Preliminary Draft: Do Not Cite

Creating Effective Governance and Leadership for Sustained National Prosperity

Professor Chukwuma C. Soludo, CFR
Governor, Central Bank of Nigeria

Being Draft of a Presentation as Part of the 12th Murtala Muhammed Memorial Lecture, delivered at the ECOWAS Auditorium, Abuja: February 12, 2007.

I: Introduction

I am grateful to the organizers of the Murtala Muhammed Memorial Lecture for the invitation to participate in this panel presentation on "Exemplary Governance through Leadership", to mark the 12th of the lecture series. I must confess that I have disobeyed the instruction to deliver the presentation in Powerpoint. As I struggled with the materials for my presentation, I thought that given the short time period for my intervention, it might be more useful to write down a few points I won't have the time to elaborate in a PowerPoint presentation. I regret any errors or incoherence of the paper as I only hurriedly put down my thoughts yesterday.

I am particularly glad to be invited to participate in the celebration of Nigeria's heroes. Reading through the life and history of Murtala Muhammed, and also his first address as the new Head of State on July 30, 1975, you cannot but agree that he was a man of immense courage. As an analyst summarized about his regime, "in a short time, Murtala Muhammed's policies won him broad popular support, and his decisiveness elevated him to the status of a national hero". The organizers deserve special commendation not only for recognizing this hero, but for doing what is not common here in Nigeria---- celebrating our heroes. As a people, we must learn to celebrate the best among us, for by so doing, we also celebrate the best in ourselves.

The theme of this panel presentation is "Exemplary Governance through Leadership". Together with my two co-panelists (Mallam Nasir el-Rufai, OFR; and Prof. Dora Akunyili, OFR) we are expected to share some perspectives on the subject, probably drawing from our individual experiences. Without knowing what my co-panelists will focus upon, I have rather chosen to focus my short intervention on how to create or mainstream effective governance and leadership for national prosperity. I focus narrowly on 'national' or 'public' governance and leadership and do not cover 'corporate governance and leadership'. I have also chosen not to dwell so much on personal examples (as I hope my co-panelists will cover) but on broad issues of highlighting the complex interrelationships between effective governance and leadership, and also between both variables on the one hand and national prosperity on the other. I argue that the critical challenge we face as a nation today is how to create or mainstream some irreducible minimum standards of governance infrastructure that will promote the emergence of developmentalist leadership and hence ensure sustained prosperity in Nigeria. My aim is to provoke debate rather than proffer solutions.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II clarifies the context, and meaning of Governance and Leadership as used in this paper. In Section III, we examine the extent to which Governance and Leadership matter for national prosperity and illustrate with some Nigerian case studies. Section IV provokes debate on the challenge of mainstreaming effective governance and leadership for prosperity. We conclude in Section V.

II: Understanding Governance and Leadership

At the outset, we need to set the boundaries of our discourse. First, our focus is not on corporate governance (which is a broad and important subject), but on national governance and leadership. Second, we see the primary objective of such national governance and leadership as that of creating environment for shared national prosperity. For a firm or corporation, leadership is about value creation or increasing the firm's competitive advantage in the market place. Leadership in the broadest sense is the ability to bring people together to dedicate themselves to the pursuit of a common goal. Such goals are often defined by the organization, firm or nation, and in some cases, the leader actually envisions such goals and motivates/mobilizes people and materials to attain them.

Governance and leadership are closely related but also different. Different definitions and concepts of governance and leadership exist. Here, we adopt a rather operational meaning of both. While governance may be broadly defined as "the traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised", leadership itself is the act of exercising that authority. We shall argue later that both governance and leadership are so intricately related that one circumscribes the other.

In a very important empirical work, Kaufmann, Kraay, and Mastruzzi (2004: 2-4) construct six aggregate governance indicators motivated by the definition above. Governance as traditions and institutions by which authority is exercised include: the process by which governments are selected, monitored and replaced; the capacity of the government to effectively formulate and implement sound policies; and the respect of citizens and the state for the institutions that govern economic and social interactions among them. Operationally, the six aggregate indicators of good governance are shown in Box 1 below.

BOX 1: SIX AGGREGATE INDICATORS OF GOOD GOVERNANCE

(i) Voice and Accountability:

This includes a number of indicators measuring various aspects of the political process, civil liberties and political rights. They measure the extent to which citizens of a country are able to participate in the selection of governments, and also measure the independence of the media.

(ii) Political Stability and Absence of Violence

This combines many indicators measuring perceptions of the likelihood that the government in power will be destabilized or overthrown by possibly unconstitutional and/or violent means--- including domestic violence and terrorism. The higher the uncertainties faced by the political process the more likely the quality of governance is compromised.

(iii) Government Effectiveness

This measures the quality of public service provision, the quality of the bureaucracy, the competence of civil servants, the independence of the civil service from political pressures, and the credibility of the government's commitment to policies. Emphasis here is on 'inputs' required for the government to be able to produce and implement good policies and deliver public goods.

(iv) Regulatory Quality or Soundness of Policies

This focuses on the soundness of policies pursued by government. It measures the extent of market unfriendly policies such as price controls, inadequate bank supervision, regulatory burdens imposed on foreign trade (customs and ports regimes) and business development (cost of doing business), soundness of the macroeconomic policies (fiscal and monetary policies); etc.

(v) Rule of Law

Measures the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society. The indicators here measure the success of a nation in developing an environment in which fair and predictable rules form the basis for economic and social interactions, and crucially, the extent to which property rights are protected. Indicators here include perceptions of the incidence of crime, the effectiveness and predictability of the judiciary, and the enforceability of contracts.

(vi) Control of Corruption

Indicators here measure the perceptions of corruption.

What is obvious is that aggregating these six clusters of governance indicators and pronouncing a judgment on whether a particular regime is 'exemplary' or not is not easy. It depends on who is judging, what weights are attached to each of the clusters, and what outcomes that are focused upon. Somehow, exemplary governance, like beauty, is in the eyes of the beholder. For many analysts and especially in a developing country context, it is unlikely that a regime will emerge as 'exemplary' on all the six clusters. Exemplary is therefore a relative concept. Even for developed countries, it all depends on what one is interested in. There are still many critics of Pinochet, Margaret Thatcher, Ronald Reagan, Lee Kuan Yew; etc for failing in one or some aspects of the governance indicators. For the purposes of our discourse however, the key issue is whether the aggregate governance indicators improved significantly and whether such governance has significantly strengthened the foundations for current and future prosperity of the nation.

Leadership as stated earlier is the act of mobilizing to get things done. University and Executive Management courses on Leadership are replete with myriad definitions of leadership, the key habits or attributes of effective leadership and even some self-help tips on how to 'lead' your organizations to success. 'Change Leaders' are often said to have certain key attributes some of which include unusual capacities to: envision and plan; and courage and commitment to implement --- the 'execution advantage'. Heifetz and Linsky (2002: 3-4*),* *Leadership on the Line: Staying Alive through the Dangers of Leading* suggest that to lead means putting yourself and your ideas on the line, responding effectively to the risks, and living to celebrate the meaning of your efforts. According to the authors:

> *To lead is to live dangerously because when leadership counts, when you lead people through difficult change, you challenge what people hold dear--- their daily habits, tools, loyalties, and ways of thinking--- with nothing more to offer than a possibility. Moreover, leadership often means exceeding the authority you are given to tackle the challenge at hand. People push back when you disturb the personal and institutional equilibrium they know. And people resist in all kinds of creative and unexpected ways that can get you taken out of the game: pushed aside, undermined, or eliminated*.

History books are full of accounts of the dangers of leadership and many people who paid the ultimate sacrifice for daring to provide leadership. Murtala Muhammed is one such example.

The literature is also full of the essential steps in leading change. In the January 2007 edition of the Harvard Business Review (p.99), eight key steps are identified as critical for Change leaders to succeed, and they are as shown in Box 2 below.

BOX 2: EIGHT STEPS FOR TRANSFORMATIVE LEADERSHIP

1. *Establishing a sense of Urgency:*
   - Examining market competitive realities
   - Identifying and discussing crises, potential crises, or major opportunities
2. *Forming a Powerful Guiding Coalition*
   - Assembling a group with enough power to lead the change effort
   - Encouraging the group to work together as a team
3. *Creating a Vision*
   - Creating a vision to help direct the change effort
   - Developing strategies for achieving that vision
4. *Communicating the Vision*
   - Using every vehicle possible to communicate the new vision and strategies
   - Teaching new behaviors by the example of the guiding coalition
5. *Empowering Others to Act on the Vision*
   - Getting rid of obstacles to change
   - Changing systems or structures that seriously undermine the vision
   - Encouraging risk taking and nontraditional ideas, activities, and actions
6. *Planning for and Creating Short-Term Wins*
   - Planning for Visible performance improvements
   - Creating those improvements
   - Recognizing and rewarding employees involved in the improvements
7. *Consolidating improvements and Producing Still More Change*
   - Using increased credibility to change systems, structures, and policies that don't fit the vision
   - Hiring, promoting, and developing employees who can implement the vision
   - Reinvigorating the process with new projects, themes, and change agents
8. *Institutionalizing New Approaches*
   - Articulating the connections between the new behaviors and corporate success
   - Developing the means to ensure leadership development and succession.

I am sure many of us who have had to lead successful transformations of organizations have (knowingly or unknowingly) followed these steps. The puzzle however is: if the "leadership steps" can easily be followed in a cook book fashion, why hasn't every head of an organization become a great leader? Why do different people, faced with similar challenges (even with same cook book steps on what to do) end up with dramatically different results?

This raises the old question as to whether leaders are born or can be made. Another, subtly different question is whether leadership is endogenous to the system, that is, whether it is true that every society gets the type of leadership that it deserves. According to this school of thought, leadership is endogenous, depending on a society's values, level of development, quality of institutions, etc. If leadership is a 'representative' of the larger society, it then follows that it is an embodiment of the society's virtues and vices. Since one cannot give what one doesn't have, it follows that leadership *evolves* in accordance with existing dominant structures and interests and cannot be expected to go beyond them. On the other hand, a different view believes that leadership can be *exogenous*- either able to convince or mobilize the society towards higher or different interests or is able to emerge in spite of the major interests and determined to wheel the society towards a different direction. This is the super man concept--- leaders possessing characteristics beyond the norms of the society and therefore able to provide 'leadership to a new society'. These are individuals possessing characteristics that often transcend the society's level of consciousness---- such people said to have 'come before their time'. The issue with the exogenous view is that the society can only depend on luck or chance event to get a good leader. The jury is still out on which view correctly describes the reality about the emergence of good leadership. While we await the final answers from the Sociologists, it is evident from history that both models--- the evolutionary and revolutionary concepts of leadership abound. We will however return to a slightly different issue of the relationship between governance institutions and leadership.

III: Does Governance and Leadership Matter for Prosperity?

In a public lecture at Benin City last year, the Togolese President stated what might seem to be an empirical relationship between governance and national development. According to him, every one year of bad governance retards national development by ten years. Is this assertion corroborated by empirical evidence?

It must be admitted that while a growing literature concludes that governance institutions are critical for growth, there are also some who question both the governance measures and the empirical results. For example, Kurtz and Schrank (2005: 23) *("Growth and Governance: Models, Measures, and Mechanisms")* conclude as follows:

The balance of the evidence available to date leaves us with two imperfect conclusions. Either we cannot reasonably conclude that improvements in governance produce meaningful increases in the rate of economic growth, or the absence of such an observed connection implies that our conceptualization and measurement of governance is as of yet quite imperfect. We remain agnostic as to which (or perhaps both?) is true, but have sought to make the case that the oft-asserted connection between growth and governance lies on exceedingly shaky empirical pilings. At the same time, potentially flawed indicators of governance quality are being utilized by policymakers to condition development aid and shape development efforts. But until we know more about what is (and is not) malgovernance, and the process by which it can be cured, such conditionality may do more harm than good.

The point that needs emphasis here is that almost all existing measures of governance that exist today are subjective and based mostly on perceptions. Kaufmann, Kraay, etal however show that there is no better measure and that in the end, perceptions matter. It is important to always bear this point in mind--- that measurement of governance is still controversial.

The various studies by the World Bank (especially in the last seven years) and the work of many independent scholars emphatically conclude that good governance is a major determinant of economic progress. For Sub-Saharan Africa, Ndulu and O'Connell (1999) ("Governance and Growth in Sub-Saharan Africa": *Journal of Economic Perspectives*) suggest that a major explanation for Africa's growth shortfall lies in the political economy literature. Governance models practiced in much of Africa are seen as the key explanatory variable for Africa's underdevelopment. In cross-country studies, Kaufmann and Kraay (2003) find that per capita incomes and the quality of governance are strongly positively correlated across countries. They however find two interesting results. First, there is a strong positive causal effect running from better governance to higher per capita incomes; and second, a weak and even negative causal effect running in the opposite direction from per capita incomes to governance. According to the authors, the first result confirms existing evidence on the importance of good governance for economic development. The second result is new and suggests the absence of 'virtuous circles' in which higher incomes lead to further improvements in governance. Put in a simple language: the second result shows that bad governance is possible even in rich societies or that higher per capita income is not a guarantee for good governance. A clear evidence of this is demonstrated by the authors with examples from some Latin American countries.

However, it might be too early to conclude from the lone work of the authors that prosperity does not increase the quality of governance. My view is that this is issue needs further empirical scrutiny. It is common sense that prosperity creates a demand for effective governance and leadership. The middle class that is the bastion of good governance is a consequence of shared prosperity.

The message that has emerged so far is that however subjectively measured, indicators of governance are at best positively correlated with growth. A lot of work remains to be done on the measurement of governance.

What about national leadership? Do leaders make a difference with regard to national growth? What is the relationship between governance and leadership?

An important paper by Jones and Olken (2005) ("Do Leaders Matter? National Leadership and Growth Since World War II"; *Quarterly Journal of Economics*) provides great insights on the subject. The authors (pp.4-6) review the historical (albeit, unsettled) debate about the role of individual leaders in national development. Extreme views abound. Tolstoy's historical theory is very dismissive of leaders, seeing so-called historic figures as mere ex-post justifications for events wholly beyond any individual's influence (Berlin, 1978). Karl Marx, in his Eighteeenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon (Marx 1852) allows some minimal role for leaders but argues that leaders must choose from a historically determined set of choices, which means that they have much less freedom to act than they think they do. More broadly, Marx's materialist dialectic inspires many to see the contest of social or economic forces trumping the roles of individuals. To Tolstoy, Marx, and others, leaders typically claim immodest powers although they are in fact of little consequence. A more modern view of leadership in the psychology literature considers the very idea of powerful leaders as a social myth, embraced to satisfy individuals' psychological needs.

Other extreme views see individuals as the decisive influences in history--- the so-called "Great Man" view. From this perspective, the evolution of history is largely determined by the idiosyncratic, causative influences of certain individuals, and perhaps a very small number. To illustrate this extreme viewpoint, the British historian John Keegan has argued that the political history of the twentieth century can be found in the biographies of six men: Lenin, Hitler, Mao, Roosevelt, and Churchill.

In the middle however are other views that see both institutional factors and individuals as playing key roles. Marx Weber, whose sociological theories act as a counterpoint to Marx on many dimensions, sees a role for "charismatic" leadership in certain circumstances (Weber, 1947). He allows for possibly substantial individual roles, but only in those cases where the national bureaucracy, or possibly traditional social norms, do not stand in the way of the individual. According to Weber, individuals, historical forces and institutions are all important and they interact in an important way. The political science literature has investigated this middle ground extensively, especially the extent to which institutions restrain leaders in democracies. More broadly, the presence of many "veto players", either constitutionally-based institutions or opposing political parties, may severely constrain the action space of leaders and policy outcomes. In summary, evidence seems to suggest that the extent to which political leaders may affect economic outcomes depends on the institutional context.

On the empirical level, Jones and Olken (2005: 26) summarize their findings as follows:

> *We find that countries experience persistent changes in growth rates across these leadership transitions, suggesting that leaders have a large causative influence on the economic outcomes of their nations. The paper further shows that the effects of leaders are very strong in autocratic settings but much less so in the presence of democratic institutions. These results add texture to a growing literature on institutions in shaping economic outcomes. In particular, this paper suggests that while political institutions may matter, their impact is not deterministic. Rather, one important effect of political institutions is to constrain the power of individual leaders. Democracies may be able to prevent the disastrous economic policies of Robert Mugabe in Zimbabwe or Samora Machel in Mozambique; however, they might also have constrained the successful economic policies of Lee Kuan Yew in Singapore or Deng Xiaoping in China…. We find that leaders do matter, and they matter to something as significant as national economic growth.*

It is important to stress that governance institutions should not be seen as 'constraints' on leaders, but as a framework to 'guide' leadership. In the history of countries, individual leaders can make a difference, but for sustained prosperity, sound governance institutions make all the difference. Sound institutions circumscribe leadership and prevent arbitrary and harmful behaviors, while providing a framework for good leaders to excel. For prosperity to be sustained there must be certain irreducible minimum standards of governance infrastructure. The scope for leaders to do harm must be eliminated, while a good institutional design should provide unlimited scope to grow the society. Here lies the contradiction: the impact of individual leadership is felt more (for better or for worse) under circumstances of weak governance institutions. The so-called benevolent dictatorships have been known to transform their societies more radically, and more quickly than under popular democracies with effective institutions for checks and balances.

We argue however that there is a two-way causation between governance institutions and leadership: without sound institutions, any so-called 'effective leadership' will end up as a flash in a pan---- not sustainable. But effective leaders can also create productive institutions (laws, procurement reforms; pension reforms; de-regulation; privatization; constitutional reforms, etc). The institutional context also defines the rules of the game and facilitates the emergence of certain types of leaders. It is our view that it requires collective leadership to build and sustain effective Governance Infrastructure. The remaining challenge is how to deliberately orchestrate the sustained emergence of able leaders under given institutional framework. This is the subject of the next section.

IV: Towards the Deliberate Creation of Sound Governance and Leadership Infrastructure

As shown above, there is a bi-directional causality between good governance and effective leadership. Effective leadership can orchestrate the continuous improvement and refinement of governance institutions, while sound institutions circumscribe leadership, preventing arbitrary/harmful behavior, while promoting a conducive environment for agents to prosper.

Nigeria has, at different times and in different circumstances, experienced exemplary leadership. Unfortunately, much of the experiences were short-lived---- a flash in the pan! The emergence of effective leadership at different times in our history has been dictated by one crisis or the other---- a phenomenon which is global. Successive military regimes in Nigeria (applauded by the populace) cited widespread corruption and misgovernance as the key reason for their intervention; Dora Akunyili in NAFDAC faced the crisis of fake drugs; Nasir el-Rufai faced the crisis of a distorted Abuja masterplan and a dying new capital city; there was the crisis of a weak banking/financial system ill-suited to national development and which faced the imminent threat of a collapse; Nuhu Ribadu faced the crisis of monumental corruption at all levels; etc. Like painful adjustment and reforms under the structural adjustment programs (SAP) which were foisted by crisis in most developing countries, it seems the emergence of reformers in Nigeria today is a response to the crisis of underdevelopment. More fundamentally, the crisis of underdevelopment has led to the emergence of a national leader--- President

Obasanjo---- who understands the state of emergency and not only has a vision of a prosperous Nigeria but has gone the extra mile in recruiting a team of reformers with whom, and under his direction and leadership, he is building a new Nigeria. The crises of underdevelopment continue. But how do we, as a nation, ensure the continuous supply of effective leadership? How do we ensure that the present reforms are not reversed after the leaders on the scene today have gone? In other words, how do we ensure that history does not repeat itself? Do we have to orchestrate other crises to ensure the emergence of leadership? This begs the question as these crises have been with us for a long time: how come that the reforms are only happening in the way the are at this present time?

An evolutionary theory of history would argue that we are able to have the kind of leaders we have today only because the time is right for it to happen. Governance and leadership are cumulative, building upon past foundations, experiences and mistakes. A society only makes progress by building cumulatively on the successive building blocks of the past as no regime begins on a *tabla rasa*. President Obasanjo partly endorses this viewpoint as he regularly reminds us that he would not have been able to assemble the kind of Economic Team he set up in 2003 in 1999. This, according to President Obasanjo is because the political-governance infrastructure was in a state of flux, and he needed a different kind of 'leadership'----- to maintain a certain political equilibrium. Once he achieved a certain level of political reorganization and consolidated power during his first term in office, he then embarked upon far reaching socio-economic reforms in his second term. He then had the political space to appoint 'political outsiders' like the panelists in today's lecture and empowered them to lead in their various sectors. So, timing and circumstances also define leadership.

But having muddled through some of the major crises and laid firm foundation for prosperity, how do we ensure continuous supply of such leadership? How do we create a critical mass of leaders so as to avoid the flash in the pan or sporadic supply of leadership? How do we orchestrate prosperity inspired, and mission driven leadership? These are questions to elicit debate: I don't have any answers. I have raised these questions in the hope that as we brainstorm on them, we could move closer to finding answers that will serve Nigeria better. What I offer below are but few suggestions to possibly inflame the debate.

The suggestions below are organized around three clusters of issues: deepening the governance infrastructure or institutions; orchestrating effective demand for effective leadership; and systematic framework for continuous supply of leaders.

The very first step is to keep our eyes on the ball---- the vision to build a strong and prosperous economy which is among the 20 largest economies in the world by 2020. Related to this is the need to keep a gaze on the template of critical success factors to attain the long term objectives including the requirements for effective governance institutions as outlined earlier. The next is mobilizing the national leadership and the entire citizens around this vision as a collective aspiration. The objective is to keep everyone focused on the big picture and to ensure that the leadership has a clearly defined terms of reference and deliverables on the basis of which the people can monitor and evaluate performance.

a) Deepening the Governance Infrastructure or Institutions

Nigeria is part of the emerging global village in which countries are benchmarked against one another on virtually every subject. Governance institutions constitute one such area of international benchmarking. Analysts in Nigeria need to take forward the clusters of governance indicators we summarized earlier and develop measurable indicators for monitoring and evaluation. We need major and continuous improvements in almost all the six clusters of governance indicators as shown in Box 1 above. More fundamentally, we need improved governance especially at the State and Local Government levels. These levels of government are critical for empowerment and poverty reduction. Legal and judicial reforms are crucial: if the judiciary fails, the society is finished, and no credible leadership can survive under the circumstance. The rule of law should be mainstreamed as a way of life in Nigeria. The Constitution is the super governance institution. The Nigerian Constitution needs serious review to make it developmental and consistent with creating a framework for prosperity. The various laws to institutionalize reforms need to be enacted, while the institutions for public accountability and fight against corruption should be strengthened.

b) Creating Effective and enduring demand for good governance and leadership

It is often argued that a society gets the kind of governance and leadership that it demands. Effective mobilization of informed citizenry is key to a demand for good governance and leadership. In this regard, we suggest the following medium-term actions:

- Mass and qualitative education, with secondary school education as the minimum standard. This will, over time, create a pool of well informed citizens that will demand effective governance and participate actively in the political-governance process.

- Peer Review Mechanism and Role of Independent Monitors. Peer Review Mechanism challenges leaders to show results, introduces the principle of healthy competition, and also encourages sharing of ideas and learning among cohorts. The SEEDS benchmarking among State Governments is an example of such peer review mechanism. We suggest that such benchmarking exercises be extended to Federal Government Ministries, Departments and Agencies, using defined indicators of governance and performance. There should be independent Governance and Leadership Monitoring Groups to monitor government institutions. Furthermore, it is suggested that donor agencies and development partners operating in Nigeria subject themselves to benchmarking based on aid governance indicators.

- Effective public-private partnerships should be forged for sustaining reforms and reaching the national vision. Such partnerships provide conducive environments for demanding, and refining reforms and for building coalitions for implementation.

c) Supply of Effective leadership?

A conscious effort should be made to strengthen the institutions that encourage the emergence of honest and exemplary leadership. The politics of the day needs major reforms. When politics is not driven by ideas, there is no incentive for men and women of vision and capacity to emerge. The political parties and the political process need fundamental reforms. For example, as we approach the April elections, it is difficult to tell the differences among the political parties and candidates in terms of ideologies, and programs. Politics that is essentially driven by money scars honest but poor people from seeking leadership positions in society. To move forward, we need to encourage the following:

- Free, fair and transparent electoral system is the key to evolving a system to guarantee the emergence of effective leadership. An effective electoral system where every vote is counted, every vote counts and only legitimate votes count, will put political parties under tremendous pressure to field only candidates that possess leadership characteristics---- have electoral value. If only the people's votes determine who should be in power, then leaders at all levels will be under pressure to serve through exemplary leadership so as to earn the people's mandate to retain power. Without a sound electoral system, systematic and effective leadership cannot emerge or endure.

- Competitive Politics under an effective electoral system helps to clarify the choices facing the electorate. We hope that over time, there will be two or three major political parties based on alternative ideologies and programs for prosperity. This should evolve over time rather the current confused state of dozens of parties and no one knows what they stand for.

- Course on "Governance and Leadership" in the curricula of Secondary schools? How about having such a course in the Universities as one of the General Studies? What about specific schools devoted to Governance and Leadership?

- Mandatory two-week Governance and Leadership Workshop for newly elected and appointed officers at all levels to be organized by international professionals. Such workshops should offer opportunities to the Executive and the legislature to share their visions of development, the governance and leadership demands for such to happen, and possibly agree on a work program. Such workshops should be organized at the beginning of every budget year.