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Abstract: Leadership is a very elusive and “general concept and one of the uncertain categories in social science”, and its study include the subjects of “political theory, history, psychology and management studies”. As old as human civilization, leadership contemporarily is identified as Democratic or Destructive leadership, and Democratic leadership is “the performance of three functions: distributing responsibility among the membership, empowering group members, and aiding the group’s decision-making process”, and Destructive leadership is “the systematic and repeated leadership style by a leader that violates the legitimate interest of the organization by undermining and/or sabotaging the organization’s goals, tasks, resources, and effectiveness and/or the motivation. This study emphasized on political leadership, i.e., “one of the many categories of leadership”, which is “central to understanding political processes and outcomes”, having the major objective of forwarding the comparative foreign policy achievements of president Donald J. Trump and PM Dr. Abiy Ahmed since 2017-19. The basic rationales for conducting this study are: - the US (globally) and Ethiopia (regionally) is hegemonic powers, and both leaders were unexpectedly coming to power reversing the political status-quo (anti-establishment/populist vs progressive). Methodologically, this study employed exploratory, explanatory and descriptive qualitative approach by collecting both qualitative and quantitative data, using text analysis method. The findings of the study analyzed how democratic and destructive political leadership affected the foreign policy of both leaders and states in their overall international relations in the global politics.
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1.0 Background of the Study

Leadership is a multifaceted concept, and interest about it “extends far back into the history of social thought, and conceptions of it have fluctuated from the Hero concept to that of the leadership of the Common Man” (Dion, 2009). Contemporarily, leadership can be analyzed from three important angles: political, economic and social perspectives in the study of social science and human life. This study is mainly dealing with one dominant aspect of leadership; political leadership that attracted attention in the prominent scholarly works of “classic authors such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber and Robert Michel’s” (Elcock, 2001), and it focuses on “governing, governance and allegiance roles political leaders play” (ibid.), identified as either Democratic or Destructive. Academically, political leadership can be explored from the personal behaviour, psychological make-up and trait of the leader and it will also be examined from the existing political system of a given state in the modern times. In order to explore, examine and categorize the type of political leadership pursued by Donald J. Trump and Dr. Abiy Ahmed, it is essential to define the key concepts of: Destructive and Democratic political leadership. Therefore, Destructive leadership is defined as “the systematic and repeated leadership style by a leader that violates the legitimate interest of the organization by undermining and/or sabotaging the organization’s goals, tasks, resources, and effectiveness and/or the motivation, well-being or job satisfaction of his/her subordinates” (The Leadership Quarterly, 2007). Destructive leadership model exhibits three vital categories of: “tyrannical, derailed, and supportive–disloyal leadership behaviour” (ibid.). On the other hand, democratic leadership is “defined as the performance of three functions: distributing responsibility among the membership, empowering group members, and aiding the group's decision-making process” (Gastil, 1994), and personally a democratic leader “will make the final decision, he/she invites other members of the team to contribute the decision-making process” (Bhatti et al., 2012). Based on the above definitions, this study attempted to comparatively analyze and assign the respective type of the political leadership that was pursued by Donald J. Trump (2017-19) and Dr. Abiy Ahmed (April, 2018). The findings of this study are supported and substantiated by the facts, the objective realities and comments, writings and research papers forwarded by different prominent scholars, political analysts, plus the findings mainly depended on the foreign and domestic policies both adopted, the political actions and measures both took, where the reports of mainstream media outlets and concerned national and international organizations were incorporated as the benchmarks in this study.

2.0 Objectives of the Study

This study has the major objective of forwarding its findings whom among Donald J. Trump (2017-19) and Dr. Abiy Ahmed (2018-19) to be qualified in pursuing either the Democratic or Destructive political leadership. The comparative analysis was made on both leaders because both

- The US (globally) and Ethiopia (regionally) are hegemonic powers,
- The US and Ethiopia are founding members of the UN having equal voting rights in the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA),
- Leaders being heads of government had constitutional mandate and prerogative on the foreign policy of their respective countries, and
- Leaders came unexpectedly to power reversing the political status-quo (anti-establishment/populist vs progressive) respectively.

It is based on the above comparative parameters and the three levels of analysis of foreign policy in the international relations (System, Nation-state and Individual) that the resultant impact of their political leadership on their foreign policy achievements (successes & failures) had been explained in the overall international relations of the two states from multiple actors’ perspective at the global level by exploring, explaining, and describing the answers for the following research questions: Which leader was qualified to be either as democratic or destructive political leader? How is the particular type of political leadership exhibited and characterized? And, what were the impacts of the democratic and destructive political leadership on the foreign policy achievements (successes & failures) of each leader in the overall international relations of both states?
3.0 Methodology of the Study

Methodologically, this study employed qualitative research approach that has the major task of “exploring a problem and developing a detailed understanding of a central phenomenon” (Creswell, 2012). By using this approach, the study generated “results either in non-quantitative form or in the form which are not subjected to rigorous quantitative analysis” (Kothari, 2004) but only exploratory, explanatory and descriptive. The both qualitative and quantitative data collecting methods used to gather both qualitative and quantitative data including: - the researcher’s personal observation and professional judgments were used as primary data, and secondary data was gathered from desk-based review and examining of important and key documents including: books, research reports, various research strategic documents, national and international journals, plus public and private publications, newspapers, audio-visual and electronic sources. Text and Image analysis methods of data were used in forwarding the findings of this study. This article has six major parts, and it is further divided into sub-parts. Part one dealt with the introduction, part two dealt with the objectives of the study, part three mainly focused on methodology, part four discussed findings, part five wrapped up the conclusion and finally references are listed.

4.0 Overview of Major findings

The research forwarded its major findings by conducting academic and scholarly investigation with the explicit identification of who (either Donald J. Trump or Dr. Abiy Ahmed) pursued and exhibited democratic or destructive political leadership? And, by exploring the impacts of the type of political leadership pursued on the foreign policy achievements (successes & failures) of the individual leader in the overall international relations of each state. Foreign policy “refers to external affairs, particularly to decisions and actions taken by states in their dealings with other states or such external actor’s as international organizations, multinational corporations and other transnational actors” (Viotti & Kauppi, 1987). Foreign policy achievements (successes & failures) of the individual leader are dependent on the personal knowledge and experience in which understanding the three levels of analysis of foreign policy and their impacts deem very vital in guiding the leaders and their governments’ foreign policy objectives and achieving national interests. The three levels of analysis of foreign policy in the international relations of states are defined by Jackson and Sorensen (2007:228), as:

1. The systemic level (e.g., the distribution of power among states; their economic and political interdependence),
2. The nation - state level (e.g., type of government democratic or authoritarian; relations between the state apparatus and groups in society; the bureaucratic make-up of the state apparatus), and
3. The level of individual decision - maker (his/her way of thinking, basic beliefs, personal priorities).

Based on this definition, what were the separate individual political decisions and actions taken by both leaders and the respective consequences in their dealings with other states which affected by the type of their separate political leadership? The nation - state level analysis of foreign policy can be affected by the domestic policy leaders pursue because “all in all internal policy and foreign relations are highly interrelated” (Shushay, 2018), and this is mainly dependent on the type of political leadership which exists in that particular state. For further understanding of the research topic and depicting the clear picture of the research findings, the study began with the very brief analysis of political biography and the life facts of both leaders, identified as the preliminary evidences to understand the type of political leadership pursued by Donald J. Trump and Dr. Abiy Ahmed respectively.
4.1 Donald J. Trump: The Businessman turned Politician

The 45th president of the US (2017 –2020) Donald John Trump was born June 14, 1946, New York who is real-estate developer and businessman that owned, managed, or licensed his name to several products and outlets having some 500 companies involved in a wide range of businesses, entertainment and television (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2019), having no prior civic experience where “Trump did not have a career’s worth of political and government contacts to call on” (Wolff, 2018). Trump’s political career emerged, since the 1980s, when he periodically announced to the public about running for president, but those moments were widely dismissed in the press as publicity stunts. By rejoining the Republican Party, he maintained a high public profile during the 2012 presidential election even if he did not run for office at that time. But he gained much attention for repeatedly and falsely implying that Obama was not a natural-born U.S. citizen. In June 2015, Trump announced his candidacy in the 2016 U.S. presidential election, pledging to “make America great again (MAGA)” (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2019).

4.2 The Individual Level Analysis of President Trump’s Political Leadership (2017-20)

Donald J. Trump assumed the 45th presidency of US in January, 2017 which is the leader of the Western Liberal Democratic Order with the largest economic and military power in the world. Trump’s presidency (at the individual level of analysis) was unusual and peculiar in the US history for several twists and setbacks beginning the campaign trail, such as “the Russian investigation”, and other controversial and divisive policy directions in which since “the election campaign, some of Trump’s critics had warned that his presidency could create a unique and immediate constitutional crisis” (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2019), and this had come true since his immediate presidency. The post January, 20, 2017 political scenarios in the US have casted the doubt on Trump’s political fitness to lead the US both in the domestic and international stage. For instance, after assuming power, Trump’s unstable and incoherent type of political leadership began to take shape by numerous swift measures that were realized through signing several Executive Orders, depicted him to be an outsider, lacking experience and clear picture of the Washington politics which is the core and the nerve centre of the US and global politics, thereby contributed in developing his anti-establishment nature and attitude towards the US government and international relations. As a result of this, contrary to his predecessors, Trump’s cabinet was the collection of personally loyal individuals who were “drawn from the billionaire class, largely financial institutions, and military and so on;” (Rosenman, 2017) exhibiting the personal style that “was unusual, if not unique, among national political figures in modern U.S. history” (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2019) because his team was comprised of Washington’s outsiders where most of his inner circle were assigned with their overnight responsibility for assembling a government, who had almost no any relevant experience as such and “nobody had a political background. Nobody had a policy background.

Nobody had a legislative background” (Wolff, 2018). Concerning Trump’s type of political leadership, personal capacity and effectiveness, it was attached with his individual character, and as a president he began to vividly show and expose it since the first months in office when, “Trump threw his power about as if it were an infinite resource. He growled threats, issued commands, picked quarrels, and played favourites” (Frum, 2018) which indicated the type of political leadership taking shape with Trump’s presidency in the USA (United States of America). Another vital scenario that revealed the type of political leadership he pursued could be examined in his relationship and use of the mainstream and social media where his twitter account had more than 40 million active and ardent followers. Trump efficiently used his Twitter account against the conservative mainstream media outlets, and his rivals across the isles by mainly undermining and ignoring the presidential moral and ethical standards in achieving his destructive, at a times disruptive and divisive political leadership when he “angrily attack Democrats and Republican rivals and critics, the news media, job-exporting corporations, and anyone else who had provoked his ire in comments [which he alleged to be]
as aggressive, boastful, petty, and vulgar, [including he also scorned] the disability of a reporter he dislikes (ibid.). Trump’s potential damage to America’s respect for democratic values, principles and institutions and his totalitarian attitude went bare and wild since the early presidential campaign and immediately after the election he openly attacked freedom of the press and the rule of law by labelling and attacking unfavourable press reports about him as “fake news,” implying that the news organizations in question knowingly published falsehoods, frequently condemning the rival major news organizations as “the enemy of the American people,” using a phrase reminiscent of totalitarian societies.

Furthermore, in contrary to “American democratic ideals and principles”, Trump praised “some of the world’s most brutal autocrats and he has taken every opportunity for self-enrichment, nepotism, and endless taxpayer-funded visits to his own properties, all while refusing the most basic measures of transparency, plus he dishonoured the ideals of the country and turned its people against one another” (Foreign Policy and Security, 2018), and with all these premises he caused huge political discontent on the American elite where his “job approval rating has never been above 45% in Gallup numbers” (Cillizza, 2019). Trump was identified as the highly unpredictable and often inflammatory leader, and his supporters established theoretical frameworks in the field of psychology clearly describing his five (5) personal traits which he exhibited and adapted during his presidential tenure by summarizing them as follows: - Authoritarian Personality Syndrome [APS] that refers to the advocacy or enforcement of strict obedience to authority at the expense of personal freedom, and is commonly associated with a lack of concern for the opinions or needs of others. Social Dominance Orientation (SDO)—different but related to [APS]—refers to people who have a preference for the societal hierarchy of groups, specifically with a structure in which the high-status groups have dominance over the low-status ones. A 2016 survey study of 406 American adults published in the journal “Personality and Individual Differences” found that those who scored high on both SDO and authoritarianism were those who intended to vote for Trump in the election (His Nationalist Inclinations). Prejudice: - Trump’s shockingly direct routine appeal to bigoted supporters when he calls Muslims “dangerous” and Mexican immigrants’ “rapists” and “murderers,” often in a blanket fashion. A new study has shown that support for Trump is correlated with a standard scale of modern racism. Intergroup contact refers to contact with members of groups that are outside one’s own, which has been experimentally shown to reduce prejudice. There is growing evidence that Trump’s white supporters have experienced significantly less contact with minorities than other Americans. For example, a 2016 study found that “…the racial and ethnic isolation of Whites at the zip-code level is one of the strongest predictors of Trump support”, and at last Relative Deprivation refers to the experience of being deprived of something to which one believes they are entitled. It is the discontent felt when one compares their position in life to others who they feel are equal or inferior but has unfairly had more success than them. Trump supporters are simply angry that American jobs are being lost to Mexico and China, and they are experiencing relative deprivation, and are common among the swing states like Ohio, Michigan, and Pennsylvania (Azarian, 2017). What had been discussed so far above could be used as the logical point of departure in passing the judgment to the individual level analysis of President Trump’s type of political leadership. The summary of President Trump’s type of political leadership would be explained and described in the following part after the brief analysis of his administration major political features at the national level analysis of foreign policy.

4.3 The National Level Analysis of President Trump’s Political Leadership (2017-20)
Trump’s political leadership at the national level has its root from his populist agenda that is derived from populism which is ‘profoundly illiberal and, in the end, directly undemocratic understanding of representative democracy” (Muller, 2011:6). Populism is “fundamentally a style of politics, in which “the people”—an imaginary moral monolith—is pitted against an enemy, typically “the elite” or, in nationalist populism, immigrants. It is antagonistic, divisive, and hostile to pluralism” (Gardner, 2018). Therefore, Trump’s populist campaign theme and his administration’s policy in general were divisive and hostile to pluralism where even his
“proponents and its supporters exhibit a distinct social-psychological profile” (Muller, 2011), Trump and his supporters were attacking immigrants, Muslims and other minorities in the US and abroad. The above-mentioned psychological traits plus what had been discussed so far describe and designate Trump as a president who was pursuing destructive political leadership (the systematic and repeated leadership style by a leader that violates the legitimate interest of the state by undermining and/or sabotaging the government goals, tasks, resources, and effectiveness) that clearly and openly violated the legitimate interest of the US by undermining and/or sabotaging the US democratic system with its long-standing principles and values negatively affecting the well-being of the US citizens and the global society at large. Trump pursued “the Derailed” destructive political leadership that was clearly characterized by (Rubin, 2019) as the “mob-boss presidency” where he was characterized by “bragging about a plot to abuse power, using federal resources to enact political revenge. [And] he tried to induce wrongdoing with a pardon offer” (ibid.) in which he purposefully derailed the American Democratic system to his own destructive attitude, agenda and personal behavior that is contrary to Western Liberal Democratic Order where the US is its archangel.

4.4 Dr. Abiy Ahmed and the Type of Political Leadership
Prime Minister Dr. Abiy is the third head of government in the post-1991 Ethiopia which then was ruled by the Ethiopian People’s Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) that was “founded by the Tigray people’s Liberation Front (TPLF) in 1989” (Pausewang et al., 2002). The Ethiopian state for the last 27 years was mainly characterized as the most totalitarian, authoritarian and repressive one, dominated by the Tigray an ethnic minority elite of TPLF, well defined and characterized as:

“Except for a brief period during the 2005 general election, the government has severely restricted the rights to freedom of expression and association, arbitrarily detained political opponents, intimidated journalists, shattered media outlets, and made independent human rights and elections monitoring practically impossible. Citizens are unable to speak freely, organize political activities, or challenge government policies without fear of reprisal (Human Rights Watch, 2010, 14–15)”

Dr. Abiy who was born in Agaro, in southern Ethiopia on 15 August 1976 to an Oromo Muslim father and an Amhara Christian mother in the Jimma Zone, Oromia Regional State, has come to power when the Ethiopian state was mired in continuous political crisis with the deepest polarization and fragmentation of the public along ethnic lines. His ascension as Africa’s youngest leader was also predicated on the resignation of Premier Hailemariam Desalegn, who left in February, 2018 paving the way in institutionalizing “sustainable peace and democracy” (Dahir, 2018) in the country. Examining his short autobiography; as a teenager in 1990, he joined the armed struggle against the Marxist Derg regime, and after the 1991 political change in Ethiopia, he devoted hugely in advancing his military, academic and professional endeavor. Militarily, he had served in the Ethiopian Defense Force and rose to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel and assigned to serve in 1995 with the UN peacekeeping Ethiopian contingent in Rwanda. Academically, he graduated with the Master’s Degree in Transformational Leadership from the University of Greenwich; London and got PhD degree in Peace and Security Studies from Addis Ababa University. He is also multi-lingual speaks fluent Afan Oromo, Amharic and Tigrinya, as well as English.

In his career civil service (professionally), in 2007, he founded the Ethiopian Information Network Security Agency (INSA) and served as a board member of various public institutions such as Ethio-Telecom and Ethiopian TV. His political life commenced when he joined politics in 2010 as an ordinary OPDO (Oromo People’s Democratic Organization) member, before joining the party’s Executive Committee in 2015. In 2016, he briefly served as Minister of Science and Technology, and finally on 2 April, 2018 he became Prime Minister of the FDRE (BBC, 2018). According (Dahir, 2018), Dr. Abiy has shown his astuteness in politics with
impressive academic and military credentials by hugely transforming the traditional, highly ethicized, minority elite based oppressive and corrupt politics of the Ethiopian state in to democracy. PM. Dr. Abiy political leadership motto is “Medemer” that emphasizes on to the adherence of “Democracy” and “Rule of Law” in which he is being able to fulfill the following major achievements in the first six months by:

……ending a decades-long schism in the Ethiopian Orthodox Church and by welcoming home exiled dissidents from all ends of the political spectrum, including the pro-democracy group Ginbot 7—which was branded a terrorist group by the government until Abiy came to power—and the Oromo Liberation Front [OLF], both of which held large rallies in the capital in September. Abiy has also warned against seeing ideological opponents as traitors or mortal foes, a characteristic of Ethiopian political culture since at least the 1970s (Gardner, 2018).

By achieving this, he has ensured “the opening of the country, its democratization as well as regional repositioning” (Gouriellec, 2018), with the “immediate end of an internet blackout, released journalists and critics, closed notorious prisons, and promised to open up the economy which was totally unthinkable during TPLF dominated government. Dr Abiy's rapid paces of democratic political reform include the following major political measures in the first six months of the post-April, 2018 period: -

❖ May - frees thousands of political detainees, including opposition leader Andargachew Tsige,
❖ 5 June - lifts state of emergency two months early, and agreed to accept border ruling giving disputed territory to Eritrea,
❖ 9 July - alongside the Eritrean president declares the end of war between the two countries, and on 11 September - reopened land border with Eritrea, and
❖ On, 16 October - appoints women to half of ministerial posts (BBC, 2018).

By examining the above analysis and the overall positive domestic political achievements of Dr. Abiy’s leadership in this short period of time, this study found out that they are very significant and outstanding in comparison to the last 27 years of TPLF dominated EPRDF rule that was characterized by corruption, endemic corruption, patron-clienteles and nepotism, combined with “consistent pattern of grave violations of human rights including torture, arbitrary killings, restrictions on freedom of the press and expression, denial of religious freedoms, and the politicized use of its notorious anti-terrorism legislation” (Allo, 2014). Contrasting this objective reality and change in the Ethiopian politics, those who oppose Dr. Abiy political leadership began to label him “populist” by using the most common and severely compelling argument blatantly stating that “Abiy is a populist in the mould of Turkey’s Recep Tayyip Erdogan, India’s Narendra Modi and U.S. President Donald Trump” (Gardner, 2018). But, with explicit scholarly counter argument, this study had found out that the PM is not a populist, rather he is identified as a Utilitarian political leader who diligently worked to achieve Utilitarianism that is defined as a:

Philosophical view or theory about how we should evaluate a wide range of things which involve choices those people face. Among the things that can be evaluated are actions, laws, policies, character traits, and moral codes. Utilitarianism is a form of consequentialism because it rests on the idea that it is the consequences or results of actions, laws, policies, etc. that determine whether they are good or bad, right or wrong in general, whatever is being evaluated, we ought to choose the one that will produce the best overall results. In the language of utilitarian’s, we should choose the option that “maximizes utility,” i.e., that action or policy that produces the largest amount of good (Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, 2019).

This philosophical view has never existed let alone in Ethiopian politics but in its political dictionary, but Dr. Abiy actions, policies, new legislations, measures so far taken and his political leadership approach proved to be Utilitarian political leader because “despite
being a member of the ERPDF, he has mostly sidelined the party and appealed directly to the public over the heads of his colleagues” (Gardner, 2018), that was previously dominated by TPLF in the last 27 years of Ethiopian politics and ethnic policies that can be labelled as “Populist” because of its similar trends and political strategies of “Populism” that has a single defining characteristic where,

It may be the invocation of “the people” who are betrayed, wronged, or otherwise left vulnerable to forces outside their control. In fact, we find in the corpus that populism is typically a reaction to a deep crisis, real or perceived, in diverse and large democracies. Of course, the culprit of the crisis as well as the identity of the victimized people are highly contested and vary widely (Gagnon, 2018).

Based on the above definition and provided evidences, this study strongly refuted and denounced labelling Dr. Abiy government as a “Populist”, rather it identified that Dr. Abiy government pursued democratic political leadership that practically achieved its political objectives by performing the three major functions of the democratic political leadership which include: “distributing responsibility among the membership, empowering group members, and aiding the group’s decision-making process” (Gastil, 1994), thereby disproving the phony “populist” argument of his opponents where “it’s a critique worth contemplating; it also happens to be wrong” (Gardner, 2018).

4.5 Comparative Analysis of Foreign Policy Successes & Failures: Trump vs. Dr. Abiy

The study found out that PM. Dr. Abiy pursued democratic political leadership with the utilitarian perspective in contrary to president Trump’s destructive political leadership that he explicitly adhered to the populist political agenda. The next part analyzed comparatively the respective achievements (either success or failure) of both leaders in their foreign policy engagements. Political leadership manages both the domestic and foreign affairs of the state where “the internal and external affairs of a given country are inseparable like the two sides of a given coin. That is why the foreign policy of the nation is described as the reflection of its internal affairs” (Shushay, 2018), directly contributing either in the success or failure of the foreign policy engagements of leaders of states in the international relations.

4.6 President Trump’s Foreign Policy Failures

Trump’s foreign policy reflects his destructive political leadership that originated from his populist and anti-establishment policies which were “said to be simplistic, irresponsible, even irrational, pandering to people’s short-term desires, etc.” (Muller, 2011:10), and in one of his major themes of presidential campaign he claimed that: - “the United States had long been treated unfairly or taken advantage of by other countries, including by some traditional U.S. allies, and under Obama’s leadership the United States had ceased to be respected in world affairs” (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2019). And with this policy he pitted the people against an enemy, typically “the elite” or, in nationalist populism. Trump’s contribution in failing the US foreign policy was facilitated by his administration’s “daily campaign against the nation’s diplomats, intelligence community, law enforcement, and civil servants” (Foreign Policy and Security, 2018). Another important factor was the lack of his personal knowledge in the overall governmental and political sphere where there was “simply no subject, other than perhaps building construction that he had substantially mastered. Everything with him was off the cuff. Whatever he knew he seemed to have learned an hour before—and that was mostly half-baked” (Wolff, 2018:27). Those mishaps mainly contributed to the failures of the US foreign policy under the destructive political leadership of Trump since January 20, 2017, and marked his administration mainly to be characterized with the highest turnover of political and administrative appointees in the modern US political history. The major foreign policy failures of the US under Trump’s destructive political leadership are described as follows: - America has retreated from its global and moral leadership roles, alienated its democratic allies, and abandoned the bipartisan defence of liberal ideals that led to more than 70 years of security and
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prosperity. America is more isolated, less respected, and weaker at home, and ultimately less safe under President Trump’s leadership. Surrendered its global leadership to China: -Trump began withdrawing America from the world, [including] the Paris Climate Agreement, Trans-Pacific Partnership, UNESCO, and global migration talks, among others; helping China fills the void at the United States’ expense. Emboldening Putin’s Russia with no plan to defend democracy:

Trump has failed to formulate a serious response to ongoing assaults on U.S. democracy and those of our allies. On the contrary, by downplaying support for democracy and human rights and undermining efforts such as the Global Engagement Centre, [his administration] hobbled efforts to counter Russian propaganda in Eastern Europe (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2019). Increased the chances of war in the Middle East with his across-the-board military escalations, blank check to impulsive U.S. partners, hostility to the Iran deal, and disinterest in peace making, made the Middle East less stable and increased the risks of conflict with silent surge of military operations from Afghanistan to Syria and Somalia, risking a slippery slope to getting America caught in another endless war with no end in sight. Trump’s blank check and unconditional military support to countries such as Saudi Arabia escalated conflicts and inflamed the terrorist threat posed to the United States. Trump’s decision to move the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem—without any effort to link the move to larger plans for Mideast peace—isolated America internationally and was condemned by close allies. Weakened America’s hand against Iran by unilaterally withdrawing from the Iran nuclear deal that blocked Iran’s path to nuclear weapons, [he] undermined the most effective aspect of America’s Iran policy. His sabre-rattling has isolated America and its allies while convincing the world that failure of the nuclear deal ultimately as Trump’s fault. By breaking America’s commitment, Trump is making North Korea and other problems harder to solve by undercutting the value of a deal with Washington. Trump has contributed to the militarization of U.S. foreign policy by eroding of civilian control, —trampling on another set of long-standing norms that have benefitted the U.S. military and political system alike since its founding. Offending and alienating people everywhere: Trump’s offensive, bigoted comments reportedly questioning whether America should accept Haitians or other immigrants from “shithole countries,” Trump earned the condemnation of the United Nations, African Union leaders, the Vatican, and people everywhere.

These were the major foreign policy failures of the US under Trump’s destructive political leadership that contradicted the long-standing American principles of democracy and its core values and fundamental ideas which are having long term negative consequences in the international relations of the US with multiple actors at the global level. In short, “the president’s unpredictability once worked to his advantage—but now, it is producing a mounting list of foreign-policy failures” (Frum, 2018) in which the president’s character was identified and clearly portrayed grossly as “the conduct of a movie mob boss, not a president. Trump is so brazened he’d rather lie to make himself appear more politically vengeful than tell the truth that his suggestion apparently was rebuffed” (Rubin, 2019). The only success of president Trump’s foreign policy was the promotion and advertisement of his business, and this was effective because the “Trump” brand of products was highly publicized at the global market by putting the US foreign policy objectives and national interest at the altar of his personal fame, adventure, financial gain, wealth generation and business success.

4.7 Prime Minister Dr. Abiy Foreign Policy Successes
PM. Dr. Abiy political leadership “implemented several reforms across the political, economic, diplomatic and social spheres” (Mumbere, 2019) of Ethiopia, and it was identified as democratic by different scholars, politicians and mainstream media outlets based on the objective reality and the political outcomes of his administration in a very short span of time that was derived from his leadership motto of “Medemer” which is resonating across Ethiopia’s national boundary. His leadership motto of “Medemer” has
made the U-Turn in the Ethiopian foreign policy objectives to the right direction by departing from the last 27 years policy of policing the region that flared implicit and explicit hostility and suspicion in the Horn of Africa, in which

*Ethiopia has long been an imperfect hegemony. Indeed, the size of the country and its population—as well as its location and history—mean that Ethiopia has stood out as the regional power. This is also clear from its foreign policy which is ‘characterized by a relationship of dominance over and assumption of allegiance from its neighbours’; an attitude which paradoxically could lead to further destabilization* (Gouriellec, 2018).

PM. Dr. Abiy democratic political leadership has hugely contributed mainly in building confidence and transforming the Region’s image where for the first time in several decades when “World leaders gather in New York [in 2018] to tackle a plethora of global problems, from climate change and migration to humanitarian disasters and war. Amid all these challenges, there is at least one positive note: The Horn of Africa’s swift and crucial diplomatic turnaround (Dahir, 2018). This swift and crucial diplomatic turnaround in the region was the undeniable positive outcome (achievements) of the following major successes in Ethiopia’s foreign policy and its international relations at the regional, continental and global levels by the democratic leadership model of PM Dr. Abiy and his administration in which he “Has prioritized regional integration with clear strategy, and provided an opportunity to pursue new relationships without the legacy of historical baggage, reducing the prospect of political competition in the Horn Reached out to long-time foe Eritrea, saying Ethiopia by fully accepting the terms of an agreement signed in 2000 which ended the war between the two nations over a disputed border. Cooled tense relations with Egypt over the Nile hydro-politics, flew to Mogadishu to solidify bilateral and trade relations, and oversaw the first meeting in two years between South Sudanese president Salva Kiir and his arch-rival, Riek Machar (Dahir, 2018). Political leaders, such as Israeli’s Premier, US Acting Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs and senior officials of Saudi Arabia and China have all came and visited Ethiopia and discussed with government officials on ways to solidify the relations between their respective countries and Ethiopia (Shushay, 2018).

The above-mentioned foreign policy successes were the outcome PM Dr. Abiy’s democratic leadership that was all inclusive aiming the overall stability, peace, security and mutual development of the Horn of African and the continents people with other global partners. In short PM Dr. Abiy’s democratic leadership was an important milestone in the foreign policy success and ensuring Ethiopia’s dominant position in all aspects of its international relations at the regional, continental and global levels.

5.0 Conclusion of the Study
The study found out that the US foreign policy was hugely failing and continued to fail with president Trump pursuing destructive political leadership (populist and anti-establishment), in contrary to PM. Dr. Abiy who pursued democratic political leadership that achieved the highest foreign policy success. With such stark differences in the type of political leadership between the two leaders, what made them similar was, both made U-turn in the policies pursued by both states governments for long time at the domestic and foreign aspects of the political, economic and social set-ups. But to conclude this study, the record and the results so far discussed are clear: President Trump and his destructive political leadership with the populist and anti-establishment policies were contrary to the long-standing American principles of democracy and its core values and fundamental ideas. This needlessly alienated the US at the regional, continental and global levels from its allies; stoked tensions and heightened risks by damaging its credibility; squandered the goodwill of people everywhere; and surrendered the high ground of America’s moral and global leadership. Trump dishonored the ideals of the country and turned its people against one another. Trump committed serious, lasting damage to America’s security at home and standing in the world. One year later, the country was divided and distracted by Trump’s foreign policy from the challenges and opportunities of a fast-changing world, and the American people were less safe with his cumulative foreign policy
failures. On the other hand, PM Dr. Abiy’s democratic leadership had fruitful foreign policy successes that guaranteed the overall stability, peace, security and mutual development of the peoples and states of the Horn and that of Africa’s with other global partners by tearing apart divisive and separatist walls of hatred, envy and suspicion by building constructive, uniting and cooperating bridges in contrary to Trump who built the long wall at the southern border of the US which negatively characterized the US politically, economically and socially across the globe being the icon and statue of hatred, envy and suspicion in the globalized, interdependent world. Another important issue concerning these two leaders and their foreign policy paradox were the following: -

❖ While the US used Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states as proxy fighters in Yemen by committing heinous crimes against humanity, Dr. Abiy and Ethiopia used them to be agents of peace with Eritrea and the other Horn states,
❖ ICC and other rights groups have focused on American War Crimes in Iraq and Afghanistan, whereas since Dr. Abiy came to power Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch witnessed positive and radical transformations in Ethiopia’s Human Rights record,
❖ Trump was very busy in scaring foreign investors and the flow of FDI (Foreign Direct Investment) got minimum, in contrary Ethiopia attracted foreign investors and the flow of FDI by opening the economy and exercising new liberal economic policies.

Finally, what made both leaders similar in terms of their domestic policies and citizens’ outlook regarding their leadership is its divisive nature, where President Trump was populist who stirred national division where his supporters are still attacking immigrants, Muslims and other minorities in the US and abroad. At the same token, PM Dr., Abiy is a utilitarian political leader focusing on uniting the Ethiopian people who were purposefully divided across ethno-linguistic lines that inculcated mistrust and hatred for the last 27 years for the sole agenda of ensuring the continuity of corrupt elite based TPLF rule. As a result of this, there is domestic political division among those who are the die-hard supporters of the TPLF dominated rent-seeking and repressive rule and those who support the new change that is in full swing since April, 2018 but continuously marred by deliberate political, economic and social tragedies, conspiracies and sabotages.
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