

New Trends in Leadership and Governance in Africa: The Jonathan – Mandela Experience

¹John T. Kalama & ²Johnson Alalibo Sinikiem

¹*Department of Political Science, Federal University Otuoke, Bayelsa State, Nigeria*

²*Institute for Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Ibadan, Nigeria*

Article DOI: 10.48028/iiprds/ijrssmt.v7.i1.05

Abstract

This paper examined the changes recorded in the leadership and governance structure in Africa with particular reference to the Jonathan and Mandela administration in Nigeria and South Africa respectively. The study made use of secondary data while the analysis was done qualitatively through contents analysis. Conflict theory was also applied to guide the study. Findings revealed that the policy actions and leadership styles of some African leaders affected the quality of leadership and governance structure in various African countries. The paper concluded that the gains recorded in the democratization process in Africa can be sustained when leaders and citizens abandon sit-tight leadership and embrace democratic values and principles as clearly demonstrated by Dr Goodluck Ebele Jonathan of Nigeria and Nelson Mandela of South Africa.

Keywords: *Leadership, Governance structure, Jonathan, Mandela, Nigeria and South Africa.*

Corresponding Author: John T. Kalama

Background to the Study

Leadership failure and policy inconsistency on the part of African leaders prompted this study. The changes recorded in Gambia, Burkina-Faso and other African countries where the people resisted sit-tight leadership clearly shows that the people are tired and unwilling to preserve the old order. The crisis several parts of Africa is a clear indication that leaders are not on the same page with their people. In Kenya for instance, the struggle for power between Mwai Kibaki and Raila Odinga Odinga led to the death of several citizens while in Liberia and Zimbabwe the struggle for power between Robert Mugabe and Morgan Tsvangirai also caused the death of innocent citizens. The story is the same in most African countries where issues of poverty, unemployment, disease and hunger have not been addressed by African leaders. Failure of leadership according to Achebe (1984) accounts for the myriads of problems facing Africa hence; several measures have been put in place to improve the quality of leadership in Africa. In Nigeria for instance, several constitutional and political conferences have been organized by different administrations yet the challenges of leadership and governance remained unresolved. While corroborating Achebe's position, François Bayart described politics in Africa as politics of the belly in which access to political power is seen and perceived as access to wealth and accumulation of resources. Zartman (2009) also added that the inordinate ambition and struggle for power among African leaders explains why most African countries are described as failed states. The need to interrogate the nature of leadership and governance system in Africa is therefore fundamental if the continent is to make any significant progress. Thus, it is in the light of this background that this paper strives to evaluate the changes that have taken place in Africa's leadership and governance structure with particular reference to Goodluck Ebele Jonathan and Nelson Mandela.

Theoretical and Conceptual Analysis

This study was guided by the post-behavioural theory which is a protest against orthodox behaviouralism which was observed to be limited to mere formulation of theories and concepts. In the words of James John Guy cited in Ntete-Nna (2004), the post-behavioural approach looks at political science as having a public purpose hence, it should not only strive for generalization and the verifiable understanding of the political process but that practitioners and political leaders should commit themselves to making the world a better place. This theory, therefore advocates that leaders and political scientists should be able to communicate with the victims of society and citizens to ensure that the choice of research projects and policies must reflect the immediate concerns for the daily struggles of the mass of the people not just elites in business. Post-behaviouralists therefore, are concerned not just with techniques of study but also with the broader questions of values such as justice and morality all geared towards policy engineering. Contextually, the various policy actions of past and present administrations in Nigeria and South Africa clearly represent a bold and pragmatic step aimed at resolving the leadership challenges confronting both countries.

Conceptual Analysis

Scholars have defined leadership in deferent ways but leadership from a general perspective refers to an individual who provides direction, implement plans, and motivate people. There are also several leadership styles that can be exhibited by leaders in the political, business or

other fields hence, leadership style include the total pattern of explicit and implicit actions performed by the leader (Newstorm, 1993). It will be recalled that the first major study of leadership styles was performed in 1939 by Kurt Lewin who led a group of researchers to identify different styles of leadership (Lewin, et al 1939). This early study has remained quite influential as it established the following three major leadership styles:

- a. Authoritarian or Autocratic Leadership Style:- According to the research, the authoritarian or autocratic leader tells his or her employees what to do and how to do it, without getting their advice.
- b. Participative or Democratic Leadership Style:-In this case, include one or more employees in the decision making process but the leader normally maintains the final decision making authority.
- c. Delegated or Laissez-fair Leadership Style:-The leader in this case allows the employees to make the decisions; however, the leader is still responsible for the decisions that are made. Lippit and White (1939) argued further that good leaders use all the three styles with one of them normally dominant. He added that bad leaders tend to stick with one style, normally the autocratic style of leadership like the case in most African states.

In their contribution to the subject-matter, Tennenbaun and Schmidt (1973) expanded on Lewin and White's three leadership styles by extending them to seven styles and placing them on a continuum indicating that as you go from left to right, it moves from manager oriented decision making to team or subordinate oriented decision making. Thus, the team's freedom increases while the managers' authority decreases. On their part, Howell and Costly (2001) maintained that there are seven behaviour patterns or styles of leaders and that such behaviour pattern of leaders often produce negative or positive actions. They added that positive and progressive minded leaders will use rewards such as education, independence etc. to motivate and command respect while negative or autocratic leaders will emphasis on penalties and sanctions (Newstorm, Davis, 1993). With specific reference to Nigeria and Africa, Achebe (1984) identified leadership as the major problem facing Nigeria and indeed Africa. According to him, the trouble with Nigeria is simply and squarely a failure of leadership. While commenting on the concept democracy and democratic leadership, Akinyanju (2000) maintained that since democracy emphasizes majority input, it is much deeper and it can be appreciated by its salient features which include:

1. Acknowledgement of the equality of men provision and respect for individual freedoms and rights (freedom of speech, association, right to life, property etc.)
2. Sovereignty of the people: The state and law must receive the consent of the people validating at regular intervals (regular elections).
3. Accountability to the People by Government
4. Rule of law and equality before the law (existence of independent judiciary and impartial administration of justice).

Akinyanju (2000) therefore posited that genuine democracy implies equal material capacity to reach and mobilize the people. He contended that political democracy cannot be achieved without economic democracy and that democratization results as a reaction to monocratic authoritarian, personal regimes: and the perceived gains of democracy. He gave the following

as the general features of monocratic centralize regimes: political exclusion and denials: resource concentration at the centre: concentration of constitutional and extra – constitutional powers in the hands of a few persons or a person with the courts and other institutions of the state emasculated or rendered dependent on the power centre. In his words:

Monocratic regimes like we have run in Nigeria for the better part of the existence of country have produced disastrous effects; gross deprivation, pervasive corruption, economic decline, political violence and infrastructural decay. When it is then perceived that democratization fosters development and provides the basis for negotiations and bargaining in the polity, societies struggle to democratize. Democratization is very rarely voluntarily allowed. It is achieved as a result of pressure. The pressure could be internal or external but usually a combination of both. In Nigeria, the internal pressure to democratize had been against colonial or indigenous authoritarianism (Akinyanju, 2000:p.3).

Gurr (1994) corroborated the above position when he cautioned that if the rights of minorities are not respected and their feelings taken into consideration in the process of policy formulation and implementation, the rate of conflict and insecurity may increase in Africa in the 21st century. He reiterated that for effective consensus building process to translate into good governance and leadership in any political system, there must be territorial constitutional integration as well as minimum consensus. In the same vein, Jega (2007) maintained that for leaders and followers to experience good governance and effective leadership there must be transparency and accountability by public office holders in discharging their duties. In his words:

A democratic political culture developed over time creates the basis for sustainable processes of good governance in democratic countries including Nigeria (Jega, 2007:p.158).

In the words of Eskor Toyo, democracy refers to the extent to which actual political power to determine their social destiny belongs to the vast majority of citizens who constitute the people distinct from a ruling oligarchy or class. This definition of democracy is in agreement with Abraham Lincoln's popular definition: Government of the people by the people and for the people. Thus, scholars have argued that no democracy can function without the people (citizens) hence, Ola Oni (1999) reaffirmed this position when he stated thus: democracy has been variously defined as a political and economic arrangement of society such that the interest of the majority of people determine the management and direction of society benefiting the majority of the people. Why democracy is yet to benefit the majority of citizens in Africa remains a paradox which this paper attempts to address. However, while appraising the impact of democratic leadership on development and good governance at any level, Awa (1973) argued that whether it is situational, traditional or charismatic styles of leadership, scholars and researchers are unanimous that good leadership is necessary and crucial for the survival, growth and development of any society.

New Trends in Leadership and Governance in Africa: The Jonathan – Mandela Experience

Thus, this section of the paper examined policy actions and programmes put in place by the administration of Nelson Mandela of South Africa and Goodluck Ebele Jonathan of Nigeria to strengthen democracy and the democratization process in Africa.

The Post-Apartheid Era and Nelson Mandela's Contribution to the Democratization Process in South Africa

After his release, where to spend the first night of freedom became a source of debate to the ANC and other Comrades but the issue was later resolved in these words:

One of the first questions to be resolved was where I would spend my first night of freedom... but my colleagues and, later my wife, argued that for security reasons I should stay with Archbishop Desmond Tutu in Bishop's court, a plush residence in a white suburb... but members of the committee explained that Bishop's court had become multiracial under Tutu's tenure, and symbolized an open, generous non-racialism (Mandela, 1994: p.559).

This no doubt affirms the fact that the church and the clergy in South Africa also participated actively in the democratization process in South Africa. The likes of Archbishop Anthony Olubumi Okojie and Bishop Mathew Hassan Kukah are still very vocal on issues relating to peace and sustainable development in Nigeria and Africa. Political mobilization by all groups in South Africa culminated into general elections where the African National Congress (ANC) won majority of the seats in parliament including the presidential elections of 2nd May, 1994. The road to freedom was not easy as several groups and organizations attempted to boycott the democratization process. Harmonizing all the groups and their positions was no doubt a major challenge to Mandela and other progressive forces. According to Mandela, Inkatha rejected participation in the election and gave itself over to the politics of resistance. In his words:

King Zwelithini, supported by Chief Buthelezi, called for an autonomous and sovereign Kwazulu, and discouraged everyone in his province from voting... February 12, 1994 was the deadline for registration of all parties, and on that day, Inkatha, the conservative party and the Africaner Volks front failed to sign...I arranged to meet Chief Buthelezi in Durban on March 1. I will go down to my knees to beg those who want to drag our country into bloodshed (Mandela, 1994:p.615).

This again revealed that even the black majority in South Africa were not ready for democratic rule hence, Mandela had to involve international mediators and diplomacy to bring all groups on board via series of agreements and memorandum of understanding (MOU) which led to the formation of a government of national unity. The humility and patriotism of Mandela was further expressed few days to his inauguration as the first democratically elected president of South Africa when he stated thus:

From the moment the results were in and it was apparent that the ANC was to form the government, I saw my mission as one of preaching reconciliation, of binding the wounds of the country, of engendering trust and confidence. I knew that many people, particularly the minorities, whites, coloured and Indians would be feeling anxious about the future and I

wanted them to feel secure. I reminded people again and again that the liberation struggle was not a battle against any one group or colour, but a fight against a system of repression at every opportunity, I said all South Africans must now unite and join hands and say we are one country, one nation, one people, marching together into the future...It was during those long and lonely years that my hunger for the freedom of my own people became a hunger for the freedom of all people, white and black. I knew as well as I knew anything that the oppressor must be liberated just as surely as the oppressed. We have not taken the step of our journey, but the first step on a longer and even more different road. For to be free is not merely to cast off one's chains, but to live in a way that respects and enhances the freedom of others. The true test of our devotion to freedom is just the beginning (Mandela, 1994:p.623 – 625).

With these words, Mandela set the stage for sustainable peace and development in South Africa through his National Truth and Reconciliation Commission headed by Archbishop Desmond Tutu, a highly respected, vocal and fearless priest of the Catholic Church. Apart from the national truth and reconciliation commission, Mandela also integrated all the major stakeholders in his government to the surprise of all including members of the ANC who were not comfortable with his patriotic zeal and ideology. Major contributions of Dr. Goodluck Ebele Jonathan to democracy and the democratization process in Nigeria are discussed under subheadings A – C below:

a. Promotion of Equity and Building Indigenous Capacity of Nigerians

Prior to 2010, Indigenous participation in economic activities in Nigeria, particularly oil and gas, was very limited primarily due to low levels of local capacity and competencies. To ensure equity and fundamental change in the landscape and also facilitate indigenous participation in economic development especially in the oil and gas, sector, the Local Content Development Act (2010) was enacted by the Jonathan-led administration. According to Jonathan, by building local capacity and competencies, the Act aims to increase indigenous participation in industry (particularly oil and gas), create linkages to other sectors of national economy and ultimately boost industry contributions to GDP growth. In his words: This reform has yielded benefits across board with increased indigenous participation in the oil and gas sector leading to the establishment of the Ebok Terminal. Current daily crude oil production is 7,000 bpd and a plateau production of 50,000 bpd is expected at full capacity (Okidegbe, 2015:p.16). The Local Content Act (2010) further enabled the Jonathan administration to establish the Nigeria Content Development and Monitoring Board which has its headquarters in Yenagoa, Bayelsa state. Thus, the active participation and engagement of youths and indigenous contractors and chiefs no doubt helped to restore peace and stability in the oil-rich Niger Delta. In the same vein, the Act also helped to check the excesses of multinational oil companies who engaged in unethical practices in the country.

b. Promotion of Human Rights and Public Accountability

This is another area where the background and humble disposition of Jonathan came into play. Realizing that he came from a quiet humble background, he never allowed fame and political power to influence his sense of judgment as a leader. For instance, under Jonathan as President politicians from other political parties won elections as governors, senators', etc. but

in the past and even in recent times, the story was different. All the arms of government also functioned independently without any form of interference by the presidency or the federal government. The appointment of Prof. Attahiru Jega as INEC chairman by the Jonathan-led administration also brought credibility to the electoral process in Nigeria. The culture of one man one vote was also made popular by the Jonathan-led administration which insisted that every vote must count in all elections and that after voting citizens must stay, observe and defend their votes. His body language no doubt opened the political space for citizens to participate actively in the political process without fear of harassment and intimidation.

Recognizing that transparency is central to building an accountable democratic society, which is necessary and fundamental for economic growth and stability, former president Jonathan went a step further to sign the Freedom of Information Act (FOI) in 2011. According to him, the Act is aimed at making public records and information more freely available, providing access to public records and information, protecting public records and information in line with the public interest, while protecting privacy and protecting serving public officers from any repercussions due to disclosure of certain official information without authorization. In his words: “By this Act, procedures for achieving these objectives were also put in place across MDAs. Backed by law, citizens can now access public records more easily with most applications received by MDAs being processed within two weeks” (Okidegbe, 2015:p.16).

Apart from promoting cordial relationship among the various arms of government in the country, the Jonathan-led Federal Government from 2010–2015 took deliberate measures to also guarantee the liberty and fundamental human rights of Nigerians. In a publication titled “forward” Isoken Omo (2011) argued that Dr. Goodluck Ebele Jonathan as a true democrat allowed rule of law and respect for due process to prevail throughout his tenure as Vice President, and President respectively. According to her, prior to his assumption of office as President, governors, were illegally removed from office. Senate president and Speakers were impeached or removed with impunity. Court orders and judgments were disobeyed willingly. Contracts were terminated without recourse to the rule of law. All these happened even when Nigerians thought they had entered the era of democracy. In her words:

Since Jonathan was elected president of Nigeria, the country has made tremendous progress in its democratization agenda. He does not interfere in the affairs of the National Assembly, even when it is clear that some principal officers have been a fool in the hand of the opposition. While the Chairmen of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) were being removed at will in the past, he has refused to toe that path, preferring that things take their natural course. It is not uncommon to hear people say: if this affront had happened under a different President EFCC would have arrested his opponents by now... He has also helped to consolidate democracy through free and fair elections (Isoken Omo, 2011:p. 9).

Not even a councilor was arrested and detained without trial during the administration of former President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan. The story today (2018) is quite different because several politicians, especially those who disagree with the president or party leaders, have been harassed and intimidated through the instruments of the State. The case of Senators Dino

Melaye, Enyinnaya Abaribe and other opposition politicians are clear examples of executive recklessness prevailing in Nigeria today. Dr. Goodluck Ebele Jonathan was very prophetic in 2014 when he said: “I am the most abused and insulted leader today but when I leave office you will realize the amount of freedom you enjoyed under my leadership.”

c. Promotion of National and Regional Peace and Political Stability

Pre-2015 Era witnessed several threats to peace and security in Nigeria coupled with the political activities of the season. Rather than influence the pre-2015 electoral process and give undue advantage to his political party and friends, Dr. Goodluck Ebele Jonathan made the political space open and free for all political parties to the extent that most of his friends, cabinet members and special advisers that resigned their appointments to contest elective positions believing that the president would influence the political and electoral process in their favour all got it wrong as some lost. One man who also resigned as information minister under Jonathan but lost the governorship election in his state (Nassarawa) was Labaran Maku. Even in defeat, he commended Jonathan for being a patriot who refused to bow to ethnic and religious pressures at the expense of the Nigerian State. In his words:

Dr. Jonathan has a special gift of humility that he may have inherited from his upbringing. He is a genuine intellectual and a quiet person whose quietness is sometimes mistaken for weakness. He is not a weak person. He can tolerate a lot and that is a particular strength that enabled him to demystify power. He does not exhibit airs in spite of his elevation and he remains focused on the task of building a better nation through institutions rather than by showing off his personal power. Presidential power in Africa is very deceptive because it gives the individual the illusion of being able to order anything to be done; but for it to work for the good of the people the individual must be aware that all earthly power is temporary. Dr. Jonathan is one person who shows a profound understanding of the temporal nature of power, so he is more inclined to building and empowering institutions. This is exactly what Nigeria needs now and as God has helped him to maintain his modest and tolerant character, so has he helped Nigeria by putting such a person in the position to lead the nation today. The only previous leaders in Nigeria who showed such simple modesty were Shagari and to some extent Gowon under the military, but Dr. Jonathan is very different from either of them because he is much more focused on the task of demystifying power and building institutions that will sustain the people's expectations even after he is gone. An important element of Dr. Jonathan's administrative style and responsibility is revealed by some of his appointments. It was clear that these were made on the basis of his personal judgment of the character of the appointee rather than for political advantage. Nowhere was this more obvious than in the choice of the women whom he appointed to his cabinet. His retention of the outspoken Dora Akunyili was not surprising since they both share a penchant for intellectual discourse as well as principled adherence to truth... Ever since he appointed me and outlined the things he wanted done by the ministry he has not interfered with our work in any way and has never tried to influence our decisions to favour anyone. Our nation will certainly benefit greatly from Dr. Jonathan's style of leadership, which is hinged on statesmanship, nationalism and patriotism (Alagoa, et al. 2010: p.197-198).

This position was corroborated by Joe Biden, former Vice President of the United States when he stated thus:

President Jonathan as ECOWAS chair and co-mediator stood courageously and firmly with other ECOWAS heads of state to resolve the crisis in Niger, Cote d' Ivoire, Mali and Guinea Bissau. None of the heads of states who have worked with president Jonathan will characterize him as weak, incompetent or confused when it comes to taking hard decisions (Isoken Omo, 2011:p.94).

However, in the midst of criticisms, President Jonathan had the courage to convoke a national conference aimed at repositioning Nigeria for robust economic growth and political stability. At end of the day, it was a success and the outcome refreshingly different. Jonathan's humility, dynamism and love for peace and stability was also affirmed by D.S.P. Alamiyeseigha when he said: “with a Deputy like Jonathan, I know I don't have to look behind me, because even when I am not around, the State will be in safe hands” (Imokhai, 2015:p.53). What could have threatened the peace and political stability of Nigeria was averted when President Jonathan put a call through to Muhammadu Buhari, the presidential flag bearer of the All Progressives Congress (APC) in 2015, congratulating him and conceding defeat while the election results were being collated. Even after the official release of results, Jonathan as the incumbent President then did not challenge the results in the tribunal and the law court, hence, emerging as the only political leader in Nigeria and Africa who deliberately refused to contest the result of an election at both the tribunal and the courts. By his action, Jonathan demystified power and helped to build sustainable peace and stability in Nigeria.

The Table below further shows the contributions of former president, Dr. Goodluck Ebele Jonathan to democracy and the democratization process in Nigeria.

Table 1: Indices Used in Measuring the Leadership Style of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan

S/N	Selected Policies	Outcomes
1	Convening of a National Conference	Encouraged popular participation by giving Nigerians from all walks of life the opportunity to come together and chart a new course for the nation.
2	Almajiri Education Programme in the North-East	A strategic long term plan to curb child abuse and insurgency in the North by also deflate the ego of the ruling class.
3	Restructuring of the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) and the judiciary.	Restored credibility in the electoral process in Nigeria through the sacking of some corrupt judges by the National Judicial Service Commission (NJC) and building trust in the Nation's Judiciary.

Source: Kalama and Arugu 2014 p.9

However, the contributions of Mandela and Jonathan to the democratization process in Africa can be summarized in table 2 below.

Table 2: Comparative Analysis of the Contributions of Nelson Mandela and Goodluck Ebele Jonathan to the Democratization Process in South Africa and Nigeria

Indices Used for Evaluation	Mandela	Jonathan
Period under Review	1940-2013	1990-2015
Upbringing/ family background	Grew up in a rural community called Mvezo, a tiny village on the banks of the Mbashe River in the district of Umtata, the capital of the Transkei in Cape Town where he had his early education. Mother was a petty trader while the father, Gadla Henry Mphakanyiswa, was a community chief.	Was born in a rural community called Otuoke in the Ogbia Local Government Area of Bayelsa State, Nigeria. Parents were involved in farming and canoe carving
Life after school/college	Joined the civil society movements and struggled for the emancipation of blacks in South Africa. All the progressive forces later merged to form the African National Congress (ANC) with Mandela as one of its youth leaders.	Continued his education and later worked in different government agencies and institutions in Rivers State, Bayelsa State etc. He later resigned and became an active politician.
Life as an adult	Spent most of adult hood in the trenches defending the fundamental rights of his people from the oppressive regime of the apartheid government. He was eventually sentenced to life imprisonment and taken to Roben Island where he spent twenty seven (27) years.	Had a successful career as a school teacher, inspector of science education, officer with the Nigeria custom service and director in the defunct Oil Mineral Producing Areas Development Commission (OMPADEC)
Relationship with the people/ electorates	Maintained a strong link with the ordinary people of South Africa especially the black majority who lived in shanties. Thus, from National Youth Leader of the ANC, he was voted President of South Africa in 1994.	Also kept fate with the people at all levels hence, his elevation from Deputy Governor, Governor, Vice President and eventually, the President was not too difficult.
Types of policies formulated to drive the vision of the government	Embarked on people-centered programmes and policies which accommodated all parties and stake holders against the wish of his party, the ANC. To build peace and also promote national unity and cohesion, he set up a government of national unity against the wish of his political party and also carried out true forgiveness and reconciliation through the national truth and reconciliation commission headed by Arch. Bishop Desmond Tutu	Formulated policies that promoted national interest and cohesion hence, in the midst of opposition, he signed the Freedom of Information Bill into law in 2011 and enacted the Local Content Act 2010. In the same vein, the national political conference was also set up by his administration.
Expected policy outcomes (feedback)	South Africans responded and voted massively for the African National Congress (ANC) in all South African elections even after his demise.	Nigerians reciprocated and voted massively for the People's Democratic Party (PDP) in 2011. Due to division and inability to manage its internal issues, the party lost to the All Progressives Congress (APC) in the 2015 elections.
Personal commitment and sacrifice in leadership	Mandela spent greater part of his life fighting and defending the rights of his people. His actions got to an unprecedented level when he decided not to seek re-election despite his popularity and that of his party, the ANC.	Was not incarcerated but made very serious personal commitments and sacrifices to keep Nigeria united. After his first term as president, he sought re-election and when everybody taught that he would go the African way, he conceded defeat and went ahead to congratulate his opponent, President Mohammedu Buhari through a phone call before the results were announced officially. Even when his kinsmen accused the electoral body INEC of rigging and insisted on going to war, Jonathan persuaded them to accept the election results in the interest of peace. Again he remains the only politician who has not contested election results in the tribunal and in the court respectively.
Political party affiliation	African National Congress (ANC)	People's Democratic Party (PDP)
Respect for party structure and ideology	Remained a loyal and committed party man who lived and died for the beliefs and ideology of the African National Congress (ANC).	Although not a radical but a quiet, loyal, humble and committed party man. Despite the challenges facing the party, he has remained the source of inspiration and national leader of the PDP.
Marriage and family life	Received tremendous support from his children and wife, Winnie, at the initial stages of the struggle, but due to prolonged detention and other factors, the peace and unity in the family was threatened.	Despite his busy schedules and public life, he finds time to address issues at the home front. Thus, the marriage is intact and the family is together.
Educational background	Trained as a lawyer and obtained two more degrees while serving a life sentence at Roben Island prison. He never allowed the prevailing circumstances to lower his spirit. From local community where the father was a chief, he rose to become the president of South Africa in 1994.	Under very hostile economic conditions, he studied up to PhD level and rose from a rural community boy to become the acting President of Nigeria in 2010 and President in 2011.
National and regional integration	Promoted national and regional cooperation and integration within African states and its leaders. Under his leadership South Africa overtook Egypt and became the largest economy in Africa. No African leader has been able to match his political records of deliberately refusing to seek a second term in office. He was indeed a shining light in Africa.	Re-defined power and politics in Africa by being the first political leader to accept election results before the official announcement by the electoral body in the 2015 presidential elections in Nigeria. As ECOWAS chair and co-mediator, he stood courageously and firmly with other ECOWAS Heads of state to resolve the crisis in Niger, Cote d' Ivoire, Mali and Guinea Bissau. During his tenure (2014), Nigeria also overtook South Africa and became the largest economy in Africa. He is truly a democrat to the core.
Childhood experiences and the impact of names	Emerged from a humble but disciplined family that started life from the grass root (community) hence, lived a humble and unassuming life style. The parents were visionary and prophetic thus; they called him Maddiba (a strange being) and Rolihlahla (trouble maker) in addition to his name. The struggles and battles he fought were geared towards the emancipation of his people and country. The initial difficulties of life never discouraged him. Indeed, he was truly a courageous and brave personality.	Started life from a rural community and went to primary school without shoes and school bags. Parents were humble and disciplined canoe carvers and palm-front harvesters in the community. They saw something great in their son and named him Azikiwe, after Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, Nigeria's first civilian President. Jonathan never allowed his circumstances to weigh him down but rather he became more resilient. He is indeed a destiny child who grew to the top by the divine grace of God Almighty.

Source: Kalama, Fieldwork 2018.

Conclusion

The study examined new trends in leadership and governance in Africa: The Jonathan – Mandela experience. The study adopted the conflict theory and qualitative research method as its theoretical framework and methodology to guide and give direction to the study. It was observed that the attitude, character and leadership style of some African leaders adversely affected the rate of development and governance structure of most African countries. In the same vein, new trends and perspective in leadership and governance in Nigeria, South Africa and some African countries emerge between 1990 and 2015 hence, leading to resistance against sit-tight leadership and voluntary relinquishing of political power for the overall interest and good of the state and citizens. Rather than engage in conflict in the process of seeking political power, the study posits that political power should be pursued peacefully and democratically for the good of all as demonstrated by the two outstanding African leaders cited in the study.

Recommendations

The following recommendations will go a long way in addressing the question of leadership, democracy and the democratization process in Africa:

1. The leadership recruitment process leading to elections should be made open, free, fair and transparent for citizens to participate freely hence, leaders in power without the mandate of their people should be banned from participating in regional and international organizations and meetings.
2. African states must develop indigenous leadership styles and development frameworks to avoid imperialism and interferences in the internal affairs of African states.
3. Centres and institutes for democratic studies should be established in honour of African leaders whose actions and policies have promoted and enhanced the rule of law, democracy and the democratic process in Africa. This will no doubt encourage young African leaders to also embrace democratic values and principles.
4. Erring leaders who have over stayed in power through military force or coercion should be sanctioned and removed from office without further delay to serve as a deterrent to others.
5. International grants and other forms of assistance should be extended to countries and leaders who adhere to democratic principles and ideals to serve as encouragement and motivation. Leaders of such countries should also be given international recognition and immunity as global citizens.
6. There is need for a review of the leadership recruitment process in most African states to ensure that persons who emerged through military and unconventional processes are compelled to embrace democracy and constitutional means approved by their people.

References

- Achebe, C. (1984). *The trouble with Nigeria*, London: Macmillan publishers.
- Adam, R. et al. (1993). *United Nations, divided world: The UN'S roles in international relations*, New York: Oxford University press.
- Akinyemi, B. (2016). *Ode to joy: Tribute to Sankara*, in The Nation Newspaper of Wednesday, 19th October, Lagos.
- Anti-Mubarak protesters hit back in *The Punch Newspaper* 17, (20) 812, 4th February, 2011.
- Ayandele, E. A. et al. (1971). *The growth of African civilization: The making of modern Africa*, London: Longman Group Ltd.
- ECOWAS (2010). Leaders recognize Quattara as Ivoirien president” in *The Punch Newspaper* 17(20) 756, 8 December,
- Gbagbo (2010). Must quit, Quattara tells Mbeki, in the *Daily Sun Newspaper* 6 (1938), 6
- Hayford, L. (2016). *Jonathan: A colossus at 49* in *The Source Magazine* of 11 December, Lagos: Nigeria
- Human Rights Watch (2018). *Cote d'Ivoire: No amnesty for serious crimes of 2010 – 2011 crisis*, <https://www.hrw.org/news/2018/08/07/cote-divoire-no-amnesty-serious-crimes-2010-11-crisis> Accessed 20/11/2018.
- Jonathan, G. E. (2015). Jonathan's next four years: my vision for a Nigeria that works for all, in *The Guardian Newspaper* of 25 March.
- Lessons from Cote d' Ivoire in the *Sunday Punch Newspaper* 17, (19616) 12 December, 2010.
- Nkrumah, K. (1965). *Neo-colonialism: The last state of imperialism*, London: Panaf Books.
- Nwankwo, P. (2017). *Goodluck Ebele Jonathan: The making of a statesman*. Garki 2, Abuja: Spot life Images Ltd.
- Omotor, D. G. et al. (2006). *Readings in conflict management and peace building in Africa*. Abraka: Delta State University press.
- Patrick, F.W. (2006). *In search of nationhood: The theory and practice of nationalism in Africa*, Zaria: Asekome & Co.publishers.
- Sesay, A. (2003). *Civil wars, child soldiers and post-conflict peace building in West Africa*, Ibadan: College press & publishers.

The ABC of FOI Bill, in *The Nation Newspaper of Thursday* 2 June, 2011.

UN asked Jonathan to intervene in Cote d' Ivoire crisis, in *The Punch Newspaper* 17, (20755) 7 December, 2010.

UN calls for immediate transition (2011). *The Punch Newspaper* 17(20), 813, 4 February

Uprising continues as protesters remain defiant (2011). *The Punch Newspaper* 17 (20), 813. 7 February,