JESUS' SERVANT LEADERSHIP IN AFRICAN PERSPECTIVE: AN EXPOSITORY ANALYSIS OF MARK 10:2-45 WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO NIGERIA

Oladosu, Samson Bisi (PhD)
Department of Islamic, Christian and Comparative Religious Studies, Kwara State University, Malete, P.M.B 1530, Ilorin, Kwara State
sambisidosu61@gmail.com
07033249214

Abstract

The alàrming poverty situation in Africa is a concern for everybody in Nigeria. It is no doubt the cause of socio-economic problems bedeviling Nigeria particularly in the areas of crime, militancy and religious insurgency. It has also resulted in the recent calls for restructuring of the country, making the 1914 amalgamation, a curse rather than a blessing, as a result of incessant leadership failure. This paper looks into Jesus' leadership style of serving his subject sacrificially rather than being served. Mark 10:2-45 is studied by way of exposition and compared with John 13:1–17 to reveal the six metaphors of a successful leader such as servant, scapegoat, shepherd, steward, student and salesperson as the overall secret of Jesus' successful leadership. The paper denounce "the hand in pocket" leadership style of Africa particularly in Nigeria where leadership is seen as means of grabbing the collective common wealth to the detriment of the populace. It recommends Jesus' servant leadership for sustainable development.

Keywords: Leadership, Sustainable Development, Servant, Insurgency, Restructuring

Introduction

The nature of man does not make characters to be easily discernable except when exposed to power, position and possibly women. New and Cormack describe power as one of the three dominant motivating factors that govern man in all he does[1]. And this is rightly corroborated by Paterson, while quoting Campolo as he observes that, "power is the basic drive of every human being... a game people play on continuous basis"[2]As essential as power is however, it must work synonymously with other concepts to operate. Such concepts include authority, position and leadership. As far as Youngblood is concerned, if power suggests physical strength, authority suggests a mental right or privilege[3]. Webster describes authority as the legal or rightful power; a right to command or to act[4]. Both power and authority must however depend on a person being placed in an advantage position to be exercised and whoever is concerned has been placed in a leadership position of power and authority.

Jesus' servant leadership is in focus in this paper because of the general but unconscious believe that to be bossy is also the same as being a leader. For example, Adebayo, Lawal and Isiag, while describing various devices of achieving set goals observe that a leader may compel the followers to action by persuasion, influence, power, threat, force and appealing to legitimate rights[5]. While these descriptions appear to be right in the surface, the inclusion of threat, force and legitimate rights make the power in use to be absolute. Such dictatorial traits would always lead to absolute corruption, injustice and rebellious. Leadership involves the ability to get things done through the assistance and cooperation of others. This is usually done by the use of motivating factors such as persuasion, sacrifice as well as Spartan and consistent exemplary attitudes and actions. Leadership is an art as well as a theoretical subject. It requires a practical and realistic approach. Otherwise, it becomes abstract, detached and idealistic. Theoretical leadership does not advance sustainable development.

Africa has a very conducive weather. It is arguably the richest continent with the most natural resources. Yet it grapples with the worst experiences of abject poverty with lowest life expectancy. Mills has an answer to the prevailing situations in Africa. According to him, African leadership has turned the continent into a chaotic wilderness without buildings, roads, hospitals, schools and every basic amenity that is found where proper leadership prevails[6]. He alluded to the frustration of an African tour guide in an African coastal city who showed the African American visitors "The door of no return," when they visited a slave castle. The door led to a deep sea where Africans were being transported to America as slaves. According to the guide, those who passed through the door either perished at the sea or die as slaves in America. Asked what the actions of contemporary Africans would look like if the repeat of slave trade presents itself again, he answered, "The ships would be filled to capacity and even sink from overloading. We would rush to get on board so that we could go to America as slaves[7]."

The answer of the tour guide captures the mind of millions of Africans who are running away from the harsh reality of situations in Africa. They are rushing to Europe and America on daily basis irrespective of whatever fate awaits them overseas. They prefer to be slaves with basic amenities than being in freedom with the attendant bondage. Curiously, it is not as if these basic amenities like schools, hospitals, electricity, and roads, to mention just a few, cannot be provided in the continent, but the resources to provide them have always been pocketed and kept in foreign bank accounts for the enjoyment of the few powerful aristocrats as well as their family members.

Jesus was a leader whose involvement in leadership encompasses all facets of human learning. He was a political, religious as well as economic leader. He occupied the office of a king who was a servant in his kingdom. The success of his leadership is seen in thousands of followers who voluntarily obeyed him and in millions all over the world who are still following him even after his demise. This paper looks at the character of Jesus and the nature of his leadership. It engages historical as well as analytical methods. By a comparative assessment of African leadership style, particularly, that of Nigeria, a

conclusion and recommendation would be drawn as legacy for African contemporary and future leadership particularly in politics, religion and educational system.

Jesus' Servant Leadership

Among the New Testament Bible writers, Mark is the one with the most practical approach to Jesus' description as the servant king. In the early years of the Church, the gospel of Mark seemed to be viewed as incongruous and anachronous. It was regarded as inferior when compared with the other gospels, due probably to its un-apostolic authorship, rough and ungrammatical use of language. Reprieve came its way in the 19th century when Bible scholars concluded that Mark was written first. It has since then been accepted as containing the uninterrupted facts about Jesus of Nazareth[8].

Ironically, Jesus did not refer to himself as a servant leader, neither was he referred to as one. However, the Gospel of Mark as used belowdepicts Jesus as a king who sets up a kingdom only to be the Chief Servant in it. Mark's several points of argument with particular reference to such theological concept as ransom is a clear allusion to the suffering servant, a prediction in some prophetic books especially Prophet Isaiah as would be seen later in his typological illustration. Buttressing the fact that Jesus attained true greatness through humble service, Maxwell opines thus: " ...As the book was written during a time of acute persecution cutting straight to the point and discussion Jesus' identity, the role of suffering and the necessity for faith, it paints a picture of Jesus as a servant leader"[9].

Chapter ten of the Gospel of Mark gives a vivid picture of Jesus' understanding and teachings in the nature of leadership. The chapter which ought to be describe as a scene of text and requests, occurred shortly after the public ministry of Jesus had just been transferred from Galilee to Judea. It would be recalled that Judea was Herod Antipas' jurisdiction with its love for power, affluence and opulence. Although, Martins describes the chapter as setting the stage for final drama of the crucifixion[10], it is indeed convenient to reveal that the "drama" addresses the avowed temptations of mankind, faced by the Judean Aristocrats namely, women, money and power.

Issues bordering on marriage are the first grey problems of leadership to be addressed in Mark 10:2-12. Although, the bible says the Pharisees, "came and tested him," the question itself was hostile, dangerous and self-serving. It was the misused of power by Herod that made John the Baptist to denounce his marriage to Herodias (Mk. 6:17-18). This rebuke resulted in one of the terrible injustices ever recorded in the New Testament, perpetrated by a leader who believed that he could use power and authority to treat his subjects as pawns as seen in the imprisonment and assassination of John. Undoubtedly, the Pharisees wanted to benefit from that unusual situation to get their target (Jesus) murdered in order to continue to be relevant in the practices of their misguided theocracy. Of course the Israelites' theocracy was not faulty by design; its operations became problematic by power tussles between the Pharisees and Sadducees, and by extension

through the Sanhedrin, not because of special love for their nation but for their personal aggrandizements.

Another issue of importance addressed is the place of wealth in man's total existence (Mark 10:17-31). Mark uses a man whom Luke and Matthew describe as a ruler (Lk. 18:18) and a youth (Matt. 19:22) respectively. This young ruler was so rich that he thought money could buy anything including the righteousness befitting God's kingdom. His reactions to Jesus' demand betrayed him as having placed wealth above God. This situation renders his request deceitful, insincere and self-centered. Since this leader neither has the fear of God nor believes in the wellbeing of others but his own welfare, he was out rightly condemned as unfit for leadership and a place in the kingdom of God.

The third issue addressed by Jesus is on the issue of power and authority through the request of James and John (Mk. 10:35-45). Wessel describes the request as preposterous and Carte blanche[11]. The potency of the foundational statement, "we want you to do for us whatever we ask" is so absurd and contrary to sincere reasoning. It is a desperate attempt to box Jesus into a tight corner. Were Jesus to commit himself, the carte blanche would have been reminiscent of a "blank cheque" Herod Antipas gave to the daughter of Herodias in Mark 6:22, "Ask me for anything you want and I will give it to you." As Hendriksen describes their action as "a method of striking while the iron was hot[12]", France says that their roundabout approach is self-centered[13]. He opines that it is the only time the two will feature together without Peter, a member, leader and spokesman of the inner circle of Jesus (cf Mk. 1:16-20; 29; 5:37; 9:2; 13:3; 14:33)[14].

Another episode to James and John's desperation for power is added by Matthew; "Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's children with her son's worshipping him and desiring a thing of him" (Matt. 20:20). Although Plumber, while alluding to tradition, says that the request looks like a mother's ambition[15], one would rather agree with Walvoord that the reason for going with their mother is essentially to use family ties to advance their cause, James and John being Jesus' cousins[16]. In worshipping him, they were sure Jesus must be a king, thought at present in disguise[17]. And going by the opinion of Edmund, Salome (the mother) was so convinced that Jesus as a mighty monarch has a huge authority to grant any request without limitation[18], and being a sister of Jesus' mother (Jn. 19:25), it might not be bad if the second and third most powerful positions are reduced to family affairs in the form of a dynasty.

Secondly, Salome's inclusion by her sons might not be unconnected with the perceived urgency, like the potency of the request. The "then" that introduces the episode in Mark 10:35 comes out of Jesus' allusion to his passion. The passion prediction that preceded the request is about the third and probably the most elaborate (Mk. 8:31ff and 9:30ff). The disciples were being led to Jerusalem by Jesus himself to face the final battle. The events of the battle are to lead to his eventual glory, a means to greater status and privilege in a royal kingdom. Should this be so, James and John were interested in

securing positions of prominence in the about-to-be-revealed kingdom, hence the request, "let one of us sits at your right and the other at your left in your glory" (Mark. 10:37).

Two things were however lost to James and John and possibly to their mother, hence the desperation. The first are the events that would lead to this cherished crown such as betraying, mocking, spitting on, flogging and eventual death. Or probably, they knew but could not believe why a king has to suffer such pains in his own kingdom and by his own subjects. That must have led to the sharp but penetrating answer by Jesus, "You don't know what you are asking for."

Secondly, they might have forgotten or unmindful of Jesus' initial emphasis that in his kingdom, greatness is measured by the yardstick of humility (Matt. 18:1-4), that trusting fully in the Lord, denying oneself and giving instead of getting is the mark of his true followers (Matt. 19:21) and Jesus teachings constantly reinforced by the exemplary life of Christ himself based on the willingness to be least in the kingdom (Matt. 12:15-21, Lk. 22:27) is actually the surest road to the kingship. Selfishly the two brothers carefully evaded the accompanied suffering and sacrifices and desperately accepted to bare the outstanding consequence. With Jesus' seal, James died while John suffers banishment to the Island of Patmos. Unfortunately, France remarks that going by the reaction of the rest disciples; they were as guilty as the first two[19].

The reaction of the other disciples appears confusing. One is likely to take their anger as a justifiable one in an attempt to repudiate the self-centered attitude of their colleagues. But Jesus was not deceived. He knew that rather than being in his support against the other two, they were indeed fending for themselves. For instance, the "*aganakteo*" which Jesus used to respond to the disciples' churlish treatment of children in Mark 10:14 is repeated here as a direct disapproval of their reaction. This open rebuke cannot be said to be addressed to James and John only, but to the whole lot. It goes to show that the other disciples were angry at the way and manner James and John tried to double cross them into grapping the best positions and which of course they themselves might have been longing for.

Typology of Servant Leadership in the Prophets

In the book of Isaiah, the term could be viewed in three significant ways. First, the servant is used to designate individuals who are clearly named such as Isaiah (Is. 20:3), Eliakim (Is. 22:20), David (Is. 37:35) and Moses (Is. 63:11). Secondly, it is used to designate the entire Israel as a Nation (Is. 41:8-9). The third designation is however found in the popular servant songs (Is. 42:1-4, 49:1-6, 50:4-9, 52:13 and 53:12) where the term servant is a clear reference to an unnamed individual.

To identify this unnamed servant king, Alexander uses four descriptive illustrations[20]. In the first instance, this servant was to come from a royal root in the lineage of David (Is. 37:35, I Sam. 23:10, I Kings 3:6, Psalms 78:70 and Jer. 33:21). Secondly the servant was to be endowed with the spirit of God (Is. 42:1), perhaps reminiscence of the empowerment of Saul and David as the anointed king (I Sam. 10:10ff, 16:13 cf. Is. 11:1-

3-4). In the third description, a clear term of reference is rolled out to the servant king. He ... to bring justice to the nation (Is. 442:3). In the fourth and the final, in order to fulfill this term of reference, the servant king would be persecuted, hated and destroyed and it is on account of this that he would be raised, lifted up and be exalted. Isaiah 49:7 read thus:

> Not only will the servant be raised and lifted up and exalted, but God promises," I will give him a portion among the great and he will divide the spoils with the strong. God says to him who was despised and abhorred by the nation, to the servant rulers, king will see you and rise up, prince will see and bow down because of the Lord who is faithful, the Holy one of the Israel, who has chosen you (cf Is. 52:13 and 53:12).

Most Bible scholars would agree that most prophets of Israel were to guide the nation to be on the lookout for the Messiah. Majority of them operated during the spiritual, economic and political anarchies, a direct result of bad leadership of Israel's Kings most of who were rejected in the theocratic order of God. As a result of their rejection, Northern Kingdom of Israel went into permanent extinction, while the southern kingdom of Judah had to struggle with chaos, national deterioration and political ruin. Prophets such as Amos and Habakkuk saw the violence, oppression, strife and plunder that prevailed around and cried out against their leaders. The powerlessness of the law and crookedness of justice did not subside, hence, the cry for the advent of the Messiah. Though when Jesus eventually came, the Israelites were unable to recognize him. The Gospel of Mark has therefore shown the climax of how Jesus fits the typology of the servant Messiah.

Jesus Servant Leadership in Action

In the 48 laws of power, Robert Greene opines that:

> When you are trying to impress people with words, the more you say, the more common you appear and the less in control, even when you are saying something banal, it will seem original if you make it vague, open-ended and sphinx like. Powerful people impress and intimidate by saying less...[21].

Unlike typical African rulers with the common trait of loquaciousness and mendaciousness, Jesus was a leader with view words and many actions. This, like in many other passages, is commonly observed in the Gospel of John 13:1-17 usually dubbed, "Jesus washes his disciples' feet". This passage has a strong connection with Mark's treated episode in many ways. Although, John does not tell us where the incident took place, according to the description of Henri, we can assume that it took place in the upper room spoken of in Mark 14:14-15 and Luke 22:10-12[22]. Secondly, John alludes to Passover feast. Aside from the disagreement over the day – whether Thursday or Friday and the date whether 14^{th} – 15^{th} or 15^{th} – 16^{th} of Nisan in the Jewish calendar according to Ngewa, both John, Mark and Luke agree that the feast was indeed Jesus' last supper with his disciples, an outstanding event in the passion week[23]. And lastly, while Matthew ties

the event to James and John's mother's request, Luke ties it to a previous argument among the disciples as read thus:

> Also a dispute arose among them as to which of them was considered to be greatest. Jesus said to them "The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them; and those who exercise authority over them call themselves Benefactors. But you are not to be like that. Instead, the greatest among you should be like the youngest, and the one who rules like that one who serves (Lk. 22:24-26 c. Mat 25:28).

In what Hendriksen describes as unforgettable paradox[24], Jesus is saying that the pursuit of greatness is exactly the opposite of what is obtainable in the modern world. According to him, the modern man engages in tremendous struggle to reach the top, after which he looks down upon others and holds down all those below him in his lofty perch. In washing the disciples feet (cf. Jn. 13:1-17), Jesus is demonstrating the characteristic of good leadership in humility and service.

John does this by displaying Jesus with the most characteristic manner of a slave. According to him, Jesus got up, took off his outer clothing, wrapped a towel around his waist, poured water into a basin, washed his disciples' feet and dried them with the towel. All the actions are in the historical present because they are everyday actions that anyone might do. The exceptions are the wrapping of towel around himself in the place of his outer tunic and washing and drying his disciples' feet. Those unusual actions are put in aorist tense to proof that Jesus actually did them by adopting slave's clothing and doing Jobs meant for a hired slave, which Donald Carson says were the norms in the classical Jewish system[25]. The prompting of Jesus for those actions are borne out of love, humilities and the need to teach the disciples, who would soon assume the positions of leadership not only to adopt his style but to always put their words into actions for the common good of their followers. The disciples were aware that Jesus' outer tunic commonly called *Chalouk* was too expensive for a slave. The normal dress for a slave is called *Sag*, that is, inner tunic and a towel around the waist. For Jesus to have done that, the focus definitely was on service to each other in love and humility.

Power Tussle in Nigeria

It is no doubt embarrassing that Nigeria as a nation has been crawling economically, physically and spiritually despite the fact of her abundant resources. It has in fact reached an alarming situation that government at all levels is finding it difficult to discharge her constitutional responsibilities to Nigerians. This has resulted into unprecedented level of poverty never witnessed in decades. The most important reason for this could not be divorced from bad leadership exacerbated by corrupt individuals who have always found themselves in power, making virtually all systems unworkable no matter how well structured the progressive indices placed on board for an enduring all- embracive developments are.

The developed countries of the world have unique political and economic histories for their rapid developments. These histories are built around the insistence of their people that those who govern them must be accountable for their actions. The Magna Charta in Britain, the French Revolution and the America war of independence are important landmarks in their struggles for responsive and responsible governments[26]. A government that allows accountability in public life would not always take her citizens for granted in a daring manner. She would therefore exercise power fairly and equitably, have respect for the rule of law and order, and utilize the common wealth of her people efficiently and responsibly. To be accountable also, is to understand that to be in authority is to be answerable to people. With the awareness that power and resources belong to the people, the user ought to ensure that the delegated power is not used contrary to the requirements of ethics, morality and spirituality.

Again, human nature makes accountability of utmost importance. Power is subject to abuse and when it is used absolutely, the tendency to misuse it becomes more overwhelming. A former Irish Prime Minister, Garret Fitzgerald, highlighted this much during an interview in answer to a question as to whether Lord Acton was wrong to have said that "power tends to corrupt". In his reply, Fitzgerald said:

> ...oh, I think it does tend to corrupt, but it does not need to do so. And in any event, the checks and balances of the democratic system as we know it here are such that the opportunities to abuse power are fortunately few, and not everybody has the instinct to want to abuse power anyway...[27].

Fitzgerald was categorical about the rare cases of abuse of power in Europe due to their leaders' attitude to politics. Can the same scenario be observed in Africa, particularly in Nigeria, where authority is used as a means for economic emancipation and self-perpetuation?

Claude Ake, once said "To have democracy, we must have democrats"[28]. We may not have enough yardsticks to determine whether there are more or less leaders in the West than elsewhere who might want to abuse delegated powers; It is however self-evident that the political elites in Europe and America subject themselves to the rule of democratic norms and usually embrace political culture where the fortunate ones regard themselves only as first among equals. Under this arrangement, politics would be played as a social contract between the electorate and the elected. It would therefore be compulsory for the electorates' votes to count. Manipulation of any kind, falsification of results, ballot box snatching, ballot stuffing, dodgy ballots, inaccurate tallies, scandalous disregard for basic decency, criminal intimidation, deployment of terminal violence, with the security and electoral officials being outrageously compromised- all clear signs of leadership impositions would clearly be out of place. Unlike Nigeria, executive councils would not fill the legislative councils with party members without a single member of the opposition parties as it is in many states in the contemporary times. Religious sentiments would never be allowed to replace merit in the appointments and enjoyments of democratic academic dividends.

Lamenting the dearth of objective and progressive leadership in Nigeria, Marijata opines

> In a way, we are in the sorry past, the veritable ditch in which we are marooned today, because elections have largely been a farce in post-colonial Nigeria and the votes of real human beings who take the trouble to go to polling booths to make their electoral choices between contending parties and candidates do not count. It is the will of conscienceless politicians who employ thugs to snatch and stuff ballot boxes, hijack the police to do their bidding...that count to the detriment both of democracy and development[29].

This is much supported by Tatalo Alamu in an article entitled, "A Congolese allegory for Nigeria" as he observes that:

> Nigeria and Congo are often compared. In terms of land mass, both are giant colonial contraptions whimsically and willfully carved out from the heart of Africa by the colonial masters. The two African mammoths are among the most richly endowed nations on earth, Nigeria's mineral wealth the stuff of legend while Congo has been described as "a huge country ridiculously endowed with natural resources". But both are prone to man-made misfortunes and human disasters in the guise of rulers[30]

Also to be compulsorily made available in a democracy of democrats is political and financial accountability. Although, within a simple democratic trust, accountability is usually discretional, where in those who exercise political power respond to the wishes of the people as a matter of morality and politically ideological commitment rather than on grounds of law. Since such is usually difficult to obtain by human nature, mandatory political and financial accountability is put in place. This ensures arrangement for limitation of governmental power and ensures that those who exercise power do it with restraints. This goes to buttress Arthur Lewis as he opines that:

> ...the essence of political democracy is that politicians are subordinate to the public in whom are vested the fundamental rights of free criticism, opposition and dismissal. A political system in which the public surrenders these rights to a political party must have the same evil results as an economic system in which the market is subordinate to a guild of businessmen[31].

As good as Arthur Lewis' opinion is, it is empirically deferent from what is obtainable in Nigeria democracy where politicians are the lords of manor. The mind bugling corruptions and monumental thefts being exposed to the public by the present government show clearly that Nigerians were being sold to the slave market on daily basis ironically by those who sworn to protect their interests. They live such a life style to prove that rather than being servant leaders, they are the masters of the electorates who have no rights to ask them for accountability.

Conclusion

Africa is a continent of deep religiosity and with her favourable weather and abundant human and natural resources, she deserves the best in the committee of continents. But her leaders' "hand in pocket" style of leadership according to Adeyemo,[32] is in conflict with Christ like leadership style, hence her underserved underdevelopment particularly as it concerns Nigeria. This "hand in pocket style" presupposes that leaders ought to be served by his or her subjects instead of the other way round.

The hand in pocket leadership style of African leaders has equally replaces the African emphasis on seasoned knowledge of life, wisdom and communalism with pride, arrogance and a deep focus on position, privileges, power and money. It is also in conflict with the biblical leadership qualities, represented by six major metaphors of servant (Lk. 22:24-27); scapegoat (John 11:50); shepherd (Acts 20:28); steward (ii Tim.1:11-14); student (Acts: 20:17-21) and salesperson (ii Tim. 1:6-7). As a servant, a leader waits on others while he/she carries others burden and punishment as scapegoat. As a shepherd, he or she cares for and protects the sheep while taking care of others valuables as a steward. He or she also listens to and learns from others as a student even as he or she motivates and inspires others as a salesperson. The apparent lack of these leadership qualities in Nigeria has resulted in the recent and louder crying for the nation's restructuring, a system that would allow for regional control of resources and lesser powers at the center[33]. According to Gbadegesin,

> The cacophony of divergent voices regarding its (Nigeria) true character is too deafening to be ignored by rational minds. Assume that Boko Haram is a fanatical jihadist insurgency without an ethnic or tribal coloration, both the indigenous people of Biafra (IPOB) and Niger Delta Avengers (NDA) have not been ambiguous in the objective of their struggle. Neither of these groups feels a sense of belonging to the Nigerian nation[34].

Jesus epitomizes those quality traits, uses himself as examples and beckons on all whether in Government, church, community, associations and parastatals to follow suit for an enduring hope and progress.

Endnotes

1. George New and David Cormack, *Why did I do that? Understanding and Mastering your Motive*, London: Holdder and Strongton, 1977), 35.
2. Richard Patterson, *Effectively Leading: A Guide for all Church leaders,* (Schaumburg: Oasis International Ltd, 1962), 66.
3. Ronald Youngblood, *Nelson's New Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, (Nashville: Thomas Nelson publishers, 1985), 1021.
4. Merriam Webster, "*Authority*" in Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, (Springfield: G&C Merriam Co. publishers, 1951), 60.
5. Adebayo, T. A.; Lawal, R. T. and Isaig, S. S.*An Introduction to Theory and Practice of Educational Management.* (Ilorin: Delma and Sons Printing Press. 2008), 31.

6. Dag Heward-Mill, *The Art of Leadership*, (Benin City: Hosanna Christian Book shop and Publishing House, 2012), 25.
7. *ibid*.
8. Stephen Short, "*Mark*" in The International Bible Commentary, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan publishing House, 1986), 1156.
9. John Maxwell, *The Maxwell Leadership Bible*, (Illinois: Thomas Nelson Bibles, 2002), 1196
10. Raph P. Martins, *New Testament Foundations*, (Grand Rapids: WMB Eerdmans Pub. CO., 1994), 191.
11. Walter Wessel, "*Mark*" in The Expositor's Bible Commentary, ed. K.L Barker and J.R Kohlen-Berger111, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 177.
12. William Hendricksen, *New Testament Commentary: The Gospel of Mark*, (Edinbugh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1975), 409.
13. R.T France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, (Grand Rapids: WMB Eerdmans Pub. Co., 2002), 415.
14. *ibid*.
15. Alfred Plumber, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983), 152.
16. John Walvoord, "*Mark*" in The Bible Knowledge Commentary, (Granada: Victor Books, 1983), 152.
17. *ibid*.
18. Edmund Hiebert, *Mark, a Portrait of the Servant*, (Chicago: Moody Press, 1974), 257.
19. R.T France, 418.
20. T.D Alexander, *The Servant King*, (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980), 108-110.
21. Robert Greene, *The 48 Laws of Power*, (New York: Penguin Books, 1998), 31.
22. Daniel-Rops Henri, *Daily Life in the time of Jesus*, (Ann Arbor: Servant Books, 1980), 221.
23. Samuel M. Ngewa, *The Gospel of John*, (Nairobi: Evangel Publishing House, 2003), 396.
24. William Hendrichsen, *New Testament Commentary*: Matthew, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973), 748.
25. Donald A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 463.
26. G.O Ijewere, " *African Governments and the Concept of Accountability." A paper presented at the Yakubu Gowon Center*, (Abuja, 7th July, 2000), 3.
27. Garret Fitzgerald, " *Interview with Geoffrey Stern*", (London: School of Economics Magazine, July, 1990). 32.
28. Claude Ake, *Democracy and Development in Africa*, (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1996), 2.
29. Marijata, " *Illuminations: That Every Vote Must Count*", (The Nation Newspaper, April 25, 2009), 56.
30. Tatalo Alamu, " *A Congolese allegory for Nigeria*"; (The Nation Newspaper, May 29, 2016), 3.
31. Arthur Lewis, *Politics in West Africa*, (London: George Allen and Unwin limited, 1965), 62-63.
32. Tokunbo Adeyemo, "*Leadership" in Africa Bible Commentary*, (Nairobi: WorldAlive Publishers, 2006), 546.
33. Femi Orebe, "*The increasing call for restructuring Nigeria*", (The Nation Newspaper, June 19, 2016), 16.
34. Segun Gbadegesin, "*What makes a nation*?", (The Nation Newspaper, June 24, 2016), 48.

Bibliography

New, George and David Cormack, *Why did I do that? Understanding and mastering your motive*. London: Holdder and Strongton, 1977

Adebayo, T. A.; Lawal, R. T. and Isaig, S. S. An Introduction to Theory and Practice of Educational Management. Ilorin: Delma and Sons Printing Press, 2008

Adeyemo, Tokunbo "Leadership" in Africa Bible Commentary, Nairobi: World Alive Publishers, 2006.

Ake, Claude. *Democracy and Development in Africa*, Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1996

Alamu, Tatalo " A Congolese allegory for Nigeria", The Nation Newspaper, May 29, 2016

Alexander, T.D. *The Servant King*, Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980

Carson, Donald A. *The Gospel According to John*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991

Fitzgerald, Garret " Interview with Geoffrey Stern", London: School of Economics Magazine. July, 1990

France, R.T. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, Grand Rapids: WMB Eerdmans Pub. Co., 2002

Greene, Robert. *The 48 Laws of Power*, New York: Penguin Books, 1998

Heibert, Edmund.*Mark, a Portrait of the Servant*, Chicago: Moody Press, 1974.

Hendrichsen, William. *New Testament Commentary: Matthew*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973.

Hendricksen, William. *New Testament Commentary: The Gospel of Mark*,Edinbugh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1975

Henri, Daniel-Rops. Daily Life in the time of Jesus, Ann Arbor: Servant Books, 1980.

Heward-Mill, Dag. *The Art of Leadership*. Benin City: Hosanna Christian Book shop and Publishing House, 2012.

Ijewere. G.O " African Governments and the Concept of Accountability." A paper presented at the Yakubu Gowon Center, (Abuja, 7th July, 2000)

Lewis, Arthur.*Politics in West Africa*, London: George Allen and Unwin limited, 1965.

Marijata, " Illuminations: That Every Vote Must Count", The Nation Newspaper, April 25, 2009

Martins, Ralph P.*New Testament Foundations*, Grand Rapids: WMB Eerdmans Pub. CO., 1994

Maxwell, John.*The Maxwell Leadership Bible*,Illinois: Thomas Nelson Bibles, 2002

Ngewa, Samuel M. *The Gospel of John*, Nairobi: Evangel Publishing House, 2003

Orebe, Femi. "The increasing call for restructuring Nigeria", The Nation Newspaper, June 19, 2016

Patterson, Richard. *Effectively Leading: A Guide for all Church leaders*, Schaumburg: Oasis International Ltd, 1962.

Plumber, Alfred. *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983

Segun, Gbadegesin. "What makes a nation?", The Nation Newspaper, June 24, 2016

Short, Stephen. "Mark" in *The International Bible Commentary*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan publishing House, 1986

Walvoord, John "Mark" in *The Bible Knowledge Commentary*, Canada: Victor Books,1983

Webster,Merriam. " Authority" in *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*, Springfield: G&C Merriam Co. Publishers, 1951.

Wessel, Walter. "Mark" in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed. K.L Barker and J.R Kohlen-Berger111, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994

Youngblood, Ronald. *Nelson's New Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, Nashville: Thomas Nelson publishers, 1985.