



Christian Chidi Okeke

*Political Science Department, Nnamdi Azikiwe University,
(Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria)*

** Corresponding author: e-mail: co.chidi@unizik.edu.ng
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5361-2436>*

CITIZEN DIPLOMACY AND HUMAN CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA: A CONTEMPORARY DISCOURSE

DYPLOMACJA OBYWATELSKA I ROZWÓJ KAPITAŁU LUDZKIEGO W NIGERII: WSPÓLCZESNY Dyskurs

Abstract

Citizen diplomacy as a key component of diplomacy is fundamental in international relations. Through it, individual citizens help realize their countries' national interests through unofficial interactions. For Nigeria however, the worry is whether citizen diplomacy can effectively complement official diplomatic activities in the face of the low human-capital development of her citizens. United Nations Development Programme in 2019 placed Nigeria's human-development-index value for 2018 at 0.534, positioning the country at 158 out of the 189 countries and territories surveyed. It also classified 51.4 percent of Nigerian population as being multi-dimensionally poor with an additional 16.8 percent categorized as being vulnerable to multidimensional poverty. In view of this challenge therefore, this paper examined the implication of the low human-capital development on foreign relations of Nigeria.

Data was collated from secondary sources while qualitative descriptive technique was used for analysis. The paper found that Nigeria's current human capital development trajectory is incapable of stimulating citizen diplomacy into complementing the country's official diplomatic relations with other states. It also found that this situation accounts for the failure by Nigeria to actualize most of her foreign policy objectives. The paper therefore recommended improved investment in wellbeing of Nigerians for better outing in foreign relations.

Keywords: *citizen diplomacy, human capital development, foreign policy, national interest, global system*

Streszczenie

Dyplomacja obywatelska jako kluczowy komponent dyplomacji ma znaczenie fundamentalne w stosunkach międzynarodowych. Dzięki niej poszczególni obywatele pomagają realizować interesy narodowe swoich krajów poprzez nieoficjalne interakcje. W przypadku Nigerii niepokoi jednak kwestia efektywności uzupełniania przez dyplomację obywatelską czynności dyplomatycznych ze względu na niski poziom rozwoju kapitału ludzkiego jej obywateli. Program Narodów Zjednoczonych ds. Rozwoju w roku 2019 uplasował wartość wskaźnika rozwoju społecznego Nigerii na rok 2018 na poziomie 0,534, czyli na 158 miejscu z 189 badanych krajów i terytoriów. Sklasyfikował również 51,4 procent populacji Nigerii jako biednych wielowymiarowo, a dodatkowe 16,8 procent sklasyfikowano jako narażone na wielowymiarowe ubóstwo. W związku z tym w niniejszym dokumencie przeanalizowano wpływ niskiego rozwoju kapitału ludzkiego na stosunki Nigerii z zagranicą. Dane zostały zebrane ze źródeł wtórnych, natomiast w analizie została zastosowana jakościowa technika opisowa. W artykule wskazuje się, że w Nigerii aktualnie trajektorie rozwoju kapitału ludzkiego nie są w stanie stymulować dyplomację obywatelską w zakresie uzupełniania oficjalnych relacji dyplomatycznych z innymi krajami. Zostało odnotowano, że ta sytuacja także jest przyczyną niepowodzenia Nigerii w kontekście aktualizacji celów polityki międzynarodowej Nigerii. W tym artykule zawarte są zalecenia poprawienia inwestycji w dobrostan Nigeryjczyków dla lepszych wyników w relacjach z zagranicą.

Słowa kluczowe: *Dyplomacja obywatelska, rozwój kapitału ludzkiego, polityka zagraniczna, interesy narodowe, system globalny*

Article history: Received: 12.02.2020 / **Accepted:** 14.04.2020 / **Published:** 30.06.2020
JEL Classification: F 63, I 25, P 16

Statement of the problem in general outlook and its connection with important scientific and practical tasks.

Foreign policy objectives of Nigeria have, over time, attracted immense scholarly interest. The debate largely centres on their inherent ambiguity and impracticability, gabbled in clumsy and nebulous characterization. The preponderance of attention to the subject matter stems from the problem inherent in defining what actually constitutes Nigeria's national interest.

Instructively, national interest is a key concept in foreign policy and the foundation of any state's foreign policy. It is the main reason or justification for foreign policy (Yakubu, 2011). Yet it is difficult to define the national interest of Nigeria (Nwanolue, 2015). According to him, some foreign policy expectorates believe that Nigeria has no clear-cut political ideology and national interest.

Be that as it may, Nigeria at independence outlined its own foreign policy goals different from the foreign policy of its ex-colonial authority – the Great Britain. In his ministerial statement in the House of Representatives on the conduct of foreign affairs, Sir Alhaji

ISSN 2450-2146 / E-ISSN 2451-1064

© 2020 / Published by: Międzynarodowy Instytut Innowacji Nauka-Edukacja-Rozwój w Warszawie, Polska

 This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Okeke Ch.Ch., (2020) Citizen Diplomacy And Human Capital Development In Nigeria: A Contemporary Discourse

International Journal of New Economics and Social Sciences, 1 (11) 2020: 297 - 314

[DOI 10.5604/01.3001.0014.3549](https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0014.3549)

Tafawa Balewa declared that in formulating its policy for the conduct of foreign affairs, the Federal Government recognized that its primary duty is to safeguard and promote the interest of the Federation and its citizens (Omenma, 2015). It is the view of Omenma (2015) that foreign policy stance of Nigeria has never shifted significantly from its original form, even though the regime of General Muhammadu Buhari (December 31, 1983 to August 27, 1985), in proclaiming the specific objectives of the Nigeria's foreign policy, included the promotion of the economic and social wellbeing of Nigerian citizens.

Generally speaking and in contemporary world today, citizen diplomacy is being adopted, nurtured and strengthened as a powerful technique in driving foreign policy of states. Greater impetus and recognition is being given to the fact that individual citizens have responsibility to help shape their countries' foreign relations.

Clearly, citizen diplomacy as a concept affirms that the individual has the right and responsibility to help shape his nation's foreign policy relations towards sound economy, decent polity, sound social structure, wealth creation and cultural values (Nye, 2010). However, the thorny issue in the case of Nigeria is how to build and transform citizen diplomacy into a tool for effective drive of foreign policy in the face of the obvious deprivations and underdevelopment of greater number of Nigerian population.

The challenge is glaring as productive steps were not taken by national policy makers to juxtapose the country's foreign policy with improved living condition of the long-deprived Nigerian populace. As a result, majority of Nigerians are today being battered by extreme poverty.

According to NBS (2010), poverty incidence in Nigeria rose from 27.2 percent in 1980 with an estimated population of 65 million, representing 17.1 million as population in poverty, to poverty incidence of 69.0 with estimated population of 163 million representing 112.47 million as population in poverty in 2010. On the other hand, the proportion of extremely poor jumped from 6.2 percent to 38.7 percent within the same period. IndexMundi (2018) even puts the population below poverty line in Nigeria from 2010 to 2019 at 70 percent.

WB (2018) reveals that despite its middle-income status, almost four out of ten Nigerians lived below the national poverty line in 2016. As it observes, Nigeria is home to the largest number of extremely poor people, overtaking India in 2018, measured at international poverty line of US\$1.90 per day.

The projection by World Bank (2019) is even more alarming to the effect that the share of Nigeria's population living in extreme poverty will have risen from 42.8 percent (in 2016) to 45.0 percent by 2030, representing about 120 million people living on less than US\$1.90 a day. This is the sad poverty condition in Nigeria that perfectly punched citizen diplomacy into a pathetic corner.

In view of the reality therefore, this paper undertakes an assessment of human capital development in Nigeria via a vis her practice of foreign relations. It specifically attempts to unravel how the low human-capital development robs the country of contributions by her citizens towards the actualization of her national interest within the global system. But it serves at this juncture to establish the theoretical framework of this paper.

Aims of paper. Methods

Theoretical Framework

This paper is based on the Social Constructivist Theory. According to Weber (2005), the theory posits that what states do depends on what their identities and interests are. The Social constructivism is a theory in International Relations that is based on how actors define their national interests, threats to those interests and their relationship to one another (Ujara and Ibieta, 2014). Thus, the theory posits that states decide on what they want and need, not only based on material needs but social interaction.

That is why Goldstein and Pevehouse (2011) aver that Constructivism recognizes that power is not absent from the international system but it focuses more on social interactions based on perception. They note that the Constructivist theory examines how state interests and identities are intertwined and how those identities are shaped by their interaction with other states.

According to Jackson and Sorensen (2006), the focus of Constructivism is on human awareness or consciousness in its place on world affairs. They hinted that Alexander Wendt in 1992 published an article in a journal of International Relations titled, Anarchy is what states make of it: the Social Constructivist of Power Politics and tried to establish that change becomes possible in a big way because people and states can start thinking about each other in new ways and thus create new norms that may be radically different from old ones. T

hus, according to Slaughter (2011), the perception of friends and enemies, in-groups and out-groups, fairness and justice all become key determinants of a state's behaviour. It is their contention that while some Constructivists would accept that states are self-interested and rational actors, they would stress that varying identities and beliefs underlie the notions of rationality under which states pursue simply survival, power or wealth.

Wendt (1995 in Weber, 2005), nonetheless, outlines the fundamental principles of the theory to include:

- People act toward objects, including other actors, on the basis of the meanings that the objects have for them: social knowledge,
- The meanings in terms of which action is organized arise out of interaction: social practice,
- Identities (and interests) are produced in and through 'situated activity': social identities and interests.

The implication of the theory for this paper which seeks to evaluate the implications of low human capital development in Nigeria on citizen diplomacy is not far-fetched. As the theory postulates, when a state succeeds in constructing a perception of itself for another state, that ultimately changes their nature of relations in the global system. The import is that the ability of Nigeria to create a positive perception of itself to the rest of the state actors in the context of social relations, for instance, will automatically bring about a corresponding change or adjustment in the way the rest of the other states relate with Nigeria.

By extension, since Nigeria relates with the rest of the world through her foreign policy, if the policy is rightly crafted and implemented, it will then bring about success in terms of goals of the foreign policy. By implication, as a key component of diplomacy, if citizen diplomacy is made to work in Nigeria through progressive improvements in the living

condition of the citizens who are the greatest asset of the country, the average Nigerians will turn out to become best ambassadors the country can have as they develop a responsibility towards improving Nigeria's relations with other states.

Definitely, citizen diplomacy appeals as crucial in achieving foreign policy goals of states including Nigeria. But for it to succeed is subject to what the country eventually makes of it. This means that greater impetus must be given to human capital development in the country for it to help Nigeria's foreign policy pursuits.

Having established the theoretical framework of this paper, the next task is to examine the various conceptualizations of the concepts of the research. We begin with citizen diplomacy.

Analysis of latest research where the solution of the problem was initiated. Conceptualizations of Citizen Diplomacy

Today, people-to-people contact is becoming one of the key elements of diplomacy and citizen diplomats increasingly complement the traditional forms of political diplomacy. The import is that international relations had gone beyond legislative officialdom into the hand of the common citizens who have the time and opportunities to interact with other countries' citizens in a more decent and interconnected frequencies (Okechukwu and Offu, 2015).

Though citizen diplomacy has varied interpretations among scholars, it centrally implies the transnational flow of information and ideas through the interaction of private groups and interests of different countries which influence the formation and execution of foreign policies in the pursuit of national interests (Montville, 1987).

PAC (2005), Ojo (2008), Eke (2009) and Eze (2009) affirm that the various interpretations and definitions of citizen diplomacy bring out two critical elements: the participation of the citizens in the foreign policy process and protection of the citizens by the state. These two elements of participation and protection are very instrumental in the foreign policy of any country towards realizing the stated national interests (Aja, 2009).

According to Nye (2010), citizen diplomacy is a concept that affirms that the individual has the right, even the responsibility to help shape his nation's foreign policy relations toward sound economy, decent polity, sound social structure, wealth creations and cultural values.

It is also a political concept of average citizens engaging as a representative of a country or cause, either inadvertently or by design (Okechukwu and Offu, 2015).

To Odoh and Nwogbaga (2014), citizen diplomacy implies that individual citizens are not just the centre-piece of state policies but also have the rights and even the responsibility to help realize the country's national interests through their interactions to complement official diplomatic activities.

The perspectives offered by the scholars, no doubt, place emphasis on some facts. Chiefly, they draw attention to the reality that private individuals through their activities engage in unofficial diplomacy which serves certain purposes, one of which is complementing the state's official diplomacy. The other is that citizen diplomacy can, as well, undermine it. This is the fact that Williams et al (2008) referred to when they admitted that citizen diplomacy can complement official diplomacy or subvert it.

However, before diverting fully to the purposes served by citizen diplomacy, it is absolutely imperative to take more explanatory incursion into other perspectives so as to better appreciate what the concept entails.

Accordingly, Malek (2013) holds the view that citizen diplomacy refers to unofficial contacts between people of different nations, as opposed to official contacts between government representatives, which may include direct contacts in joint activities of various sorts or in situation mediated or facilitated by unofficial third parties, private peace-makers, scholars or any other unofficial bridge-builder. By his clarification, he expressly aligns with the notion that citizen diplomacy can serve as a tool to break existing negative stereotypes between people or states.

In fact, some scholars like Clinton (2003) and Nye (2010) view citizen diplomacy as rights and obligations of citizens. For instance, Clinton (2003) sees it as a concept that informs that every global citizen has the rights, even the responsibility to engage across cultures and create understanding through meaningful person-to-person interactions.

Obviously, when the view as expressed by Clinton (2003) is critically evaluated, one finds that globalization has become an enabler for citizen diplomacy.

This is more so as Khor (2000) describes the globalization phenomenon as the defining process of the present age. Clearly, it is a process of intensification of economies, political, social and cultural relations across international boundaries (Audu, 2010); a multidimensional concept that connotes the deepening of social, economic and cultural interactions among countries of the world through the conquering of the barriers of time and space (Muhammad, 2013); a positive phenomenon which ensures greater movement of people, goods, technology and idea, with the potency to accelerate sustainable development across the globe (Ezeibe, 2015) and a concept that is seen essentially as shrinking of borders, dismantling of territorial boundaries and removal of all barriers on investment and investment capital for easy flow of goods and services across nations (Okeke, 2018). Be that as it may and in order to simplify the understanding of the concept, Goodman (2011) informs that citizen diplomacy involves two seemingly disparate ideas: private citizens engaging in individual endeavors that serve their interest, and diplomacy which includes a framework for cooperation between countries. Definitely, citizen diplomacy is the civic engagement of the citizen diplomats that leads to cooperation and mutual understanding (Gelder, 2006).

From the foregoing, it is essential to align with Zimpleman (2014) in his postulation that the working of citizen diplomacy, aptly leveraging on globalization, has made the world a smaller place since it has been recognized as a powerful force in building and sustaining a secure, economically-sound and socially-interconnected world with a uniting network. It also suffices to align with Okechukwu and Offu (2015) to the effect that citizen diplomacy has been positioned as a more unique and sophisticated tool in both individual and international dealings. To us, citizen diplomacy is indeed a potent tool for peaceful conduct of relations within the global system.

But it suffices to extensively examine the roles served by citizen diplomacy in the contemporary time.

Exposition of main material of research with complete substantiation of obtained scientific results. Discussion

Application of Citizen Diplomacy in Contemporary International Relations

Citizen diplomacy, which is one among the several types of diplomacy, stands out as people-based and oriented. In the contemporary era, its value, apart from the consistent and continuous utilization, suggest a dynamic import of the changing world (Okechukwu and Offu, 2015).

The appeal which citizen diplomacy has gained, particularly among developed economies, justifies its relevance in contemporary relations at international level. Certainly, states that place high premium on it have, by all indications, come to recognize citizen diplomacy as a dynamic force in not only evolving but sustaining a healthy and interconnected world that thrives on sound economy and social indices.

Arguably, citizen diplomacy is very interesting and vibrant in the contemporary era as it seems to contain several arrays of actions and activities existing between individuals, communities and people with deepened ties of relationship that holistically makes the world a common village; door-to-door neighbourhood interactions; a person-to-person familiarization; and a nation-citizen to a nation-citizen interaction (Okechukwu and Offu, 2015). Of course as they rightly put it, citizen diplomacy is an act that does not only enhance wellbeing, but boosts and projects foreign policy of participating states to mutual understanding of the core values of their existence.

In fact, to underscore the relevance of citizen diplomacy, Washington (2014) maintains that it explains the future of global prosperity, peace and stability which depends also on the increased international cooperation, collaboration and mutual understanding. What this simply means is that citizen diplomacy, as an initiative, enables a cross-fertilization of idea which when used in a positive sense can advance mutual understanding and broaden the knowledge on a wide-range of issues with an ultimate objective which hinged on transformation of the state.

As a tool, it brings interesting issues direct to the target.

Hinting on the importance of citizen diplomacy, Okechukwu and Offu (2014: 326) say: From the look of things, one fact remains very clear and is that citizen diplomacy is well-nurtured and profoundly established in the developed world like America, Britain, France, Germany, Portugal, Sweden, Denmark and Spain among others. This is simply because it engendered development, sustained development and advanced technology of these states unlike in the developing countries like Nigeria, Ghana, South Africa, Egypt, Angola and Congo DR among others where the level of interaction is moribund by several hiccups and terribly sterilized by the havoc of poverty and poor leadership problems.

They further contend that: Agreeing that citizen diplomacy is the right if not the obligation of the individual citizen to be personally engaged in international relations in the contemporary era shows that persons or groups engaging with people from other countries is an important boost to the host economy with adequate security guarantee.

In countries where such is practised, you notice that the essence is not only to exchange ideas, make friends and gain an understanding of each other's culture and way of life, but it makes all the parties believe in the power of citizen diplomacy and involvement in the state governance through international exchanges (Okechukwu and Offu, 2014: 327)

In view of the obvious importance of citizen diplomacy, a salient discourse should prop up on how the concept has fared within the foreign policy environment of Nigeria. Before then, it suffices to put citizen diplomacy in historical perspective.

Citizen Diplomacy: A Historical Perspective

The concept of citizen diplomacy originated from the United States of America. It was first coined by David Hoffman in 1981 through an article on Dr Robert W. Fuller's work (Odoh and Nwogbaga, 2014, quoting Wikipedia, 2011)

According to them, Dr Fuller was an American Physicist who traveled frequently to the Soviet Union in the 1970s and 1980s in effort to alleviate the cold war between the US-led capitalist West and the Russia-led socialist East. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, Dr Fuller continued the tension-dissipating visits to the political hotspots around the world and developed the idea of reducing "rankism" to promote peace.

As Odoh and Nwogbaga (2014) puts it, in the course of developing the concept, different scholars described citizen diplomacy with various terms: Gullion (1965) earlier called it public diplomacy in 1965 at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University when he explained it as involving the transnational flow of information and ideas through the interaction of private groups and interests of different countries. Montville (1987) addressed citizen diplomacy as "Track Two Diplomacy" when he distinguished it from traditional (Track One) diplomacy as unofficial informal interactions among the citizens of countries. Also, John McDonald and Louise Diamond referred to citizen diplomacy as "Multi-tract Diplomacy" and suggested that there are many ways to bring people together in addition to official negotiations (Montville, 1987).

The question then is, how has citizen diplomacy fared in Nigeria?

Citizen Diplomacy in Nigeria's Foreign Policy Environment

Citizen diplomacy is current and not yet fully imbibed or appropriated by most Nigerians both inside and outside our shores, not to talk of other African states where things are still in crude stage (Okechukwu and Offu, 2014). According to them, the situation is simply because the level of poverty is not only very high, the level of the quest for primitive accumulation has outgrown desires, and bad and aspiring leaders who see the state treasury as opportunity to cut and carry home are still much, with many Nigerians who also see the Nigerian project with misgivings.

It is of course important to take note of their suggestion that if citizen diplomacy is properly and thoroughly scrutinized and generally accepted as a way forward in re-writing the name of the country with golden pen, then citizen diplomacy will enthrone the much-desired light of development in the country. Sadly, however, they said:

These defects, deficiencies and decimations were mostly found in the developing states of Africa like Nigeria during the long years of military aberrational rule and at the onset of democratic governance under General Olusegun Obasanjo, the self-made life president of Zimbabwe - Robert Mugabe, Dennis Sasso Ngueso of Congo Republic, Paul Biya of Cameroon, Yoweri Museveni of Uganda and many other deadwoods on the throne of several African states governance replicating the opposites to establishing a platform where everything about citizenship diplomacy and contemporary interrelations are not only killed but daily monitored and restricted, thereby making the development of such under a social civility context impossible, because they cannot give what they have denied

themselves to the citizens who were increasingly aware as the days go by (Okechukwu and Offu, 2015: 326)

For Nigeria, citizen diplomacy gained preeminence within foreign policy environment during the Umaru Musa Yar'Adua's administration (May 29, 2007 to May 5, 2010). Maduekwe (2008) hinted during the period that Nigeria's foreign policy would be more citizen-centred than ever before. By implication, the Nigeria's citizen would be the subject and object of Nigerian foreign policy. Thus, Nigeria and Nigerians would be at the core of the country's foreign policy exertions (Yakubu, 2011).

However, as Yakubu (2011) puts it, what the then Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ojo Maduekwe said was the need for diplomacy of consequence which in ordinary diplomatic parlance was called reciprocity. The minister said citizen diplomacy during the era required Nigerians to seek to do or say what will best serve and advance the interests of Nigerians at any place and at any time.

Thus, he maintained that: Citizen diplomacy focused on maximizing the economic, political and social welfare of the citizen through astute diplomacy. It is concerned with how to enhance the image and self-worth of the Nigerian people. Citizen diplomacy proceeds from the basic assumption that the foreign policy must be the external projection of Government's efforts at promoting the welfare of the citizen. It was, thus, an extension of traditional diplomacy in seeking to advance and protect the national interests of the Nigerian people (Maduekwe, 2008: 5)

In his reaction to the citizen diplomacy popularized at the time, Yakubu (2011) argues that Maduekwe (2008) was aware that it was not a new foreign policy but same foreign policy repackaged to meet the challenges of domestic policy and the rapidly changing world order. To him, it was a rebranding of Nigeria's traditional foreign policy with a sharper focus on the Nigerian citizen since the basic needs of the citizens would henceforth be the rationale and the justification for every foreign policy decision.

Nonetheless, the basic tenets or elements of the citizen diplomacy were:

1. Nigeria and Nigerians to be at the centre of the nation's foreign policy
2. Nigeria's foreign policy must meet its development aspirations and objectives in a manner that impacts more directly on the lives of the citizenry. Indeed, Nigeria's foreign policy must reinforce and contribute significantly to the realization of the Seven-Point Agenda of the present administration
3. Nigeria's foreign policy must seek a synergy with domestic policy to ensure that the former benefits ordinary Nigerians. Indeed, the boundary between domestic policy and foreign policy has collapsed into national security for the collective wellbeing of Nigerians
4. In line with the servant-leadership of Mr. President, Nigerian Missions abroad must actively engage the Nigerian community and the Nigerian diaspora and render quality consular and other services as a matter of right, duties and obligations
5. Foreign policy making and implementation must be democratized to involve Nigerians from all walks of life and not left for a small cycle of experts and practitioners alone
6. Every foreign policy endeavour must meet the litmus test of determining the extent to which it protects and advances what will best benefit the Nigerian people

7. Nigeria to be guided by the principle of reciprocity in pursuit of “diplomacy of consequence” in all interactions with the rest of the world
8. Nigeria and Nigerians will not accept being criminalized by the international community simply on the basis of the despicable conduct of a few of their nationals. Due recognition must be given to the remarkable feats and tremendous contributions of Nigeria and Nigerians to world civilization, socio-economic and scientific development as well as international peace and security (Yakubu, 2011: 233-234)

Be that as it may, Alalade (2009) hints that the concept of citizen diplomacy was explored as a policy pronouncement of the Yar’adua administration yet the operational modalities of the policy were not fully articulated and fashioned out till his death in May 2010. In line with the assertion, Omenma (2015) argues that even though the citizen diplomacy as adopted by the administration of President Musa Yar’Adua focused attention on the Nigerian citizens at home and in the diaspora and an opposite of the country’s traditional approach to foreign relations, yet it qualified for mere policy simulation. He maintains that the citizen diplomacy adopted a cosmetic approach and was a mere policy deception and nothing more.

Obviously, the citizen diplomacy of the regime did not achieve development of Nigerians after all. It equally had nothing tangible to justify the noise made about it in terms of deliverables.

Generally speaking and as Odoh and Nwogbaga (2014) rightly put it, the theory and practice of citizen diplomacy in Nigeria’s foreign policy process seem to have been more of rhetoric than reality. This, according to them, is because the formulation, implementation and evaluation of the country’s foreign policy rested more with the elites largely at the expense of the ordinary Nigerians.

In fact, they argue that realizing the emphasis on participation, welfare and security of the people as the central concern of citizen diplomacy in the foreign policy process largely depends on the disposition of the Nigerian government in the reorientation and mobilization of the general public. That explains their argument that the actual application of citizen diplomacy in Nigeria’s foreign policy requires a more inclusive participatory approach in which the opinions of the people count while deciding matters that affect them. But a critical question remains: why is citizen diplomacy not yet fully appropriated by most Nigerians? Also, what link does citizen diplomacy have with human-capital development? Before finding an answer to the posers, it is, however, important to take an incursion into the concept of human capital with a view to having an understating of what it represents.

Understanding Human Capital

Traditionally, economists have identified three factors of production as land, labour and physical capital. But from early 1960s, attention began to shift towards quality of labour. The focus at that time began with the level of education and training in the workforce. It was through that effort that human capital came to be associated with skills as well as other attributes (innate capabilities inclusive) which confer personal, economic and social benefits to individuals. In fact, physical, emotional and mental health of individuals became aspects of human capital.

It is in that direction that OECD (2001) gives the definition of human capital as the knowledge, skills, competencies and attributes embodied in individuals that facilitate the

creation of personal, social and economic well-being. It reveals that human capital is multifaceted in its nature and grows through use and experience, such as it depreciates through lack of use. It is equally in that light that it has often been argued that human capital is not homogenous and static, and that it is not skills and competence that is acquired once and for all by individuals. Rather, there is a geometrical growth with course of time associated with human capital.

Human capital, according to OECD (2001), is developed in the contexts of learning within family and early childcare settings, formal education and training (including early childhood, school-based compulsory education, post-compulsory vocational or general education, tertiary education, public labour market training, adult education, etc), workplace training and informal learning. The import therefore is that human capital formation does not take place only in formal education and training programmes but also through informal-driven self reflection and self-directed modes.

Okereke and Ekpe (2002) believe that human being is the epitome of development. That is to say that human development is the most important factor for real development. And they listed human development to include impact in the areas of mental balance, academic sophistication, moral rectitude and material well-being. To them, the acquisition of those essentials will and must move an underdeveloped society to genuine development.

Agreeing with the proposition put forward by Okereke and Ekpe (2002), Udenigwe (2010) maintains that the first step in the development process is a total overhaul of the overall improvement of mankind who is seen as the voyage of transformation and change before the actual complexities of development. He says: This belief that mankind is the harbinger or agent of development sparked-off another lacuna which is, "how can this mankind be developed in order to define society's development aptitude?" The Marxists see it as: free, compulsory and universal education; improvement of the general education, cultural and technical training of the working populace; raising the peoples standard of living to a qualitative and new height; improvement of peoples health and extending their active life through a system of universal health checks in the polyclinic, hospitals and sanatoriums, and ensuring that the levels and structures of consumptions of materials, social and spiritual goods and services are raised (Udenigwe, 2010: 18)

In his conclusion, Udenigwe (2010) avers that the Marxists strongly believe that if those conditions as mentioned above are met, the objectives of molding a well-grounded individual abilities and endowments for the advantages of the whole society at large must be achieved. Achieving this, no doubt, results in well-being of citizens.

Well-being is an abstract concept that refers to the state of a person's life (Clark and McGillivray 2007). It is peoples' positive evaluations of their lives include positive emotion, engagement, satisfaction, and meaning (Diener and Seligman, 2004). To them, it incorporates several separable concepts.

The observation is why Summers et al (2012) posit that well-being is a positive physical, social, and mental state, and not just the absence of pain, discomfort, and incapacity. According to them, it requires that basic needs are met, that individuals have a sense of purpose, and that they feel able to achieve important personal goals and participate in society. In fact, they contend that it is enhanced by conditions that include supportive personal relationships, strong and inclusive communities, good health, financial and personal security, rewarding employment, and a healthy attractive environment. In addition,

they maintain that human well-being is composed of four primary components—basic human needs, economic needs, environmental needs, and subjective happiness.

No doubt, achieving citizens' wellbeing is paramount and should be a priority in every state. But we are challenged to interrogate the nexus between citizen diplomacy and human capital development in Nigeria.

Human Capital Development and Citizen Diplomacy in Nigeria

It is a universally-accepted fact that for any foreign policy to succeed, the charity of that foreign policy must start from home.

This fact is what Omenma (2015) tries to affirm when he asserts, inter alia, that the roadmap to a vibrant and consistent foreign policy in Nigeria is selfless and foresighted leadership that would have the interest of the country uppermost at heart while engaging in foreign relations by ensuring that Nigerian resources hitherto wasted on pleasing other countries at the expense of the long-suffering and starving Nigerians are utilized in reviving the local industries and alleviating the poverty of the Nigerian citizens.

As he puts it, this is because success at home invariably enhances a state's prestige and respect abroad.

Showing clear understanding of the importance of human capital development in the success of foreign policy, Ahonsi (2007) avers that for Nigeria's foreign policy to be stable and consistent, concrete steps need to be taken in order to make it a veritable tool for delivering rapid economic growth that would improve the lives and living conditions of Nigeria's long-suffering and desperate masses. This is more so as Omenma (2015) observes that that as post-colonial state, the Nigerian state lacks the economic fibre to firmly pursue and sustain its declared foreign policy goals. In fact, it is his contention that Nigeria's foreign policy since independence has been characterized by flowery language, flamboyance and much inaction largely attributable to the dependent nature of the Nigerian economy which undoubtedly limits its potential to play a dominant and influential role in international politics.

From the foregoing, it is glaring that the issue of human capital development in Nigeria calls for concern. Today, over 93 million Nigerians who constitute citizen diplomats live in extreme poverty.

According to UNDP (2019), Nigeria's human development index value for 2018 is 0.534 which puts the country in the low human development category, positioning it at 158 out of 189 countries and territories surveyed. This is despite the fact that between 2005 and 2018, Nigeria's human development index value increased from 0.467 to 0.534, representing an increase of 14.4 percent. However, although the 0.534 was above the average of 0.507 set for countries in the low human development group, it was below the average of 0.541 for countries in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Table 1 shows Nigeria's progress in each of the human development index indicators.

Table 1. Nigeria’s HDI Trends Based on Consistent Time Series Data and New Goalposts.

YEAR	LIFE EXPECTANCY AT BIRTH	EXPECTED YEARS OF SCHOOLING	MEAN YEARS OF SCHOOLING	GNI PER CAPITA (2011 PPP\$)	HDI VALUE
1990	45.9	6.7		3,221	
1995	45.9	7.2		2,872	
2000	46.3	8.0		2,828	
2005	48.3	9.0	5.2	3,819	0.467
2010	50.9	8.4	5.2	4,793	0.484
2015	53.1	9.7	6.2	5,540	0.527
2016	53.5	9.5	6.3	5,336	0.528
2017	54.0	9.7	6.5	5,203	0.533
2018	54.3	9.7	6.5	5,086	0.534

Source: UNDP Human Development Report Nigeria 2019

The table shows that between 1990 and 2018, Nigeria’s life expectancy at birth increased by 8.4 years, mean years of schooling increased by 1.2 years and expected years of schooling increased by 3.0 years. Similarly, Nigeria’s GNI per capita increased by about 57.9 percent between 1990 and 2018.

In Nigeria, 51.4 percent of the population (98, 175 thousand people) are multi-dimensionally poor while an additional 16.8 percent are classified as vulnerable to multidimensional poverty (32, 091 thousand people) (UNDP, 2019). Table 2 shows the percentage of Nigeria’s population that lives in severe multidimensional poverty.

Table 2. The Most Recent MPI for Nigeria Relative to Selected Countries

Country	Survey year	MPI value	Headcount (%)	Intensity of deprivations (%)	Population share (%)			Contribution to overall povert of deprivations in (%)		
					Vulnerable to multidimensional poverty	In severe multidimensional poverty	Below income poverty line	Health	Education	Standar of livin,
Nigeria	2016/2017	0.291	51.4	56.6	16.8	32.3	53.5	27.0	32.2	40.8

Source: UNDP Human Development Report Nigeria 2019. Minor adjustment made by the researcher to exclude data on DRC and Ethiopia.

The table shows that the breadth of deprivation (intensity) in Nigeria, which is the average deprivation score experienced by people in multi-dimensional poverty, is 56.6 percent.

ISSN 2450-2146 / E-ISSN 2451-1064

© 2020 /Published by: Międzynarodowy Instytut Innowacji Nauka-Edukacja-Rozwój w Warszawie, Polska

 This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Okeke Ch.Ch., (2020) Citizen Diplomacy And Human Capital Development In Nigeria: A Contemporary Discourse

International Journal of New Economics and Social Sciences, 1 (11) 2020: 297 - 314

[DOI 10.5604/01.3001.0014.3549](https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0014.3549)

The multi-dimensional poverty index, which is the share of the population that is multi-dimensionally poor, adjusted by the intensity of the deprivations, is 0.291.

To further underscore the problem of low human capital development in Nigeria, WB (2018) notes that despite its middle-income status, almost four out of ten Nigerians lived below the national poverty line in 2016. As it observes, Nigeria is home to the largest number of extremely poor people, overtaking India in 2018, measured at international poverty line of US\$1.90 per day.

Clearly, the poverty-problem in Nigeria is so dire that the WB (2019) laments that large number of Nigerians are vulnerable to falling into poverty. Also sad is its observation that the rapid growth in gross domestic product (GDP) until the recent recession did not translate into sufficient poverty reduction. Table 3 shows the relative poverty headcount from 1980 to 2010 in Nigeria.

Table 3. Relative Poverty Headcount from 1980-2010.

YEAR	POVERTY INCIDENCE %	ESTIMATED POPULATION (MILLION)	POPULATION IN POVERTY (MILLION)
1980	27.2	65	17.1
1985	46.3	75	34.7
1992	42.7	91.5	39.2
1996	65.6	102.3	67.1
2004	54.4	126.3	68.7
2010	69.0	163	112.47

Source: National Bureau of Statistics. HNLSS 2010

According to the table, the proportion of the population living below the poverty line in Nigeria increased significantly from 1980 to 2004. It shows that the poverty incidence in Nigeria rose from 27.2 percent in 1980 with an estimated population of 65 million, representing 17.1 million as population in poverty to poverty incidence of 69.0 with estimated population of 163 million representing 112.47 million as population in poverty in 2010.

A major dimension to the poverty crisis in Nigeria is that the impact of the scourge varies by region, sector and gender. As revealed by NBS (2010), poverty impacted more on Nigerian youths, children and mothers than the male adult population. Table 4 shows the poverty numbers for absolute, relative, dollar/day and food poverty in Nigeria.

Table 4. 2010 Poverty Numbers for Absolute, Relative, Dollar/day and Food Poverty.

		Food Poverty		Absolute Poverty		Moderately poor based on 2/3 of the weighted mean household per capita expenditure regionally deflated (Relative poverty)		Dollar per day based on adjusted PPP	
		Food Poor	Non Poor	Poor	Non Poor	Poor	Non Poor	Poor	Non Poor
Sector	Urban	26.7	73.3	52.0	48.0	61.8	38.2	52.4	47.6
	Rural	48.3	51.7	66.1	33.9	73.2	26.8	66.3	33.7
	National	41.0	59.0	60.9	39.1	69.0	31.0	61.2	38.8
Zone	North Central	38.6	61.4	59.5	40.5	67.5	32.5	59.7	40.3
	North East	51.5	48.5	69.0	31.0	76.3	23.7	69.1	30.9
	North West	51.8	48.2	70.0	30.0	77.7	22.3	70.4	29.6
	South East	41.0	59.0	58.7	41.3	67.0	33.0	59.2	40.8
	South South	35.5	64.5	55.9	44.1	63.8	36.2	56.1	43.9
	South West	25.4	74.6	49.8	50.2	59.1	40.9	50.1	49.9
	Abia	30.5	69.5	57.4	42.6	63.4	36.6	57.8	42.2
State	Adamawa	55.4	44.6	74.2	25.8	80.7	19.3	74.3	25.7
	Akwa ibom	35.6	64.4	53.7	46.3	62.8	37.2	53.8	46.2
	Anambra	34.2	65.8	56.8	43.2	68.0	32.0	57.4	42.6
	Bauchi	54.1	45.9	73.0	27.0	83.7	16.3	73.1	26.9
	Bayelsa	23.3	76.7	47.0	53.0	57.9	42.1	47.0	53.0
	Benue	48.5	51.5	67.1	32.9	74.1	25.9	67.2	32.8
	Borno	33.2	66.8	55.1	44.9	61.1	38.9	55.1	44.9
	Cross-Rivers	46.4	53.6	52.9	47.1	59.7	40.3	52.9	47.1
	Delta	42.8	57.2	63.3	36.7	70.1	29.9	63.6	36.4
	Ebonyi	63.5	36.5	73.6	26.4	80.4	19.6	73.6	26.4
	Edo	39.4	60.6	65.6	34.4	72.5	27.5	66.0	34.0
	Ekiti	35.8	64.2	52.4	47.6	59.1	40.9	52.6	47.4
	Enugu	52.7	47.3	62.5	37.5	72.1	27.9	63.4	36.6
	Gombe	71.5	28.5	74.2	25.8	79.8	20.2	74.2	25.8
	Imo	33.3	66.7	50.5	49.5	57.3	42.7	50.7	49.3
	Jigawa	71.1	28.9	74.1	25.9	79.0	21.0	74.2	25.8
	Kaduna	41.7	58.3	61.5	38.5	73.0	27.0	61.8	38.2
	Kano	48.3	51.7	65.6	34.4	72.3	27.7	66.0	34.0
	Katsina	56.2	43.8	74.5	25.5	82.0	18.0	74.8	25.2
	Kebbi	47.0	53.0	72.0	28.0	80.5	19.5	72.5	27.5
	Kogi	50.1	49.9	67.1	32.9	73.5	26.5	67.3	32.7
	Kwara	38.1	61.9	61.8	38.2	74.3	25.7	62.0	38.0
	Lagos	14.6	85.4	48.6	51.4	59.2	40.8	49.3	50.7
	Nassarawa	26.8	73.2	60.4	39.6	71.7	28.3	60.4	39.6
	Niger	20.4	79.6	33.8	66.2	43.6	56.4	33.9	66.1
	Ogun	41.8	58.2	62.3	37.7	69.0	31.0	62.5	37.5
	Ondo	36.1	63.9	45.7	54.3	57.0	43.0	46.1	53.9
	Osun	19.5	80.5	37.9	62.1	47.5	52.5	38.1	61.9
	Oyo	24.6	75.4	51.8	48.2	60.7	39.3	51.8	48.2
	Plateau	44.0	56.0	74.1	25.9	79.7	20.3	74.7	25.3
	Rivers	26.3	73.7	50.4	49.6	58.6	41.4	50.6	49.4
	Sokoto	56.6	43.4	81.2	18.8	86.4	13.6	81.9	18.1
	Taraba	45.2	54.8	68.9	31.1	76.3	23.7	68.9	31.1
Yobe	58.5	41.5	73.8	26.2	79.6	20.4	74.1	25.9	
Zamfara	44.4	55.6	70.8	29.2	80.2	19.8	71.3	28.7	
FCT	32.5	67.5	55.6	44.4	59.9	40.1	55.6	44.4	

Source: NBS 2010

According to the table, the North-West and North-East geo-political zones recorded the highest poverty rate in the country with 77.7% and 76.3% respectively in 2010, while the South-West geo-political zone recorded the lowest at 59.1%. Sokoto State came top among the states with poverty rate at 86.4% while Niger had the lowest poverty rate at 43.6%.

The dangerous implication of the poverty condition for citizen diplomacy in Nigeria is what Omenma (2015) alluded to when he expressly pointed out that a hungry man does not philosophize. What it means therefore is that pursuing foreign policy objectives through citizen diplomacy requires a deliberate refocusing on human capital development.

Conclusions

Nigeria as a sovereign state within the international system has crafted for herself foreign policy objectives which could enable her to actualize the country's national interest. However, for the foreign policy goals to be achieved, certain instruments need to be brought to the front-burner. This includes citizen diplomacy.

Obviously, individual citizens of Nigeria have responsibility to help shape the country's foreign relations. Nigeria can, no doubt, tap from the unofficial contacts between Nigerians and other people of different countries to achieve her national interest.

The challenge, however, lies in the fact that majority of the people are ill-inspired as they live in extreme poverty. Nigeria, today, is home to most extreme poor people in the world. And this condition is antithetical to mobilization of citizens for productive foreign relations. This requires an urgent intervention of government.

First and foremost, resources must be channeled towards poverty alleviation and revitalization of industries for huge employment generation. There is no gainsaying the fact that Nigerian masses need to be pulled out of their current poor quality of life. In fact, this needs to be pursued ahead of other national priorities. Otherwise realization of the country's foreign policy will continue to fail in the face of the insignificant contribution by citizen diplomacy.

References:

1. Ahonsi B., (2007). "Foreign policy as a development strategy" in The Guardian. 10 December
2. Aja F., (2009). *National interest, international law and our shared destiny*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd
3. Alalade O., (2009). "How serious is Nigeria about its foreign and security policy?" in The News, May 18
4. Audu J., (2010). "The interface among globalization, democracy, governance and leadership in Africa: the Nigerian experience under President Olusegun Obasanjo (1999-2007)" in Nigerian Journal of Political Science Vol 14 Nos 1 & 2
5. Clark D., McGillivray M., (2007). "Measuring human well-being: key findings and policy lessons" in United Nations University, World Institute for Development Economics Research. Helsinki, Finland
6. Clinton J., (2003). *The Work of the Citizen Diplomacy*. Community Reports, Global Ties, USA

ISSN 2450-2146 / E-ISSN 2451-1064

© 2020 / Published by: Międzynarodowy Instytut Innowacji Nauka-Edukacja-Rozwój w Warszawie, Polska

 This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Okeke Ch.Ch., (2020) Citizen Diplomacy And Human Capital Development In Nigeria: A Contemporary Discourse

International Journal of New Economics and Social Sciences, 1 (11) 2020: 297 - 314

[DOI 10.5604/01.3001.0014.3549](https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0014.3549)

7. Diener E., Seligman M., (2004). "Beyond money: toward an economy of well-being" in Psychological Science in the Public Interest. 5:1–31
8. Eke A., (2009). *Globalization challenges and Nigerian foreign policy*. Abakaliki: WillyRose and AppleSeed Publishing Coy.
9. Eze O., (2009) "Citizen diplomacy: legal perspective, national and international dimension" in Eze, O. Citizen Diplomacy. Lagos: PrintServe Ltd
10. Ezeibe C., (2015). *Abc of political economy: a beginner's guide to understanding the state and economy*. Nsukka: UNN Press Limited
11. Gelder M., (2006). *Meeting the enemy, becoming a friend*. Boulder: Bauw Press
12. Goldstein J., Pevehouse J., (2011). *International relations*. United States: Pearson International Edition
13. Goodman A., (2011). "Roundtable on evaluating and measuring the impact of citizen diplomacy", Institute of International Education, Washington DC
14. Gullion E., (1965). *Track II diplomacy: can unofficial talks avert disaster?* Retrieved on March 2, 2020 at 1:05pm from Carnegie website: http://carnegie.org/carnegie_reporter
15. Jackson R., Sorensen G., (2006). *Introduction to international relations: theories and approaches, 3rd edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
16. Khor M., (2000). *Globalization and the south: some critical issues*. Penang: Third World Network
17. Maduekwe O., (2008). "Citizen diplomacy and Nigeria's national interest". A speech delivered at the eleventh orientation course for volunteers of the technical aid programme for the 2006-2010, May 19-June
18. Malek C., (2013). "Citizen diplomacy" based on long essay on track ii/citizen diplomacy in Diana Chigas, Feb. Burges
19. Montville J., (1987). *Track II diplomacy: can unofficial talks avert disaster?* Retrieved on March 2, 2020 at 2:15pm from Carnegie reporter website: <http://carnegie.org>
20. Muhammad A., (2013). "Globalization" in Hassan, A. and Fatai, A. (ed) *Introduction to International Relations*. Ibadan: College Press and Publishers Limited
21. National Bureau of Statistics (2010) *Nigeria poverty profile*. Abuja: NBS.
22. Nwanolue B., (2015). "State and national interest: the Nigerian question" in Okorie, A (ed) *Contemporary Readings on Nigeria's External Relations: Issues, Perspectives and Challenges*. Abakaliki: WillyRose and Appleseed Publishing Company
23. Nye J., (2010). "The pros and cons of citizen diplomacy" Harvard Kennedy School of Government, October 4 publication
24. Odoh S., Nwogbaga D., (2014) "Reflections on the theory and practice of citizen diplomacy in the conduct of Nigeria's foreign policy" in *Journal of Humanities and Social Science* Vol 19 Issue 10, Ver. viii pp 09-14
25. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2001). *The Well-being of Nations: The Role of Human and Social Capital*
26. Ojo M., (2008) *Reshaping the nation's foreign policy as 50*. The Guardian, April 16, p.15
27. Okechukwu G., Offu P., (2015). "Contents and applications of citizens diplomacy and transformation agenda: a contemporary discourse" in Okorie, A (ed) *Contemporary Readings on Nigeria's External Relations: Issues, Perspectives and Challenges*. Abakaliki: WillyRose and Appleseed Publishing Company
28. Okeke C., (2018). "International relations" in Oddih, et al (ed) *Fundamentals of African government and politics: perspectives, issues and challenges*. Awka: Centre-point Publishers

29. Omenma D., (2015). "Nigerian foreign policy: trends and transformations" in Okorie, A (ed) Contemporary Readings on Nigeria's External Relations: Issues, Perspectives and Challenges. Abakaliki: WillyRose and Applesed Publishing Company
30. Presidential Advisory Council (PAC) (2005). *Foreign policy in Nigeria's democratic transition*. Abuja: PrintServe Ltd
31. Slaughter A., (2011). "International Relations, Principal Theories" Retrieved on April 2, 2020 at 2: 45pm from <http://opil.ouplaw.com/view/10.1093>
32. Summers J., et. al. (2012). "A review of the elements of human well-being with an emphasis on the contribution of ecosystem services" in Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences. Retrieved on April 2, 2020 at 3pm from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3393065/>
33. Ujara E., Ibietan J., (2014). "Citizen diplomacy and Nigeria's international image: the social constructivist explanation" in Covenant Journal of Business and Social Sciences Vol. 6, No.2
34. UNDP (2009). *Human Development Report Nigeria*
35. Washington C., (2014). "Discovering diplomacy" International Visitors Council, Columbus, May/June
36. Weber, C. (2005). *International relations theory: a critical introduction*. New York: Routledge
37. Williams et. al. (2008). *Banning landmines: disarmament, citizen diplomacy and human security (ed)*. UK: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc.
38. World Bank (2018). *Investing in Human Capital for Nigeria's Future*, Page 17
39. World Bank (2019). *Advancing Social Protection in a Dynamic Nigeria*, August.
40. Yakubu Y., (2011). *Nigeria's foreign policy: a basic text*. Zaria: Ahmadu Bello University Press Limited
41. Zimpleman L., (2014). "What is citizen diplomacy?" in Then Principal for Financial Group Centre for Global Citizenship. Drake: Drake University
42. <https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/nigeria/net-official-development-assistance-and-official-aid-received> Retrieved on February 29, 2020 at 9:20pm