi, S. (2020). Africa's approach to UNSC reform: A critical assessment. *African Affairs*, 119(476), 234–256.
- African Union. (2005). *The common African position on the proposed reform of the United Nations: The Ezulwini Consensus*. African Union.
- Annan, K. (2005). *In larger freedom: Towards development, security and human rights for all*. United Nations.

- Bach, D. C. (2016). *Regionalism in Africa: Genealogies, institutions, and trans-state networks*. Routledge.
- Cilliers, J. (2008). *Peacekeeping and conflict resolution in Africa: South Africa and Nigeria's roles*. Institute for Security Studies.
- Crush, J., Ramachandran, S., & Pendleton, W. (2008). *Migration, remittances, and development in Africa*. Southern African Migration Programme.
- Eze, O. C. (2010). *Nigeria and South Africa: The challenge of leadership in Africa*. Nigerian Institute of International Affairs.
- International Energy Agency. (2020). *Global energy demand in the COVID-19 crisis*. International Energy Agency.
- Luck, E. C. (2006). *UN Security Council: Practice and promise*. Routledge.
- Onyekwena, C., & Ekeruche, M. A. (2019). *Trade between Nigeria and South Africa: Trends and challenges*. Brookings Institution.