

The Diplomacy of Transformation: Interrogating the Issues in President Jonathan's Transformation Foreign Policy

John Tor TSUWA

Department of Political Science, Benue State University, Makurdi NIGERIA

Abstract

The crux of this paper is to interrogate the key goals of the diplomacy of transformation adopted by the Goodluck Jonathan administration geared towards achieving foreign policy goals that will reposition Nigeria amongst the comity of nations and accelerate development for the country. This paper is qualitative and it uses secondary method of data collection to gather data. The data so obtained from these secondary sources is analyzed within the arguments of the visionary / transformation theory of leadership on which the discourse is anchored. Findings revealed that the transformation diplomacy recorded little achievement due largely to bad leadership, infrastructural decay, insecurity, chronic corruption inherent in the nature and practice of politics in Nigeria among others. The paper therefore recommends that the government in its actions and through the anti-graft agencies should strengthen their fight against corruption. The Nigerian political class should develop the political will capable of transforming and reposition the Nigerian state for development. These can be achieved through culture of discipline and purposeful leadership. The Fight against insecurity is a collective task, both the leaders and the followers must ensure that, there is peace and security in the society if our society is to experience socio-economic development.

Key Words: Development, Diplomacy, Foreign Policy, Transformation,

Introduction

The realization that no nation no matter how powerful can survive and develop alone has made nations to interact with one another in the bid to achieving their national goals. All nations interact to be able to attract the resources not found in their nation from others to meet their needs. Nigeria has also since independence developed relations with other nations in other to do same. After the enunciation of Nigerian foreign policy thrust by Tafawa Balewa at Nigeria's independence, other past administrations in Nigeria have always reshaped Nigerian foreign policy approaches, strategies and methods of achieving them. Over the years, Nigeria had made Africa the centerpiece of her foreign policy by taking the leadership of the African continent in ensuring the liberation of African nations

from colonization, enhancing integration, growth and development as well as ensuring peace and security on the continent. To this end, Nigeria has spearheaded the formation of the Organization of African Unity now the African Union and the Economic Community of West African States. Nigerian has also played prominent role in the Non-Align Movement, the Common Wealth of Nations, the United Nations and other bilateral and multilateral engagements that are aimed at improving sub regional and regional condition.

Of all the many strategies or what is referred in foreign policy studies as instruments of foreign policy, the instrument of diplomacy is most critical. This is because the international community has rejected the use of war and force as legitimate instruments of statecraft but has favoured peaceful negotiation between states in the resolution of contentious issues. It is based on this that all nations use it in their interaction with other nations in the bid to achieving their goals. Nigeria has also used and continue to use diplomacy in leading the African continent and in achieving her foreign policy objectives. With changes in the international system in terms of the actors, interest and strategies of achieving their goals, the Nigerian government also planned a careful shift in her foreign policy calculation. It is based on this that the Nigerian government established the National Technical Working Group (NTWG) on foreign policy to reconstruct the Nigerian foreign policy architecture. After several consultations and brainstorming, the group in 2009 came out with a blueprint for Nigeria's foreign policy architecture which was believed to have the potentials for jumpstarting Nigeria's economic progress, ensure peace and security, and consolidate democracy. It was also aimed at positioning Nigeria on a viable platform among the comity of nations.

The document produced by the group provided *inter alia* the following objectives for the achievement of the vision of the Nigeria government in the midst of contemporary international politics: (a) Articulate a better image for Nigeria and improve the country's relationship with the outside world by cultivating goodwill for Nigeria (b) Seek closer and better relations with the major and emerging powers (c) Pursue the acquisition and transfer of technology, promotion of trade, investment and cultural relations to boost Nigeria's ailing economy (d) Facilitate rapid and sustained economic growth and development (e) Assist Nigeria to achieve systemic equilibrium, peace, stability and good governance (f) Ensure Nigeria's leadership role in Africa and the ECOWAS region is sustained and safeguarded. (g) Use diplomacy to persuade Nigerians in the Diaspora to be part of nation (h) building efforts (i) Assist Nigeria in securing a permanent seat in the United nation's Security Council (j) Ensure Nigeria's strategic role and military capability (k) Seek and encourage high level visits by government officials and private sector to countries abroad that have strategic relevance to Nigeria's interests and vice-versa, for achievement of our goals in vision 20:2020 (l) Use success stories elsewhere and domesticate these for national Interest (m) Ensure Nigeria's domestication and compliance with bilateral and multilateral obligations

With the above provisions, it became clear that Nigeria was determined to pursue a robust foreign policy to achieve her socio-economic development agenda. Critical to this was diplomacy. The Jonathan administration tried to pursue a robust diplomatic agenda that will re-lunch Nigeria into the international political arena adopted the recommendations and was determined to achieving them. The crux of this paper therefore is to interrogate the key goals of the diplomacy of transformation adopted by the Goodluck Jonathan administration to achieve the goals of the new policy direction of the Nigerian state. The paper will also interrogate the core issues in the strategy and the implication of it on the Nigerian society.

Conceptualizing Foreign Policy

Conceptualizing foreign policy is as complex as the actors and the strategies involved in the exercise of foreign policy. This account to why it is difficult for a single definition of foreign policy to be arrived at. For Saliu (2013:133), foreign policy is simply the calculated steps taken by a state which are intended to maximize the opportunities that are available outside its geographical boundaries, while at the same time, minimizing the perils that are abound. Saliu's argument shows that, nations also desire resources that are not commonly found within their territories, and to that, they stage strategic and conscious steps to acquire and utilize such resources which are scarce and competed upon by other actors in outside climes. Within this competition, there is a possibility of conflict, and to Saliu, the nations are to be careful so as not to engage in wasteful and destructive engagements that will cost them or prevent them from achieving their set goals and threatening their survival as a nation.

The state centric conception of foreign policy considers the actions and inactions of the state and the impact of that on its interaction and benefits. To this group, foreign policy is an action of the state. This is why Frankel (1975:9) described foreign policy as consisting of decisions and actions which involve to some appreciable extent relations between one state and another. He argues further that, this relationship is shaped by the internal dynamism of the interacting nations. The import of this definition is that, as nations interact, their ability to take decisions that affects them in the global arena is influence by their internal capacity to mobilize resource and use such resources to develop their domestic condition. It is clear from here that, the state is the main actor in foreign policy decision making and implementation though in some cases, these decisions are influenced by non-state actors who are critical in the calculations of the state in achieving her goal.

Another perspective of foreign policy sees it in terms of national interest and the capacity of a state to pursue it. Crab (1972:121) argues that, foreign policy reduced to its fundamental ingredients consist of national interest to be achieved and the means of achieving it. The gamut of this definition is that, nation's desire to asserting themselves in

a vantage position that will enhance their image, their influence and prestige at both domestic and external stage. These are the core values of a nation that the nation wishes to protect through the use of her internal and external capabilities. The role of resources in achieving these goals therefore becomes central in nations calculations. To this end, any strategy that will enhance the capacity of a nation to protect its internal resources and influence over other nations in the process of interaction is adopted.

As a summation of the above definitions, this paper therefore sees foreign policy as involving all the elements listed in the definitions above and including the conscious mobilization of resources by the state to vigorously pursue her external goals via a viable and secured domestic condition with the hope of positioning the nation at a high pedestal amongst the comity of nations. Nigeria's determination to decolonized Africa, to integrate Africa and to spearhead the development and democratization process of African states and at the same time creating a robust internal economic system has therefore remained the core of Nigerian foreign policy.

Conceptualizing Transformation Diplomacy

The term diplomacy is derivative of via French from the ancient Greek diploma, composed of *diplo*, meaning "folded in two", and suffix *ma*, meaning "an object" the folded document conferred a privilege often a permit to travel on the bearer, and the term came to denote documents through which princes granted such favours. Later it applied to all solemn documents issued by chancelleries, especially those containing agreements between sovereigns. From here it metamorphosed into concrete discussions between independent states. According to Satow (1922:1) as cited by Akinboye and Basiru (2014:156) diplomacy is the application of intelligence or tact to the conduct of relations between the governments of independent states or more briefly still, the conduct of business between states by peaceful means. Elaborating on the core goals of diplomacy, Ofoegbu (1980) argues that, diplomacy involves the use of negotiations and bargaining by a state to sustain an existing mutual objective or to change the policies of the states. This is why Saliu (2013:142) argues that diplomacy as simply the platform for decision makers. Primary at the heart of it is to influence policy makers to view things the way their counterparts in other countries want them to see such issues.

Deducing from these definitions, we can argue that diplomacy is central to interstate relations. It is at the heart of policy makers of countries as it helps them to view things the way their other colleagues are viewing it in other climes. It help policy makers to negotiate on behalf of the countries to reach agreement on issues that will positively help the growth and development of their communities and endanger peaceful cooperation and coexistence amongst the various segments of the society. The Vienna Convention states in Article 3 paragraph 1 and 2 that, diplomacy performs the functions interest protection,

observation and reporting, negotiation, representation and consular services. We can therefore argue that diplomacy is an established method of influencing the decisions and behavior of governments and people through dialogue, negotiation and other measures short of war or violence to achieve certain political and economic goals by nation-states. It is the process were national harmoniously pursue and achieve their national interest.

Transformational diplomacy is a relatively new codification in foreign policy calculations. According to Vaisse (2007:2) 'transformational diplomacy', is a concept coined and inaugurated by Condoleezza Rice, the former American secretary of state in early 2006 emphasizing the determination of the United States to working with its partners with a view to build and sustain democratic, well-governed states that will respond to the needs of their people and conduct themselves responsibly in the international system. According to him, the goal of Rice was to champion the consolidation and expansion of democratic governments. According to Rice (2006) the [September 11, 2001 attacks](#) were rooted in "oppression and despair" and so, the U.S. must advance democratic reform and support basic rights. According to her, "Transformational Diplomacy" can be described as the goal of "work(ing) with our many partners around the world... (and) build(ing) and sustain(ing) democratic, well-governed states that will respond to the needs of their people and conduct themselves responsibly in the international system.

According to Vaisse (2007) Rice's Transformational Diplomacy involved five core elements: (a) Relocating American diplomats to the places in the world where they are needed most. (b) Requiring diplomats to serve some time in hardship locations (c) Focusing on regional solutions to problems such as terrorism, drug trafficking, and diseases. (d) Working with other countries on a bilateral basis to help them build a stronger infrastructure, and decreasing foreign nations' dependence on American hand-outs and assistance. (e) Creating a high-level position, Director of Foreign Assistance, to oversee U.S. foreign aid managed by the two agencies that manage the majority of foreign aid, the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

Vaisse insist that Rice's conviction on the above core areas was that they will help to "maintain security, fight poverty, and make democratic reforms" and also help to improve foreign nations' legal, economic, healthcare, and educational systems. We can therefore argue that, transformational diplomacy is geared towards changing a countries policy thrust towards a more robust approach that will liaise with other countries to safeguard the territorial integrity of nations, ensure peace and security, encourage democratic consolidation that will improve on the justice delivery system, reduce poverty, inequality and ensure well governed states that will help reduce conflicts in the society.

Theoretical and methodological Issues

This paper is qualitative and it uses secondary method of data collection to gather information in the process of writing. The data so obtained from these secondary sources is analyzed within the arguments of the visionary/transformation theory of leadership on which the discourse is anchored. Transformational leadership is defined as a leadership approach that causes change in individuals and social systems. According to Burns (1978:94) who is considered as the proponent of this theory, transforming leadership is a process in which "leaders and followers help each other to advance to a higher level of morale and motivation". We can argue that, at the core of transformational leadership theory is the ability to create valuable and positive change in the followers with the end goal of developing followers into leaders. According to Burns, the transforming approach creates significant change in the life of people and organizations. It redesigns perceptions and values, and changes expectations and aspirations of employees. Here, the leader's personality, traits and ability to make a change through example, articulation of an energizing vision and challenging goals help in changing the capacity of the organization and her members. Bass (1998:67) expanded on Burns arguments and pointed out that the extent to which a leader is transformational, is measured first, in terms of his influence on the followers. The followers of such a leader feel trust, admiration, loyalty and respect for the leader and because of the qualities of the transformational leader are willing to work harder than originally expected. These outcomes occur because the transformational leader offers followers something more than just working for self gain; they provide followers with an inspiring mission and vision and give them an identity. While an alteration or modification of any component of a phenomenon through addition, subtraction, elimination or substitution inaugurates change, transformation entails creating something new or different through the remolding or reconfiguration of the constituent element of the old. In contrast to change, transformation is more revolutionary, less evolutionary, more expeditious in execution and prone to jolting and convulsive experiences. It involves rapid and sometimes cataclysmic forms of change (Smart 1992; Obikeze, 2003) cite in (Tsuwa, 2013:100).

We can argue that, the followers are allowed to develop new innovations that will change the status quo for a better one which will galvanize development and ensure peace and security, respect and integrity for the generality of the people. Despite the good of this theory, it has the disadvantage of creating a cult personality for the leader. This is a situation where the leader is so revered that s/he is only the personality that drives activity. In most cases when this is done, the leader tend to become autocratic and corrupt as absolute powers corrupt absolutely. Since this theory shows that transformational leadership is good and can create a robust domestic development for the state and will at the same time enhance the capacity and integrity of the people and project their image amongst other nations, this paper despite the short comings of the theory strongly believe

that it has more the capacity of explaining more the dynamics involved in the president Jonathan's style of transformational diplomacy.

Applying this theory to the Diplomacy of Transformation of Jonathan's administration, it entails that transformation goes beyond mere approaches and it is revolutionary in nature. Thus in search of policy options for the development of the society there is need to take into consideration the key ingredient embedded in the process of transformation. This calls for collaboration between the leader and the followers. The leader is to be committed to the transformation of the society for the good of the follower, a condition that will the followers to dedicate their energies in supporting the leader. The leader must take issues of integrity and ethics seriously in order to motivate the followers towards good, governance, consolidating democracy and instituting justice and transparency. This is the bases on which this paper adopts this theory to interrogate Jonathan's foreign policy issues.

Interrogating the Dynamics of Transformation Diplomacy

As aptly put forward by Maku (2013:2) and NPC (2011:7) the transformation agenda was meant to touch every aspect of the socio-economic and political life of the nation. To this a recap of certain areas were enumerated which among others are: job creation, good governance, agriculture, security, power sector etcetera. With this, the administration was expected to take a critical look at the various classifications of diplomacy within which it can anchor its transformation agenda on. These are, Track I and Track II diplomacy, parliamentary/democracy diplomacy and citizen diplomacy.

Track I diplomacy according to Akpuru-Aja (2015) is the traditional process of communication relations between and among nation-states at a horizontal axis. This involves bilateral relations between nations which can be carried out on behalf of the state by its accredited representatives. Despite the existence of the missions and their officials, the leader (president) can engage in a leader to leader diplomacy on critical issues that will attract more weight if the leader attends in person. The numerous travels during the Obasanjo period tagged "shuttle diplomacy" can be said to be one of the process. This system allows the leaders to appreciate their collective challenges and is able to mobilize resources to collectively solve their collective challenges.

Track II diplomacy is multilaterally based and involves non-governmental organizations that are established with the purpose of bringing nations together to realize commonly held goals. It is expected that nations will key into the activities of these organizations to achieve their foreign policy trust and also achieve their goals of development and to overcome their challenges. Organizations such as the United Nations, the African Union, Economic Community of West States, Organization of Petroleum Producing Countries, African Development Bank among others are the critical actors in

this track of diplomacy. This is because it is clear that in today's globalized world, no single nation can solve its problems alone and nations are differently endowed so they need the support of others and non-state actors who are critical in the world to help in issues such as climate change, insecurity, poverty and other issues with multiplier effects. Akpuru-Aja (2015) insists that, in power politics, multilateral framework offer more protection to weak or vulnerable powers against unilateral aggression by stronger aggressors. To this, we can argue nations especially those of Africa, Nigeria inclusive need these organizations and other states to collectively fight to liberate themselves from their weak and almost failed status.

Parliamentary or democratic diplomacy entails the consolidation of democracy by states and within the structural composition of international organizations that will provide a level field for the benefit of all members. As Akpuru-Aja (1998) argues, in conventional democracy, a majority vote carries the show but within the United Nations Security Council, it is the opposite and meant deliberately to avoid the conspiracy and tyranny of the majority. This is basically done to strengthen the collective security posture of the UN so as to guarantee world peace and security. Nations are therefore usually determined to participate in this process so as to contribute to the development of peace, security and collective development.

Citizen diplomacy seeks to ensure the collective welfare of the citizens. Nations usually have their nationals abroad. It is therefore the commitment and responsibility of the nations to take care of the welfare of the people within the state and those in Diaspora. It is therefore the responsibility of the state to protect her citizens irrespective of their place of abode from dehumanizing experiences, abuse of human rights, and provision of basic needs and provide an enabling environment for the citizens to maximize their potentials. To this effect, Ogunsanya (2009:12) argues that citizens diplomacy as the new orientation of a country's foreign policy which is aimed at providing the basis for the participation by the people (citizens) in their government shall be ensured in accordance with the provisions of the country's constitution.

Jonathan's Diplomacy of Transformation in Nigeria: Interrogating the Issues

According to Didzis (2011:12) in the 21st Century, diplomacy is no longer characterised by the traditional gatekeeper model, associated with a state-centric environment, a foreign ministry as the exclusive institution for foreign policy implementation and provision of communication through traditional channels of information exchange. Today, diplomacy is characterised by networking that includes all levels of cooperation, within which business-related issues play an increasingly important role. Within the dynamics of these modern day international relations acting within the process of globalization, Didzis (2011:114) argues that, diplomacy and business, as well as international actors or

international agendas, are subject to continuous change. Developing, adapting and transforming diplomatic agendas are therefore central to the new character of international diplomacy as states and non-state actors have become major players in the interconnected socio-economic, political and cultural competition.

It is in line with the above that former President Goodluck Jonathan moved towards transforming the Nigerian agenda to compete on the same level with other countries in the changing world. In his inaugural address on May 29th 2011, President Jonathan stated *inter alia* that;

... I am confident that we have every reason to look to the future with hope. We own ourselves and posterity the duty of making this country respectable in the comity of nations. Nigeria as a responsible member of the international community will remain committed to the maintenance of global peace and security. We will continue to play an active role in the United Nations. Our role in the African Union, ECOWAS, and the Gulf of Guinea will be enhanced to ensure greater human and energy security...this is a new dawn for Africa...we fought for decolonization... Nigeria in partnership with the African Union, will lead the process for democracy and development in Africa... we shall improve our capability in combating trans-border crimes. (Jonathan 2013:31)

The above views capture the transformation posture of President Jonathan's transformation diplomacy both within and outside the country. In fact, President Jonathan during a retreat on the review of Nigeria's foreign policy on 1st August, 2011 stated *inter alia* that;

...in the era of globalization; at a time of grave challenges to national and international security, such as we face from terrorism and transnational criminal networks, at a time of massive poverty and youth restiveness in our country, we have no choice but to adjust and adapt the way we conduct foreign policy. As we response to the forces of globalization, perhaps more than ever before, our diplomacy must be put at the service of our domestic priorities... the big challenge for Nigerian diplomacy is to articulate and vigorously market the country as a conducive environment in which to do business. (Jonathan 2013:165)

From the above, we can see clearly that President Jonathan's emphasis on economic diplomacy was based on his argument that, economic diplomacy is entirely compatible with democracy promotion, for at least two reasons which he emphasized; First, building a strong economy will help build a strong, stable, prosperous and peaceful country, where

democracy will thrive and business will flourish, and where citizens can live and pursue their dreams with dignity under the protection of the law. Second, it is Nigeria's interest to promote the culture of democracy across Africa. Since it is the surest way to guarantee peace, justice and happiness in the continent.(Jonathan 2013:166).

We can therefore argue that, with the new dynamics in the international arena, especially the deconstruction of the Euro-American economic dominance and the emergence of other economic powers such as China and India with great impact on African economies, Nigeria needs to transform its diplomacy starting from the domestic arena. As submitted earlier, the transformation diplomacy of President Jonathan was a medium term development strategy. Thus the key goals of the transformation Agenda as elaborated by Maku, (2013:4) among others were; (a) Strong, inclusive, non-inflationary economic growth. (b) Employment generation, poverty alleviation, and sustained improvement in the well-being of all classes of Nigerians. (c) Value re-orientation that targets a robust anti-corruption campaign.

Intimating on the measures of realizing these goals Maku, (2013:4) submitted that, priority sectoral issues were taken into consideration viz (a) Governance (b) Human capital development (c) Infrastructure (d) Real sector. According to Maku's projections, the policy thrust of government is to maximize the benefits citizens derive from governance by way of more efficient and effective utilization of public resources. It also entails a higher accent on safety of lives and property and better service delivery. Thus the aforementioned, will be achieved through; public service reforms such as security, anti-corruption, Foreign policy and economic diplomacy under human capital development, Education, health, labour and productivity, women and youth development will be given greater attention since human capital development is strategic to the socio-economic development of any nation.

It is therefore worthy to note here that, the transformational diplomacy of President Jonathan showed some strength in some areas. For instance, he made efforts that culminated into the delisting of Nigeria from the discriminatory rule of the Department of Homeland Security on special screening of Nigerians on international flights into the US which was instituted as a result of the attempted suicide bombing by the young Abdulmutallab. Again, the visit of US secretary of state, Senator John Kerry in 2015 also showed a strong signal to the Jonathan's diplomatic efforts. When John Kerry visited, he emphasized that; Nigeria must raise her standard of democracy. According to Kerry as cited by the Nation News Paper of January, 27, 2015 (61) and echoed by Pine (2015:140), it is absolutely critical that the 2105 general elections be conducted peacefully, that they are credible, transparent, accountable, so that the people of Nigeria can have faith and the world can have faith in the government that flows from it. It was at this occasion that Kerry stated that, the international community was deeply committed to working with Nigeria going forward.

With this show of commitment from the US, President Jonathan stated after the visit as quoted in Nation News Paper of January, 27, 2015 (61) that Kerry's visit was underscored by the mutual admiration for each other and the deep commitment to freedom, democracy, and human rights. It is also an acceptance by the US that Nigeria can not negotiate her sovereignty and survivability. What we can glean from here is that, irrespective of the inner motive of visit, there is this realization that Nigeria is critical in her foreign policy calculations and the survival of the Nigerian nation despite US prophesy that Nigeria will disintegrate in 2015 is sacrosanct is the African continent is to be stable and prosperous.

According to Abati (2015:1) due to Jonathan's transformation diplomacy, Foreign Direct Investment generated in the last year alone according to UNCTAD's 2012 Investment Report was \$8.9 billion making Nigeria No 1 in Africa and a top quartile investment destination in the world. He also pointed out some other points of Jonathan's high points of transformation diplomacy. For instance, during the president's visit to Rio, Brazil, Nigeria signed an MOU with Electrobras to invest in the generation of 10, 000 MW; since then, there have been subsequent visits to Nigeria by Brazilian investors interested in infrastructure, food and beverages and consumer items. Abati (2015:2) also pointed out that, in October 2011, President Jonathan met with the Australian investment community in Perth, on the sidelines of CHOGM, the Australia-Nigeria Trade and Investment Council (ANTIC) was established to facilitate the flow of investments into agriculture, mining and the petrochemicals sector. Australian Council members have since visited Nigeria, and there is an agreement in place to provide technical support for the local mining sector. He stated further that, in April 2012, the President, in the course of an official visit to Germany, got Siemens to commit to investment in power generation, and turbine maintenance and repair in Nigeria.

Abati (2015: 3) insisted that Nigeria under President Jonathan was highly respected in the international community. This account to why he was by the TIME international magazine amongst the 100 Most Influential leaders of the world in 2012. This to him is a reflection of his impeccable diplomatic achievements. He noted that, the president had held the highest national honours in Liberia and received recognitions and was honoured by people, governments and institutions in Nigeria, Ghana, Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago. Another strong point in Jonathan's transformation diplomacy was when he recalled Nigeria's ambassador to Libya in protest of suggestion by Muammar Gaddafi that Nigeria should separate into a Muslim North State and a Christian South. This was to indicate that Nigeria could not allow any nation to interfere in the domestic affairs of the country. The abstinence of Nigeria from voting in the Israeli-Palestinian statehood imbroglio was also another point in President Jonathan's diplomatic strategy.

From the above, we can argue that the Jonathan administration made some efforts in achieving some of his foreign policy objectives. The problematic however is that, his

transformation diplomacy did not follow the core objectives he accepted to pursue as contained in the recommendations of the 2009 NTWG. His emphasis on economic development, provision of security for the people, transparency, creation of an integrity base for the country and maintaining a sound relationship between the leaders and the follower became the major undoing of the administration. This paper will interrogate some few areas that made the transformation diplomacy a mirage.

One, there is no iota of doubt saying that the transformation diplomacy failed to take Nigeria to the promise land due largely to the reason why the Peoples Democratic Party failed to retain power in the 2015 general elections in Nigeria. The Diplomacy of transformation accordingly, experienced infrastructural failure, economic distortion and above all was entangled by corruption and insecurity.

The success of any society to experience socio-economic transformation is anchored on a good and stable investment environment to which investors, individuals and the citizenry go about their daily activities in a free and stable manner. These variables were lacking not only due to the activities of insurgent (Boko-Haram) but also due to the lack of clear leadership focus on the side of the government. The core objective of the transformation diplomacy which was to ensure peace and security and secure the nation's borders to prevent trans-border criminality could not be achieved. The government showed a lack of capacity in handling the Boko Haram insurgency as shown in the withdrawal of US and French personnel who came to support in the war on terror. The inability of the administration to coordinate her immediate neighbours to fight the insurgence destroyed the image of Nigeria. The capture of Nigeria territories, hoisting of the flag of Boko Haram, the retreat of Nigeria military into Cameroon and the postponement of the 2015 general elections on account of insecurity greatly battered Nigerian image and integrity.

It is worthy to note here that, the politics that trailed the abduction of the Chibok girls was a very low point for the image and sincerity of the leadership of Nigeria. The refusal by the president that the girls were abducted and his late acceptance showed how the state did not value the issue freedom and human rights in Nigeria. This is because it took the visit of the Pakistanis activist Malana for the president to interact with the parents of the abducted girls. Apart from the issue of insurgency, there was also increase in insecurity as seen in the high number of kidnapping, famers/herders conflicts and general criminalities. This was another minus to the success of the transformation diplomacy.

Another problem that contributed to the dismal outing of Jonathan's transformation diplomacy was the problem of leadership. Leadership in Nigeria according to Tsuwa (2015:12) hinges on belly politics. This is a situation of primitive materialism. Were the leaders "greedily" accumulates the collective wealth of the people for their private consumption thereby denying the citizenry the privilege of benefiting from the resources

their society accrues them. Achanya (2014:50) argues in the same line that; our political leaders are in a rat race for the acquisition of houses, choice parcels of lands, posh cars, business houses and shares in blue chip companies. Their life style spells ostentation and they believe in self-centered politics. The corruption cases surrounding presidents' Jonathan's officials and close allies such as Aroma Oteh, Stella Uduah, Pastor Oritsejafor, Bode George, Godswill Orubebe, Diazani Madueke amongst others was a clear disregard for the commitment made by Jonathan's transformation agenda.

The Jonathan administration also failed to attract foreign investments and many other multinational corporations also left Nigeria due to lack of power supply and insecurity. This is fundamentally the problematique to the failure of public policies in Nigeria and most of the developing nations in the world. This was also the major problem that the Jonathan administration faced. So instead of transforming the country and wiping out corruption as he promised, the regime was engrossed in corrupt activities as seen the decline in Nigerian foreign reserve.

Apart from the above, there were several other factors that contributed to the inability of the Jonathan's administration in meeting up with the promises of its transformation diplomacy. The poor image of the Nigerian state and her leaders in the international comity was also very low due to corruption and weak representation. The lack of diversity of the Nigerian economy could also not provide a robust base for the nation to participate favorably within the dynamics of the globalization process.

Conclusion

This paper x-rays the transformation diplomacy of former president of Nigeria, Goodluck Ebele Jonathan. The paper explores the thematic goals set out by the transformation diplomacy and attempt to evaluate the success and the challenges recorded from the transformation goals. Findings emanating from the paper which are basically from secondary sources revealed that the transformation diplomacy even though recorded little achievement hence the low indicators of the Nigerian state. The above is due largely to bad leadership, infrastructural decay, insecurity, chronic corruption inherent in the nature and practice of politics in Nigeria among others. In the light of the above and deriving from the defeat the government experienced in the last general election. It is the position of this paper to offer useful suggestions to the present led All Progressive government (APC) champion by President Muhamadu Buhari for a restructuring of public policies and adherence to the tenants of democracy and good governance. To this, the following recommendations are put forward;

The culture of corruption in the polity needs to be given serious attention. The EFCC and other anti-graft agencies should strengthen their fight against corruption. The Nigerian political class should develop the political will capable of transforming and

reposition the Nigerian state for development. These can be achieved through culture of discipline, purposeful leadership based on the interest of the people.

Fighting insecurity is a collective task. Both the leaders and the followers must ensure that, there is peace and security in the society if our society is to experience socio-economic development. For unstable environment is tantamount for investment to thrive. Accountability, Transparency, Reciprocity, the Rule of Law which are the core tenets of governance must be put in place. Lastly internal democracy, party discipline and adherence to the tenets of governance aforementioned by public officers/servants among others are the keys for transformation to work since transformation involves creating something new.

References

- Abati, R (2015) The Gains of Jonathan's diplomacy. *Premium Times*, Friday, 16, November
- Achanya, J.J (2014) "Good Leadership; Good Governance: A Tool for Sustainable Development in Nigeria" in Tsuwa, J.T., Akuul, T., Ashaver, B.T (eds) *Democracy Leadership and Good Governance in the 21st Century; Contending Issues and Options for Nigeria*. Lagos Gamint Corporate Publishers.
- Akinboye, S.O and Basiru, A.S (2014) *Foreign Policy Analysis: Conceptual and Theoretical Logic*. USA: Wits Publishing Limited
- Akpuru-Aja, A (1998) *The US Presidential Personalities and Power of Persuasion in Foreign Policy*. Abakaliki: Willy Rose and Appleseed Company Ltd
- Akpuru-Aja, A (2015) Transformation in Diplomacy on the World Stage: Lessons and Opportunities. in *Millennium Journal of International Affairs and Security Studies*. Vol.1, No.1
- Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Burns, J.M. (1978) *Leadership*. New York. Harper & Row.
- Crab, C. V Jr. (1972). *American Foreign Policy in the Nuclear Age*, 3rd ed., N/Y: Harper and Row
- Didzis, K (2011) The Transformation Diplomacy: Why Do Diplomats Needs to Understand How the Business World Operates. *The Magazine for International Business and Diplomacy* No. 3 March 2011: University of Latvia
- Frankel, J (1975) *The Making of Foreign Policy*. London. Oxford University Press
- Jonathan, G. (2013) *Determination Unshakeable: A Collection of Speeches*. Abuja: Clear Coast Communication Limited.
- Kerry urges peaceful Polls in Nigeria, in *The Nation Newspaper*, Tuesday, January, 27, 2015.
- Maku, L. (2013) "The Transformation Agenda and Facilitative Measures by the Federal Ministry of Information. Kuru - Jos. Being a paper at an Interactive Session with the Participants at the Senior Executive Course.
- NPC (2011) "The Transformation Agenda 2011-2015". <http://www.google.com/searn?>
- Ofeogbu, R (1980) *Foundation Course in International Relations for Universities*. London: G. Allen and Unwin.
- Oladimeji, A.D & Opeyemi, A.I. (2013) A Mid Term Evaluation of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan Transformation Agenda in *Journal of Research and Development* Vol. 1, No.1.

- Pine, A (2015) US Secretary of State, John Kerry's Visit to Nigeria: a post –Colonial Perspective, in *Millennium Journal of International Affairs and Security Studies*. Vol. 2 No. 1
- Punch Mobile (2013): 24% Unemployment Rate Worrisome". Tuesday, 14th May.
- Rice, Condoleezza (2008-02-12). "Remarks on Transformational Diplomacy". United States Department of State. Archived from the original on 2008-02-13. Retrieved 2008-02-13.
- Saliu, H (2013) Foreign Policy, in Saliu, A. H and Aremu, F. A (ed) *Introduction to International Relations*. Ibadan: college Press and Publishers
- The Vienna Convention 1961
- Tsuwa, J. T (2015) Reconstructing Nigerian Belly Politics: A Search for a New Leadership Ideology, in Okpeh, O.O and Yav, B.D (ed) *Leadership and governance in Africa*. Vol. 1. Ibadan: Bahita Publishers.
- Vaïsse, Justin (June 2007). "Remarks on Transformational Diplomacy" (PDF). *Transformational Diplomacy* (Institute for Security Studies). pp. 47–59. Retrieved 2008-05-05

Biographical Note

John Tor TSUWA *PhD.*, is a Lecturer in the Department of Political Science, Benue State University, Makurdi NIGERIA. He is the Chairman of North Central Zone of the Nigerian Political Science Association. Email: johntsuwa@gmail.com