Linnéuniversitetet
Kalmar Växjö

Bachelor's thesis in Political Science

Tanzania's failure in consolidating a strong democracy

A comparative case study of Tanzania and Botswana's democratization processes between 1961-2015

Author: Emelie Rasby
Tutor: Daniel Silander
Examiner: Emil Uddhammar
Spring semester: 2017
Political Science: 2SK30E

Abstract

This study allocates the issue of democratization in Tanzania and Botswana between 1961-2015. The purpose is to explain why Tanzania's democratization process between 1961 and 2015 has not developed into a solid democracy. Nine factors, both internal and external that has affected the countries democratization process has been highlighted and compared in a macro-perspective in order to find explanatory factors the aim.

A qualitative, theory consuming approach is used, where methodological understandings such as the method of difference and the congruence method are applied. Furthermore an analytical framework is used to pinpoint important differences between the two countries democratization processes that are considered being valid explanations to why contemporary Tanzania is not considered being a full-scale working democracy.

The comparative conclusion showed that there are three explanatory factors to Tanzania's present democracy status. The lack of free values, an economic development and authoritarian divisions within the country has proven being vital in the failure of consolidating a democracy.

Key Concepts: *Tanzania, democratization, Botswana, democracy, civil society, free values, socio-economic development, authoritarian divisions*

Table of Content

1 Introduction **1**
1.1 Research problem 2
1.2 Aim and research questions 3
1.3 Disposition 4

2 Method and Material **5**
2.1 Research design 5
2.2 Methodological and epistemological understandings 5
2.2.1 Reliability and validity *7*
2.3 Delimitations and limitations 7
2.4 Material 7

3 Theory **9**
3.1 Previous theory research 9
3.1.1 Democratization *9*
3.1.2 Democracy *11*
3.1.3 Democratization in Africa *12*
3.1.4 Factors that favor a democratization process *12*
3.2 Larry Diamonds democratization theory 13
3.2.1 Internal factors *14*
3.2.2 External factors *15*
3.3 Critique regarding Larry Diamond's democratization theory 17
3.4 Summary of the theoretical framework 18
3.5 Shaping the analytical framework 18

4 Analysis **19**
4.1 Early history 19
4.1.1 Tanzania *19*
4.1.2 Botswana *19*
4.2 Tanzania 20
4.3 Botswana 25
4.4 Analytical apparatus 29

5 Comparative Conclusion **36**

Bibliography **I**

List of Tables

TABLE 1 THE DIFFERENT PHASES OF A DEMOCRATIZATION PROCESS 10
TABLE 2 ANALYTICAL APPARATUS 18
TABLE 3 AUTHORITARIAN DIVISIONS 29
TABLE 4 AUTHORITARIAN DEVELOPMENT 30
TABLE 5 FREE VALUES 31
TABLE 6 THE RISE OF CIVIL SOCIETY 31
TABLE 7 DIFFUSION AND DEMONSTRATION EFFECTS 32
TABLE 8 PEACEFUL PRESSURE 33
TABLE 9 THE LIMITS OF SANCTIONS AND AID CONDITIONALLY 33
TABLE 10 DEMOCRATIC ASSISTANCE 34
TABLE 11 DEMOCRATIZATION BY FORCE 34

List of Acronyms

BDP Botswana Democratic Party

BNF Botswana National Front

BOCONGO Botswana Council of Non-Governmental Organisations

CCM Chama Cha Mapinduzi

CHADEMA Chama cha Demokrasia na Maendeleo

CSO Civil Society Organization

CUF Civic United Front

DRP Democracy Research Project

ERP Economic Recovery Programme

GDP Gross Domestic Product

IMF International Monetary Fund

NGO Non Governmental Organization

PSM Public Service Media

SAP Structural Adjustment Programme

TANU Tanganyika African National Union

1 Introduction

Tanzania was a British protectorate for a long time until 1961 when it became independent and therefore their own sovereign state (Hydén, 1999: 142-143). After the declaration of independence a one-party system evolved where the revolutionary party Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM), after nearly 30 years of ruling opened up for a multi-party system due to external and internal pressures (Sandbrook, 1996: 70). The transition from a one-party system to a nation body where several parties were allowed into the political arena was seen by many as a fresh start on Tanzania's process towards a steady democracy, the best one since they gained independence in 1961. However, scientifically research proves that political- and individual rights in the country has not changed and are still relatively low (Freedom House, 2015). According to Freedom House, an independent watchdog organization that makes yearly investigations about the expansion of democracy and freedom around the world (see more: https://freedomhouse.org), Tanzania is still considered being a partly free country where the civil society is suppressed by the state and where wide corruption exists amongst the parties (Liviga, 2011: 17; Ewald, 2011: 103).

Barely five years after Tanzania got independence from Britain another African country gained their sovereignty from the same state. In 1966, Botswana declared themselves independent after which the pace of their democratization process enlarged and they later consolidated a solid democracy. According to Freedom House Botswana is a free country (Freedom House, 2015) and research indicates that the country has low levels of corruption, an excellent rule of law and political stability in a multi-party system (Alexander & Kaboyakgosi, 2012: 2-3). The country has since gaining independence held elections every five years where there have been consistent changes within the office without any international complaints on the country's human rights record or the quality of the democratic process (Alexander & Kaboyakgosi, 2012: 65).

These two countries are fairly alike. They both have been ruled by Britain, they are placed south of Sahara near one another and they gained independence only five years apart. The major factor where they differ is that Tanzania today is considered as a non-working democracy where human rights and liberties are restricted and Botswana is classified as a full-scale working democracy. This conclusion leads to interesting theories and discussions regarding the fact that one country's democratization process succeeded and the other one did not. The questions to be asked

are: why did Tanzania not consolidate into a strong democracy while Botswana did? What factors had an impact on their outcomes and is it possible to find explanations to Tanzania's failed democratization process through investigating the countries differences?

1.1 Research problem

Regarding the understanding of the outcome of Tanzania's democratization process there is clearly an interest in answering the question: *why?* Why did Tanzania not prosper in their democratization process? Why is Tanzania only being considered partly democratic today? This interest leads to the issue of this paper, which is to try to figure out why one Sub-Saharan African country did not prosper in their attempt of becoming a democracy. To understand this one needs to lift out the main factors, both external and internal, which could have had an impact on the democratic results and then later compare those factors and outcomes with a similar country that has succeeded. It is then crucial that the comparison is made during the same period of time, which in this case will be between the years of 1961-2015.

Moreover, the research problem is scientifically interesting due to the possibilities that transpire when looking at both countries democratization processes. When comparing Tanzania and Botswana's external and internal factors, which has had an impact on them consolidating a democracy one can find so called "blank spots", which in this paper would be explanations to why Tanzania's democratization process has not developed a strong democracy. When finding these one can analyze the impact of different factors that may appear in countries democratization processes, and therefore is able to draw conclusions to why Tanzania has not developed a solid democracy.

Furthermore it is interesting to analyze Tanzania and Botswana's internal and external factors and later compare them due to the fact that democratization is a frequent subject in discussions throughout the global political arena. In Sub-Saharan Africa, which hereafter will be called "Africa", there are many countries that has developed a democracy, however there is still an ongoing struggle in many countries, which are trying to consolidate a democracy (Mawere & Mabaya, 2016: 221). Throughout the first three decades of independence many attempts on democratizing were made but failed due to one-party systems, personal dictatorships, military- and socialist regimes. The "second liberation" in Africa came right after the fall of the

Berlin wall when socialism collapsed. When this happened in 1989 three countries had a multi-party system and were considered fairly as democracies in Africa, these were Botswana, Gambia and Mauritius. The second wave of democracy did not leave many states in Africa unaffected. Many countries tried to hold multi-party elections, which had many flaws but stilled worked as a force towards democracy (Diamond, 2010: ix-x; Huntington, 1993: 19). Even though Africa has shown positive features that are considered democratic many countries democracies are of low quality. This is a result made out of widespread corruption as well as the underlying effects of having political systems where a totalitarian or an authoritarian rule has existed. These issues have tarnished freedom, political competition and the rule of law in Africa (Diamond, 2010: xi). Only 15 percent out of 50 countries and territories in Africa are considered being free, referring to their political and individual rights (Freedom House, 2016).

When studying Tanzania and Botswana in a comparative case study the chances are given to illustrate new explanations in African democratization processes. These are two countries that are interesting when discussing democratization in Africa due to their similar features and different outcomes in their democratization processes. When looking at both countries in comparison a new approach is made possible in order to highlight new characteristics of an ongoing and well-debated issue in our contemporary society: democratization. When comparing both countries it is made possible to find explanation to why Tanzania after 54 years of independence still has no full-scale working democracy.

1.2 Aim and research questions

The aim of this paper is to explain why Tanzania's democratization process between 1961 and 2015 has not developed into a solid democracy.

Henceforth the aim of this paper has resulted in two research questions that are:

(i) How did internal and external factors affect the democratization processes in Tanzania and Botswana between 1961 and 2015?

(ii) What differences are there between the two countries explanatorily factors?

1.3 Disposition

This research paper is divided into five parts. The first chapter presents the *introduction*, *research problem* and *aim* of the study. The second chapter, which can also be called the method chapter, discusses the *methodological approach*. Henceforth, the second chapter brings up the choices of *material* and a critical discussion concerning it. It also highlights the *limitations and delimitations* with the research paper. The third chapter introduces the *theoretical framework* chosen for this study, where its relevance and critical perspectives are being discussed. *Previous research* around the subjects democratization and democratization in Africa will be discussed as well as earlier research regarding the theoretical framework and the chapter ends with a presentation of the *analytical framework* created especially for this study. The fourth chapter presents the *analysis* of the chosen material by using the theoretical framework and the analytical apparatus. Finally the last chapter of this research paper will present a *comparative conclusion* of the analysis given from the previous chapter.

2 Method and Material

This following chapter presents how the study methodologically will be done and why the study has been chosen. It will discuss the design of the research paper as well as the choice of methodological approach and how it will be used throughout the study along with its reliability and validity. The limitation and delimitations of this paper will then be presented followed by the material that has been chosen, which will be discussed critically.

2.1 Research design

Since the aim of this study is to analyze *why* Tanzania's democratization process between 1961 and 2015 has not developed into a solid democracy whereas Botswana's have and different internal and external factors will be identified in order to explain it, the approach of this research paper will have an explanatory character, due to the fact that the paper asks why-questions (Esaiasson et al., 2012: 36). Using this approach will narrow the focus upon the theoretical framework and give this paper the possibility to discover and explain why one country resulted in a strong democracy and another one did not. Moreover, due to that characterization a theory consuming approach has been chosen. Why a theory consuming approach is considered being the ultimate course of action is because this research paper is trying to explain and create a deeper understanding regarding Tanzania's failed democratization process through comparing the country with the democratization process of Botswana. The approach will help the researcher find explanatory factors and come to term with the aim and research questions. Additionally, the approach will also help the paper get its qualitative feature, which is necessary in order to focus upon a specific descriptive factors. It is then clear that a methodology that solely focuses on the cases throughout the paper is needed in order to achieve the aim of this study, which is also why an already established theory has been chosen to analyze the contexts (Esaiasson et al., 2012: 41-42; Bryman, 2002: 341).

2.2 Methodological and epistemological understandings

The methodological approach that will be used throughout the research paper is a combination out of three different methods: comparative case study, method of difference and the congruence method. Since the purpose of the analysis is to examine

two different contexts within the same time frame a comparative case study has been chosen (Esaiasson et al., 2012: 109; Landman & Robinson, 2009: 14). The study will be qualitative and make assumptions regarding possible explanations (X) to an already known outcome (Y), which in this case are two dependent variables that are known beforehand: solid (Y_1) and not solid democracy (Y_2). When comparing two countries that have different outcomes the possibility to identify important explanatory factors that have had an impact on Tanzania's democratization process will be revealed and it is feasible to find an answer to the aim.

Additionally, the research paper will use the methodological understanding of method of difference; which will be used due to its ability to identify independent variables (X) correlated with different outcomes (Y_1, Y_2) (George & Bennett, 2005: 153). Using this will create a clear method and a common thread throughout the paper and research, which will favor the reader (and researcher). When comparing two cases and using the method of difference, this paper is given the opportunity to use the logic of abolition in order to eliminate as a candidate cause (independent variable, X) for the alteration in the result (dependent variable, Y) through any circumstance that is given in both cases (George & Bennet, 2005: 156); hence, conditions that are not found in both cases may be regarded as a explanatory factor and it will give answers to the aim.

Moreover, in order to trace causality this study will use a congruence method. The motivation for this methodological choice is based on its ability to take the form of an empirical generalization in this paper. When the value of the independent variables are examined, an opportunity is created, through the congruence method, to predict or explain an outcome if the case is coherent with the theory (George & Bennett, 2005: 181). Moreover the method offers substantial adaptability and flexibility for the paper (George & Bennett, 2005: 182), which is perfect when wanting to look at considerable factors in a democratization process over a large time frame. Important questions to ask when using the congruence method is: (i) is the consistency false or of possible casual significance? and (ii) is the independent variable a necessary circumstance for the result of the dependent variable? (George & Bennett, 2005: 185).

Despite the fact that there are other ways of approaching the scientifically problem, this study finds it most relevant, in order to contradict the research problem, to use the methodology that focuses merely on applicable features, since doing that one

can find underlying factors that may answer the research questions and fulfill the purpose of the study (George & Bennett, 2005: 182).

2.2.1 Reliability and validity

When using the method of difference one must take into consideration that the researcher cannot be guaranteed that all of the feasibly important independent variables have been identified, which can affect the study's validity. On this notion it is possible that the paper will be invalid and spurious (George & Bennett, 2005: 156). However, to counteract this, a large number of independent variables will be analyzed and found through a congruence method in order to reassure the paper's validity.

Regarding the reliability, it is considered being strong since the method and theory is well described and the two cases are being studied within the same time frame that has already happened, thus the same factors that are being investigated in the paper would presumably be examined if doing this study again.

2.3 Delimitations and limitations

When looking at Tanzania and Botswana's democratization processes delimitation has been made, which is to study political happenings between 1961-2015. It is important to understand the limitations of studying the factors that influenced the democratization processes, due to the large time frame (54 years); due to this the research will focus upon important factors in a macro-perspective. When doing this it is possible to fulfill the aim of the paper: explain why Tanzania's democratization process between 1961 and 2015 has not developed into a solid democracy. Furthermore, the possibility to receive a general explanation why one country consolidated into a strong democracy and another did not is given when using this delimitation.

2.4 Material

Different types of material have been used throughout this paper in order to reach a broad and legit spectrum. The information has been collected from different scientifically articles, diverse literatures as well as relevant Internet pages.

Through this source criticism have been carried out through the paper. The theory has been discussed critically and its arguments have been strengthened with other sources, which increases its validity. This characterizes all the material gathered where both primary and secondary sources have been applied. The secondary sources

are not used to justify what the primary information cannot illuminate; rather they are operationalized as a complement to the primary sources. Furthermore, material related to the methodological approach has in order to achieve high legitimacy been taken from three different method books. This has been done to create clarity and present a correct approach, where different research has been taken into consideration.

As in any research paper there has been a need for limitations when it comes to analyzing material. Since this paper needs to study two cases out of a macro-perspective the material that has been chosen is considered being more broad than narrow since the aim as well as he methodological approach demands it.

Regarding relevant internet pages, *J-store* and *One Search* has been used to find scientifically articles, which have been used when strengthening arguments and collect empirical material. The other Internet page that has been used is *Freedom House*, which is considered being a good source due to the simple material that has been received, and that the material gathered later on has been strengthened through other sources.

3 Theory

In this chapter the theoretical framework that will be used for this research will be presented. Firstly, previous research regarding the concepts democratization and democracy will be given followed by previous research about the democratization in Africa. Hereafter, a discussion about previous research concerning factors that favor a democratization process will be discharged into an argument why the theoretical framework in this study has been chosen instead of others. Henceforth, the theory will be presented where its features will be described in details followed by a critical view of the theoretical framework and a summary. Lastly, an analytical framework, which has been created out of features taken from the theoretical framework and the methodological approach, will be presented.

3.1 Previous theory research

In this part of the paper, previous research regarding the theory will be given in order to create a greater understanding of the theoretical framework and why it has been chosen for this paper.

3.1.1 Democratization

There have been a lot of discussions concerning the topic democratization among political scientists, where many are very prominent and present valid arguments. The research regarding democratization has brought up many questions such as: what triggers a democratic transition? What factors contribute to a democratic process? What affects democratic values in a country? And how does one consolidate a strong democracy? The main areas that have been analyzed are the government, the population, governance and social-, economical and cultural factors. With this information one can say that the spine of democratization research is the correlation between the state and its citizens. Democratization research stretches throughout economical, social and cultural contexts within the society and studies how factors within these contexts affect democratic values (Huntington, 1993: 123).

Previous democratization process research discusses three phases that a country might go through when they work their way from a non-democratic state to a democracy. These are liberalization, transition and consolidation. In order to create a greater understanding a crosstable has been made below to present an overview:

Table 1 The different phases of a democratization process

Liberalization	This includes mixes of social and policy changes in nondemocratic settings. Examples may be less censorship of the media and improving the toleration of the opposition. Liberalization is considered being crucial in democratization.
Transition	This is when sufficient agreements concerning the political methods of elections are made. A government chosen through a popular and fair election also characterizes the transition. In this phase the judicial and legislative sector does not have to share authority.
Consolidation	This phase in a democratization process has three main features, these are: (i) *behaviorally*: when no significant social, national, economic, political or institutional actors create nondemocratic regimes or turn violent when trying to achieve their objectives; (ii) *attitudinally*: when a strong majority of the population believes that democratic institutions and procedures is the best way to govern; and lastly (iii) *constitutionally*: when nongovernmental and governmental forces alike, become subjected and familiar with the resolution of conflict through institutions sanctioned by the new democratic process.

Source: Adapted from Linz & Stepan, 1996: 3-6

These happen in a chronological order where liberalization is the starting point. To explain further: when changes that favor a democracy happens in a country, for example less censorship or less corruption, possibilities are made for a democratic transition to transpire. This also means that liberalization is impartial and does not have to end up in a democratic transition. If they do reach the democratic transition stage, they have developed democratic ways of governing as well as free and fair elections. Lastly if the democratic transition has resulted into a consolidation, democracy is "the only game in town"; meaning where all ways of governing among government and nongovernmental powers is democratic and alike, and where democracy is accepted as well as considered being the best way of ruling amongst the population.

3.1.2 Democracy

In order to apply the theoretical framework on the analysis, one most know what recognizes a democracy. When knowing this it is easier to get a deeper understanding about the democratic process through knowing how a democratic rule works but also its different contents.

The first concept of democracy to be defined is *electoral democracy*. This concept contains features such as the need for basic levels of freedom (organization, assembly, freedom of speech and press), in order to create a communicative opposition and participation (Diamond, 1999: 8). Understanding this, an electoral democracy should consists of competitive and regular multi-party elections, where voters are truthfully counted, and where the winning candidates get to practice effective power in the country (Diamond, 1999: 9; Schumpeter, 1947: 250-252). Additionally, electoral democracy may be called - a thin concept of democracy. It is considered being a narrow definition of the concept democracy since its focus is on the political system, especially the electoral process (Schedler, 2001: 67).

Furthermore, the concept of democracy may be defined differently. A *liberal democracy* covers all the elements that were conceptualized in the definition of an electoral democracy; however, a liberal democracy requires the horizontal responsibility of the rulers. This meaning that there are no reserved spheres of power for players accountable to the electorate, indirectly or directly. When constraining the executive power a democracy is secured through its ability to protect legality, constitutionalism and the deliberative procedure. Additionally, a liberal democracy includes general necessities for civic and political pluralism as well as for group- and individual freedoms. This ensures that the opposition can compete through a constant process of representation and expression (Diamond, 1999:10-11).

Between these two definitions, there is the notion of *polyarchy*. A polyarchy has several important characteristics, which includes the notion where representatives are elected by free and fair elections. In a polyarchy all citizens have the right to run for office, get access to alternative information and to the freedom of expression. Furthermore, a polyarchy stresses on the notion of full inclusion and that the citizens control the agenda (Dahl, 1989: 222).

3.1.3 Democratization in Africa

Democratization in Africa has been and remains an insubstantial work in progress in several unstable and poor countries. Populations, the civil societies and even the military have gotten tired of corruption, economic mismanagement and repression, which has led to demands for political liberalization and democracy in many countries (Ihonvbere, 1997: 371). However, democratic transitions have been concentrated on countries with small populations and attempts on democratic elections have a history of failure (Bratton, 2009: 342). There is a widespread weakness among African states, which generates difficulties when trying to consolidate a democracy and the political and civil society it is not considered being strong enough in relations to the state; the institutions do not posses the capacity or independence to implicate democratic changes and the positive effects of a multi-party system (Bratton, 2009: 352). Other factors such as economic stagnation, deepening poverty, lack of expression and recurring crisis has made it difficult to democratize in African countries (Lewis, 2010: 89).

However, examples of successes in Africa, concerning democratic processes are to be found in Botswana, where legal efforts resulted in greater inclusion of the citizens, and in South Africa, where there have been success in human rights and in the political system (Freedom House, 2014; Ihonvbere, 1997: 371). Moreover, examples where there has been a democratic setback is in Gambia, were there is presidential suppression of the media, civil society and opposition. Besides that the Gambian legislature has intensified criminal penalties for press offenders (Freedom House, 2012; Saine, 2002: 167).

3.1.4 Factors that favor a democratization process

The political scientist Samuel P. Huntington discusses the factors that have had an impact on the democratic process, both positive and negative. He stresses on the importance of those in power within the authoritarian regime and their role in altering into a democratic system (Huntington, 1993: 124). According to Huntington there were three essential interactions in democratization processes during the third wave, between 1974-1990:

> The three crucial interactions in democratization processes were those between government and opposition, between reformers and standpatters in the governing coalition, and between moderates and extremists in the opposition (Huntington, 1993: 123).

Henceforth, he highlights a number of factors that contribute to the successful democratization process: a strong middle-class, high levels of education and literacy, democratic authority structures within social groups, political leaders committed to democracy as well as economic development and social modernization (Huntington, 1993: 37).

Another political scientist whom discusses factors that affect a democratization process is Larry Diamond. He stresses on the importance of nine different factors, both external and internal and how they drive democracy forward. He discusses the positive and negative effects that they may have on a democracy and on a democratic process. The internal factors regard the country's economic development, government, values and its civil society (Diamond, 2008: 90-105) and the external factors concern influences other countries and organizations have on the democratization process in a country (Diamond, 2008: 107-134).

Finally, since the aim of this paper is to explain why Tanzania's democratization process between 1961 and 2015 has not consolidated into a strong democracy, and the research questions focuses upon how different factors may explain the aim, it is safe to say that Diamond's theory suits this paper the best. The factors cover a wide range of interstate and international aspects and it includes perspectives focusing on actors and structure, which all summaries the most anticipated explanatory factors when it comes to studying democratization processes; hence it represent previous research superbly. Furthermore, it provides for the opportunity to study Tanzania and Botswana from a macro-perspective. This leads to the conclusion that these nine factors will increase the study's reliability and validity. They are easily applied and they create a structure and clarity when analyzing the democratically changes.

3.2 Larry Diamonds democratization theory

The theoretical framework that will be consumed in this research paper is taken out of Larry Diamonds book *The Spirit of Democracy: the struggle to build free societies throughout the world*, published in 2008. Diamond discusses the influences of different happenings and doings in a country's democratization process. Within the theory there are nine factors. They all play a part in a country's democratization process according to the theory and due to this all of them will be used in the theoretical framework. This will be done in order to prevent the exclusion of any important details or explanations

on why Tanzania has not consolidated a strong democracy. Each factor can generate both a positive and a negative outcome and they will be described and discussed below followed by a critical discussion regarding the theory and in the end summed up in order to make it easier to get a overall perspective of the theory.

3.2.1 Internal factors

The first internal factor that Diamond highlights is *authoritarian divisions*. This factor focuses upon fractures within the authoritarian regimes and the consequences it has upon democratic transitions. It discusses how the power is divided within the regime and what role the different elites take on within the government (Diamond, 2008: 90-91, Huntington, 1993: 123). The leaders within the government play an important role in a country's democratization process due to the fact that a small number of leaders, conflicts, coalitions, agreements, blunders and rivalries can determine the pace of a consolidation process towards democracy (Diamond, 2008: 90; Morlino, 2009: 206; Huntington, 1993: 37). When discussing this it is important understand the concepts *"soft-liners"* and *"hard-liners"*. These perceptions are different labels that are put on the leaders within the regime. A leader whom is a "soft-liner" does not take extreme measures in order to keep their superior position. Instead they listen to the population and use more sensible methods. Its contrary "hard-liner" is a leader or elite, which do not have any intentions of listening to the population or to bend their thinking for another's input (Diamond, 2008: 92-93; Huntington, 1991: 581). The thesis of the authoritarian division concentrates upon how the different power-elites relates to one another as well as the people. An elite that contains different interests and opinions is more likely to be open towards the population's opinions, than an elite that has a united interest and similar opinions (Diamond, 208: 91; Huntington, 1993: 124-125).

The second internal factor is *authoritarian development*. This issue discusses the impacts on economic development generated by the government, where economic success pushes a democratic transition due to the emerging of an intellect middle class (Diamond, 2008: 94; Huntington, 1993: 37; Bernhagen, 2009: 123). The connection between democracy and development, Diamond argues, plays a huge part in whether the developed democratic system will be unassailable; rich states tend to have more sustainable democracies (Diamond, 2008: 97; Huntington, 1993: 32). If the opulence increases it is more likely that a middle class fosters. When a middle class evolves the chances of having an increased amount of individuals whom questions the

decisions and actions of an authoritarian regime escalates as well as the demands for basic human- and political rights. An economic development may lead to a larger amount of individuals getting education, which in its own way can lead to democratization through mobilization (Diamond, 2008: 94-95; Inglehart & Welzel, 2009: 34; Papaioannou & Siourounis, 2008: 387).

Economic successes transform a society in several ways that makes it difficult to keep the concentration of power to one man. It modifies a country's economic and social structure when widely scattering resources and it strongly changes the values and attitudes in a democratic direction. This fact leads us to the third internal factor that affects a country's democratization process, which are *free values*. These are made possible due to the structural changes, which develops a middle class and increases the levels of information and education amongst the common community. When this is achieved inequalities tend to fall due to a higher national income, which later tends to reduce the political and social polarization within the country and between the classes (Diamond, 2008: 98; Huntington, 1993: 37). Hereafter, the social and psychological changes gained from information and education, cultivate a mobilization; people in rising numbers join and form organizations to outlet their needs and interest (Diamond, 2008: 99; Inglehart & Welzel, 2009: 142). Consequently higher levels of education combined with increased income, media exposure and working status indicate greater democratic values, attitudes and behavior within the population (Diamond, 2008: 99; Inglehart & Welzel, 2009: 36).

The last and fourth internal factor is *the rise of civil society*. This factor is interwoven with the three factors above and it studies the connection and relations between the government and the citizens. Changing political values combined with an economic development is possibly the best feature that mobilizes the civil society towards a common purpose: democratization (Diamond, 2008: 102-103; Huntington, 1991: 593). When the populace mobilizes and people start to engage themselves within different organizations, the chances are that the general opinion regarding democratization shifts in favor of a democratic transition (Diamond, 2008: 102; Letki, 2009: 161; Huntington, 1993: 37).

3.2.2 External factors

The first external factor that has an effect on a country's democratization is *diffusion and demonstration effects*, which is all about how democracy and its methods travel

across immense distances both geographically and culturally. This concept covers the spread of direct or indirect ideas, public opinions and actions throughout the world. For instance, if a manifestation breaks out in country A, where they are fighting for their rights to political freedom and they succeed, then it is more likely that citizens in country B will start a similar manifestation where they demand the same rights as in country A. An important argument in this concept is that a country is more likely to start a democratization process the closer geographically it is to the country that succeeded, additionally cultural similarity also plays a part in the diffusion development (Diamond, 2008: 108; Huntington, 1993: 33; Yilmaz, 2009: 95; Rawnsley & Voltmer, 2009: 237).

The second factor that Diamond addresses to externally have an impact on a democratization process is *peaceful pressure*. This mechanism concerns the philosophy that different influences affect a country's democratization process. The peaceful pressure consists of three main linkages that make authoritarian countries vulnerable to Western pressures, these are: (i) security ties, which include guarantees and treaties; (ii) economic ties that embrace investment, trade and credit; and lastly (iii) social ties, which contain features such as immigration, tourism, elite exchanges, transnational non-governmental organizations (NGO) and overseas education. The main thesis here is that powerful linkages forge cultural bonds, which will assist on uniting democratic societies (Diamond, 2008: 112; Yilmaz, 2009: 94).

Henceforth, the second factor could appear in different shapes and it can lead to many different outlets. The peaceful pressure to democratize normally takes three international forms, these are: the conditioning of aid, sanctions and diplomacy, where the last one is most preferable. Diplomacy is according to Diamond's theory the most effective approach when trying to imply liberal ideas and encouraging democratic change, especially when used during a period of political crisis within the democratizing country (Diamond, 2008: 114; Rathbun, 2014: 2).

The third factor is *the limits of sanctions and aid conditionally*. Sanctions may result in a number of various outlets and their goal is to isolate authoritarian regimes and their relationships. If the regime that is receiving the sanctions is heavily linked and has relationships to Western democracies, it is more likely that a positive cumulative effect may happen (Diamond, 2008: 116; Marinov & Nili, 2015: 760).

The fourth factor, which plays a part in a country's democratization process, is *democracy assistance*. This one contains features such as reforming the governance, monitoring democratic elections, strengthening democratic institutions,

empowering the civil society and building a democratic culture. The democratic assistance often comes from other states, different NGOs and foundations (Diamond, 2008: 120-123; McFaul, 2010: 155). When doing this it enhances the chance of a democratic transition.

The fifth and last external factor is *democratization by force*. This factor is the last option to transnational actors and it contains threatening or putting pressure on a country in order to reestablish or impose a democracy. This is usually made through military- or organizational interventions and the record of achieving democracy by international force does not speak well about this way of creating a democracy (Diamond, 2008: 133; Beetham, 2009: 444).

3.3 Critique regarding Larry Diamond's democratization theory

Critique targeted towards Diamonds way of explaining democratization processes through internal and external factors is scattered among different arguments. Primarily, the critique is built upon the notion of the democratic transition. A democratic breakthrough and consolidation of a strong democracy is not as simple as going through nine different factors and not all countries that become strong democracies go through them (Carothers, 2002: 9). The transition from an authoritarian regime to a democratic state is according to critics simplified by Diamond. Conferring to the critique, most countries often get stuck in a grey area between democracy and authoritarianism, where it is hard to tell whether a country is going through a democratic process or not (Carothers, 2002: 10). In addition, there is a belief that the citizen's view on democracy has been omitted when studying the democratization process (Carothers, 2002: 10-11).

Given the critique against Diamonds democratization theory, this study has focused on investigating the result in which one country is partly free and the other one is free (Freedom House, 2016); hence weak and strong democracy. The ambition is to find factors affecting the democratic process, where arguments will be presented referring to their connection to the development. Regarding the critique that all countries does not go through the nine factors, does not affect this study, due to the fact that the purpose is to through them trying to explain why Tanzania has not consolidated into a strong democracy. There is no argument that neither Tanzania nor Botswana would have been affected by all of them. Furthermore when studying the civil society, there will be a larger focus on the citizens perspective on democracy.

3.4 Summary of the theoretical framework

The theoretical framework has been created out of Larry Diamonds nine factors, which all have an impact on a country's democratization process. There are four internal factors (authoritarian divisions, authoritarian development, free values and the rise of civil society), and five external factors (diffusion and demonstration effects, peaceful pressure, the limits of sanctions and aid conditionally, democracy assistance and democratization by force). The impact on each may vary, where one may not have any impact on the outcome and another might have an essential effect on a democratization process that will result in consolidating a democracy.

3.5 Shaping the analytical framework

The presented result of the material will be put in table 2, which is based on the theoretical framework, in order to create a comparison between the two countries factors. Each factor will be put in its own figure where the following questions will be asked: did it occur? And if it did, what positive or negative significance did it have on the democratization process?

Table 2 Analytical apparatus

Country	Occurrence	Significance
Tanzania		
Botswana		

The benefit of creating an analytical apparatus is the opportunity to build the concluding arguments on a clear comparative ground, which will strengthen the reliability and validity of the paper. When using the analytical framework answers to the research questions and also the aim will be provided: what external and internal factors have had an impact on both countries democratization process and in what way do they differ? And is it possible to explain why Tanzania's democratization process not resulted in a strong democracy through comparing the explanatory differences between each countries different factors affecting a democratization process?

4 Analysis

This chapter will begin with a briefing part of both countries early history in order to create a better illusion of the comparative case studies before a deeper analyze can be done. The early history will be followed by empirical material from Tanzania and Botswana between 1961-2015, which after presented will be put into the analytical apparatus before the comparative conclusion.

4.1 Early history

The early history of both countries will brief the years between the beginning of the 20th century until they both got independence from Britain in 1961 (Tanzania) and 1966 (Botswana). The goal is to create a small understanding of the situation in both countries before they gained independence.

4.1.1 Tanzania

In the beginning of the 20th century, modern day Tanzania consisted out of two units. The mainland, which then was called Tanganyika, was a German colony until 1919 and when the British defeated Germany in World War I they gained administration over the African country. The second unit, Zanzibar, became a British protectorate in 1890 and remained under British rule until the beginning of the 1960s. Tanganyika got independence in 1961 shortly followed by Zanzibar in 1963, and in 1964 the two units united and formed the United Republic of Tanzania (Mbogoni, 2013: 3).

When being a British colony, Tanzania was exposed to the British industrialization, whose goal was to secure new foundations of raw material, open new markets for producing commodities and lastly to produce international channels for capital investments (Mbogoni, 2013: 4; Havnevik, 1993: 31).

4.1.2 Botswana

Botswana, then called Bechuanaland, became a British protectorate in 1885 (Zaffiro, 2014: 959), but it was not until 1891 that they started to make changes in the country. An effort was made to create an administrative structure that would be controlled by the British (Makhala, 2009: 229). Botswana was exposed to a British ‘indirect rule’, which was founded on the theory that that the colonial goods were territories. These territories were held in trust and Britain was obligated to help the colonial people to develop and advance the resources of the colonies that would not necessary gain Britain but people

in Botswana generally (Boateng, 1978: 61; Good, 1992: 72). Botswana later gained independence in 1966 (Zaffiro, 2014: 960).

4.2 Tanzania

When Tanzania became independent in 1961 they inherited an economic structure shaped by 70 years of colonialism, the economy was structured to meet to the needs of Britain and had a focus on world economy (Ewald, 2014: 96). The agricultural production dominated the economy. In addition, competition from imports had weakened the traditional production within the country based on craft skills, which resulted that Tanzania when gaining independence had an extremely low level of industrial development (Ewald, 2014: 97). Nevertheless, Tanzania's socio-economic profile was considered being a "peripheral" economy. The characteristics of this were features such as low-paid labor, low levels of economic diversification and labor intense production. Characteristically, they exported raw materials whilst being reliant on the import of high-level technology and manufactures (Wallerstein, 1979: 81-82).

Thus, the early years after independence Tanzania had a flourishing political culture and an expanding civil society due to national unity and political mobilization in connection with breaking free from Britain. Yet, the country had a bureaucratic apparatus that was extremely centralized. It held an elitist and arrogant position, and there was not any political participation from below (Ewald, 2014: 97; Havnevik, 1993: 32-33).

When Tanzania became independent, Julius Nyerere gained office. It was him who took initiative to form Tanganyika African National Union (TANU), a small but well organized labor force that established the social base of the nationalist movement (Kiondo, 1989: 11), which had been a driving force in the process of gaining independence. His three biggest concerns and priorities for Tanzania was poverty, ignorance and disease, which led to a focus upon democratic governance, reducing poverty and inequalities between the years of 1961-1967 (Ewald, 2014: 99). When doing this he developed the concept of *"ujamaa"*, which basically means family hood. The concept came with the beliefs that development and socialism would bring Tanzania's liberation further (Schneider, 2014: 320; Havnevik, 1993: 37). Nyerere's general notion transformed into a sequence of proclamations, one of them was the Arusha Declaration that became effective in 1967. The Arusha Declaration was tinged with socialist reforms, especially alterations concerning the rural areas of Tanzania. The

declaration affirmed that TANU would build a socialist society that would contain freedom of expression and individual human rights, which would have an officious role for the state (Havnevik, 1993: 42). Quickly, what was supposed to be liberation for the poorer periphery areas turned into coercive campaigns by the state. The government started to resettle rural inhabitants into so-called "ujamaa villages", approximately 70 percent of Tanzania's population had leave their homes and were relocated into ujamaa villages, which were supposed to be internally self-governed (Schneider, 2014: 320; Havnevik, 1993: 48). Nyerere's idea was that these communities would establish and bring scattered rural citizens into solid settlement, where the ujamaa villages would facilitate cooperative organization of economic activities as well as provide services like water supply and health care (Nyerere, 1968: 110; Schneider, 2014: 320; Ewald, 2014: 102).

During this period the political elite in Tanzania believed that it was justified and obligated to force charges. They believed that peasants were not competent enough to make their own decisions regarding on how to build their better futures, which was why the politicians had to take control. In order to legitimize the governmental coercive approach, the politicians claimed that it was for the better good, that it would enhance socialism and work against still remaining colonialism within the country (Schneider, 2014: 320). In addition, during the period when the ujamaa villages were created, attempts on increasing the country's economy was made through developing cash crops in Tanzania, which advocated exports as the engine of growth. Furthermore, industries were established by former suppliers, which resulted in that the attitude towards commercialization and modernization changed (Havnevik, 1993: 29). However, this strategy failed to attract foreign capital due to changes in the world economy and Tanzania's economy stayed weak (Ewald, 2014: 100).

After the Arusha Declaration it became clear that the state controlled most of Tanzania's arenas. The economy became state-led without any competition from any other forces or actors and media was systematically eliminated by the intensive control the power elite had gained. The civil society, which hade been flourishing before the independence and a few years after, became significantly reduced from 1964 and onwards (Kiondo, 1995: 110; Havnevik, 1993: 39) and the organizations that were consecutively assimilated within the state apparatus (Havnevik, 1993: 39; Coulson, 1982: 140). With time the powers between the party and the government had shifted and

the party with Nyerere at the forefront became superior over the parliament (Ewald, 2014: 102-103).

Later during the 1970s a combination of monopolization of the democratic system, nationalization of a great part of the private segment and the incorporation of the civil society in the state-apparatus made the government elite practically independent from all checks and balances. By 1974, the number of state-controlled cooperations had increased extensively. The cooperations had three main responsibilities: (i) to enlarge investment in constructive sectors; (ii) to diminish the relocation of profits out of the country; and (iii) to reinforce beneficial infrastructure (Coulson, 1982: 274). This expansion meant that Tanzania's population was excluded from control of the power elite. They could neither check the elites activities nor express their wishes and thoughts through a democratic process. The development of authoritarianism in Tanzania was a response to the negative external economic developments and the problems gained from the implementation of the Arusha policies as well as enhanced stagnation in the domestic economy (Havnevik, 1993: 46). Despite all this, the statist model in Tanzania was supported by a majority of the international community (Ewald, 2014: 103).

It was also during the 1970s that the authoritarian implementations of the villagization took an extreme upspring. President Nyerere had called upon the stupidity among them who did not move into the ujamaa-villages; according to him it was an act against modernization. The result of this was tremendous, and between the years 1972 and 1977, the number of people living in the ujamaa villages went from 2 to 13 million (Coulson, 1982: 241). The rapid movement of people resulted in that the quality and quantity of water provision, health services and education started to decline within the villages (Havnevik, 1993: 54).

Henceforward, it was throughout the 1970s that foreign assistance to Tanzania started to increase rapidly and it was about to continue into the 1980s. The effects the foreign assistance had during the 1970s on the state was that it compensated for an underlying tendency of economic stagnation, but most importantly, it strengthened the authoritarian statism in Tanzania, thus the external aid that was sent to Tanzania coincided with the elites of the state. It was used to maintenance the development model, which Nyerere had developed as well as for the expansion of state institutions and industry (Havnevik, 1993: 54).

In the end of the 1970s and in the beginning of the 1980s the authoritarian approach that Tanzania had gained and the statist model broke down due to increased internal and external pressure. The internal pressure came out of the displeasure of the increased inefficiency and growth in unaccounted spending in parastatals and government. These tendencies resulted in loss of political legitimacy within Nyerere's party and government (Havnevik, 1993: 54). This displeasure evolved in small reforms such as liberalization of the government and the economy. Furthermore, it led to a declined state intervention and control as well as a reduced social profile of the state (Havnevik, 1993: 29-30).

These changes that were made resulted in an economic crises in the country, which later steered Tanzania in the beginning of the 1980s to the International Monetary Fund (IMF), where they appealed for help and applied for extended fund facilities. The country was already receiving aid from the West, China and the Soviet Union, since their independence, though it was not enough anymore. Between 1980 and 1986 the country's GDP declined and a great part of the infrastructure as well as the production system was affected badly. IMF agreed on funding on the conditions that Tanzania would: (i) liberalize its inter-regional trade; (ii) strengthen their control of public spending, including the parastatal sector; and (iii) devaluate and rationalize the producer price scheme (Biermann & Wagao, 1986: 94). However, the credit was frozen since Tanzania did not fulfill the conditions issued by the IMF (Ewald, 2014: 107; Biermann & Wagao, 1986: 95), which led to considerably reduced incomes amongst farmers and social services. The discontent with the state was now a definite fact and the legitimacy for the statist model declined when Nyerere government failed to provide the people of Tanzania with development towards the right direction. With the discontent among both internally and externally Nyerere tried to save the situation through a few new policies and changes within the party and the government. However, in 1985 Nyerere realized that his presidency had come to an end and stepped down to be replaced by Ali Hassan Mwinyi, although he still kept chairmanship of the party (Ewald, 2014: 108).

During the economic crisis in Tanzania the public sector somehow had positively grown (Ewald, 2014: 106) and the civil society in Tanzania was mobilizing.
The new government approved in 1986 an Economic Recovery Programme (ERP), which was a neoliberal Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) covered by the IMF. The conditions were the same as usual, they encouraged integration with the world

market thus it was considered being the winning strategy for economic development and growth in Tanzania (Frame, 2015:1083). The conditions involved importation of reforms and liberalization within the market and the distribution systems. The privatization and liberalization that ERP interpreted, were positively introduced and the power elite reluctantly started to implement the policies that IMF and the ERP demanded (Ewald, 2014: 108). The aid that came from the IMF came in three generations where Tanzania received its last SAP in 1993. However, the years of receiving aid and applying new reforms did not strengthen the country enough due to the fact that Tanzania now was in deep dept. Even though Tanzania had SAPs, the majority of the labor force's incomes remained being reliant on rural subsistence farming and low-productivity (Frame, 2015: 1085). This was a result due to the transformations from state-capitalism to a more liberal one and changes within the power elite, where new elites were developing while the old elite was gripping on to power (Ewald, 2014: 108).

Moreover, the civil society in Tanzania during the 1990s was characterized by trade liberalization, structural adjustment, administrative decentralization and democratization (Gibbon, 2001: 820). The roles of organizations in Tanzania shifted during this period and clear tendencies toward privatization and translocalization were evident (Gibbon, 2001: 833).

In Tanzania the public sector received targeted donor funding that helped Civil Society Organizations (CSO) in Tanzania develop. The donations provided standard tools for gathering a national civil society sector, which consisted out of different roles (Mercer & Green, 2013: 109). This led to a national NGO policy that was formulated in 2002, which helped CSOs represent the poor population in Tanzania but also to ensure government accountability. The policy gave the CSO sector a role both in monitoring the government and doing the policy process, which first and foremost was supposed make the public a part of the poverty reduction strategy (Merver & Green, 2013: 112).

Other important issues that developed in Tanzania during the 1990s were a multi-party system. Due to the post-independence ideologies (i. e. socialism and nationalism) a multi-party system was first considered bringing damage to the fragile country and the national unity (Babeiya, 2011: 83; Ewald, 2014: 110). All critique and opposition against the power elite was regarded as a threat to the state and previously electoral competition had only been between individuals in a party, not amongst

different parties. However, due to internal discontent and external pressure Nyerere, whom still was the chairman of the ruling party, realized he had to refresh in order to maintain CCMs legitimacy. A multi-party system was introduced and in 1995 the first government election was held (Babeiya, 2011: 84; Ewald, 2014: 110-111). Due to the fact that CCM had better access to information and greater experience they won the first multi-party election. In the opposition, where new parties had started to develop, there had been a struggle to take place within the political arena due to lack of experience. This led to that before the election in 2000 an effort was made in the opposition to strengthen the strategies, programs and parties; which resulted in four new parties that were considered being fully developed (Babeiya, 2011: 84; Ewald, 2014: 222). When enhancing new political parties in Tanzania it became clear that all parties, including CCM were to a large extent based on narrow social bases and on charismatic individuals rather than strategies (Ewald, 2014: 223). However, due to those features there were two parties that succeeded to develop a more institutionalized characteristics that were enabled to be measured with CCM, these parties were Civic United Front (CUF) and Chama cha Demokrasia na Maendeleo (CHADEMA). Within the multi-party system these two newly developed parties had financial, resources and an organization that was equal to CCMs. They also enlarged procedures and structures for elections that helped them reach out to diverse branches in the country, and which also made them a respective party. Even though other parties developed during the consolidation of the democratic system in Tanzania CCM have won all election since the implementation of the multi-party system and they still dominates the legislature (Babeiya, 2011: 85; Ewald, 2014: 224-225).

4.3 Botswana

When Botswana gained independence in 1966 the country quickly became one of the poorest countries in the world due to its topography; Botswana was unfitting for productive farming. However, this misfortune did not affect the country badly for very long thus in 1967 large deposits of copper-nickel and diamonds was found in the country. The large deposits of natural resources created a revenue stream and it radically restricted the political economy in Botswana. This discovery ensured economical growth within the new country due to the primary architect of independence, Seretse Khama. Khama became the first president in Botswana after the country's independence and he quickly took on the reasonability of setting the standard for managing the newly

found mineral fortune in a nationally beneficial and transparent manner (Brown & Kaiser, 2007: 1134).

When Botswana gained independence the country inherited a multi-party system in which Botswana Democratic Party (BDP) took office in 1966.The new ruling party's ideology and character was modest. BDP was also considered being very tolerant to different ethnic and racial groups (de Jager & Sebudubudu, 2017: 19; Hjort, 2010: 690). Moreover, the new government led by Khama was considered being centralized and elitist thus local councils had limited authority and the government overruled reforms that would delegate significant powers to local authorities (Riedl & Dickovick, 2014: 334). The new political system that grew in Botswana was a mix of parliamentary and presidential elements. The president had the authority to dismiss and appoint cabinet ministers as well as to dissolve the legislature (Sebudubudu & Osei-Hwedie, 2006: 37; Brown & Kaiser, 2007: 1133). However, Khama's government quickly developed a construction sector after the independence which resulted in a firm and quick development; modern housing, telecommunications and electricity expanded quickly and the cattle segment was considered being greatly successful (Hjort, 2010: 691).

During this expansion, BDP wanted to extend the party's reach and strengthen its support due to increased competition among the political parties, which they did through improving development and services within the country. By the end of the 1970s the government established local level sub-districts, so called Kgotla, in order to improve service delivery, although this fiscal decentralization did not increase administrative or funding authority (Riedl & Dickovick, 2014: 335). Nevertheless, this regionalization increased the involvement of social- and political culture amongst the population and Kgotla is still used as a link between the government and the population in order to secure social development. Through the institution of the Kgotla the government engage the populace in the decision-making on a village level, which makes popular involvement by the citizens possible (Macartney, 1974: 223; Osei-Hwedie, 2010: 122).

The social structure in Botswana has proven being important in the provision of native institutions of cultural groups throughout the years after gaining independence. They create a civil society with entrenched values that has developed a democratic atmosphere within the different contexts of the state. The culture and traditions, which the different tribes and ethnic groups provide has created a foundation

of tolerance and conflict prevention. They have also promoted development and democracy as well as helped consolidating a national unity, stability and identity in Botswana (Hjort, 2010: 689; Osei-Hwedie, 2010: 119). Tswana, which is one of the largest tribes in Botswana, has played a vital part in the country's consolidation of democracy. The tribe is built upon the foundation of values such as community consensus, moderation, public discussion and non-violence. In addition, the political culture of the tribe does not support extremist organizations (Holm, 1988: 180; Hjort, 2010: 692; Charlton, 1993: 330). These values that characterize a large part of the Botswana's population is intertwined with the governance and the political parties. Botswana has four national principles that are inspired by the morals of the tribes, on which the country's development plan is built upon. These are democracy, self-reliance, development and unity to encourage societal harmony. These are revived by academics, civil society organizations and politicians, which has created a democratic atmosphere in Botswana. A result of the social and political culture is a healthy democratic ambiance; hence the democracy emphasizes the importance of individual obligations, while at the same time it respects individual rights and promotes the importance for the grandeur of others (Osei-Hwedie, 2010: 121, Charlton, 1992: 332).

The assets gained from the social structure have built a strong democratic foundation on which Botswana's civil society could emerge from. The civil society started mainly to appear in the 1980s when NGOs and CSOs were created in the country. Their main goal was to supplement the mistakes of the state to successfully bring development and services to the citizens all around the country. However, the emerging of NGOs in Botswana had to struggle due to lack of experience and knowledge among the citizens. Most NGOs that were created took on an ad-hoc way of organizing, which meant that they addressed a particular issue and then went in to a state of deterioration. The NGOs also got tinted by external donor agencies as well with the government in terms of funding and polices. This quickly created a problem since some of the CSOs then could not criticize the government due to the fact that they were manipulated by state funding (Lekorwe & Mpabanga, 2007: 8; Maundeni, 2005: 181). In the late 1980s the Democracy Research Project (DRP) was established, which was a group of academics, politicians civil servants and journalists. The DRP later united into an official assembly of indigenous researchers whose activities were founded neither by the university nor by the state. They initiated different debates on comparative representation, gender and the electoral system throughout the country and in 1995 they

held a conference where various CSOs in Botswana came together for the first time. The result from the conference was the creation of Botswana Council of Non-Governmental Organizations (BOCONGO), which has become an important player in the policy processes in Botswana (Maundeni, 2005: 182). This strong culture within the civil society has led to that the parliamentary democracy in Botswana emphasizes participation, accountability, consultation and representation (Hjort, 2010: 690; Osei-Hwedie, 2010: 122).

The economic prosperity in Botswana, which is a result of its vast natural resources, has led to a socio-economic development within the country since the independence. The ruling party BDP has used resource readjustment policies and balanced resource distribution. In connection to this, BDP has established development programs that are supposed to make sure that the opulence from the mineral expansion benefits everyone. President Khama made sure that the development programs focused on infrastructure and the provision of services. The development programs smeared on the country included the construction of roads, schools, and clinics as well as the endowment of health services, education and the access to food and water (Alexander & Kaboyakgosi, 2012: 86). In doing so the party advanced their genuineness and gained the trust of the citizens. This combined with committed economic policies, politicians devoted to development, democratic governance and upright economic management has promoted social justice and made sure that the country's economy would blossom (Osei-Hwedie, 2010: 125). In the 1970s when the diamond profits started flowing, which later resulted in that the government loosened their economic control and that the quantity of central planning was steadily reduced during the 1980s. This later resulted in a flourishing entrepreneurship and private market in Botswana (Hjort, 2010: 691).

Since gaining independence and implementing a multi-party system, BDP has won every election and they have all been considered fair and free. Meanwhile, the distinct freedoms have mostly been secured by effective checks and balances (Hjort, 2010:695). The elections has had an emphasis on the importance of moderation, discussion and compromise gained from the cultural legacy that has created a democratic foundation on which the elections in Botswana are based upon (Charlton, 1993: 332). Additionally an opposition started to develop in 1969, where other parties started to gain more support thus they lacked the ascriptive status that BDP have. Botswana National Front (BNF) became BDP's main opponent among other smaller parties that challenge the dominant support of the BDP (Charlton, 1993: 335).

4.4 Analytical apparatus

In the tables that follow below the empirical material will be coincided with the theoretical framework. The first column will state whether the factor has occurred within Tanzania and Botswana between 1961-2015 (yes or none). In the column next to occurrence an explanation to why it is has or has not occurred will be stated followed by the significance it has had on the country's democratization process.

Table 3 Authoritarian divisions

Country	Occurrence	Significance
Tanzania	Yes	It was not until the 1990s when an opposition was created in Tanzania and authoritarian divisions occurred. Before that President Nyerere had been superior over the parliament and ruled over an elitist, arrogant and centralized one-party government. This made it almost impossible for the civil society to affect the government due to lack of "soft-liners", and there was no participation from below that could promote democracy.
Botswana	Yes	The country had a multi-party system from the beginning of their independence, where President Khama promoted decentralization through Kgotla. Even though Khama was a "hard-liner" the civil society could affect the opposition and other "soft-liners" within BDP and promote democratic policies.

Table 4 Authoritarian development

Country	Occurrence	Significance
Tanzania	None	The country struggled with economic development for a long time, where the government tried many times to increase the economic development. It was not until in the 1980s when a small liberalization of the economy happened due to an ERP and SAPs, however the financial aid stayed within the power elite and no investment in socio-economic development was made that would grant the population. This made it hard for an intellect middle class to emerge whom can affect the democratic values.
Botswana	Yes	The country experienced economic growth early after the independence, which led to a socio-economic development. The ruling party used resource readjustment polices to ensure that services such as schools, roads and clinics were created. The policies created an equal chance for the population to develop an intellect through education. This has ensured the interest of democratic values within the country, where a middle class and a civil society has been given the opportunity to grow.

Table 5 Free values

Country	Occurrence	Significance
Tanzania	None	Due to lack of socio-economic development the chances to increase levels of information and education amongst the community has been obscure. This has resulted in an ongoing political and social polarization, which makes it hard for the civil society to develop greater democratic attitudes and values within the population.
Botswana	Yes	Ever since before the independence the country's civil society has been entrenched by democratic values through the different tribes and ethnic groups within the country. They have promoted free values that have affected the governance where a democratic atmosphere tinged with moderation, democracy and consensus has developed.

Table 6 The rise of civil society

Country	Occurrence	Significance
Tanzania	Yes	The civil society blossomed in the early years after the independence, which quickly were reduced by governmental actions in 1964 and onwards. Existing CSOs were assimilated into the government and the population was excluded from control over the power elite. This restrain on the development of the civil society has made it hard for the populace to

		mobilize and for people to start engaging themselves. This has later resulted in that the country has suffered regarding its chances to change the general opinion regarding democratization towards the positive. It was not until the 1990s when the civil society started to develop again and democratic promotion was made possible.
Botswana	Yes	CSOs and NGOs did not start to appear in Botswana until the 1980s. However, the civil society had existed through the concept of Kgotla. Through this the citizens were able to organize and be involved in decision-making processes on a local level.

Table 7 Diffusion and demonstration effects

Country	Occurrence	Significance
Tanzania	None	The country's democratization process has not been affect by any diffusion or demonstration effects. This has not had any crucial effect on the country's democratization process.
Botswana	None	The country's democratization process has not been affect by any diffusion or demonstration effects. This has not had any crucial effect on the country's democratization process.

Table 8 Peaceful pressure

Country	Occurrence	Significance
Tanzania	Yes	Peaceful pressure has been put upon the country through the financial aid they have been receiving from IMF. The conditions that followed with the financial assistance forced the government to implement democratic values as well as a liberalization of the economy and the government. Additional peaceful pressure was put upon the country through donations sent to the civil society in order to mobilize and promote democratic values within the country.
Botswana	None	The country's democratization process has not been affect by any peaceful pressure in terms of sanctions, conditions of aid or of any significant diplomacy.

Table 9 The limits of sanctions and aid conditionally

Country	Occurrence	Significance
Tanzania	Yes	When the government failed to live up to the conditions followed by the financial aid their credits were frozen. This isolated the government who lost its legitimacy and had to take democratic actions and liberalize the government and the economy. This also resulted in critique towards the government where the civil society demanded improvement within the country.

Botswana	None	The country's democratization process has not been affect by any sanctions or aid conditionally.

Table 10 Democratic assistance

Country	Occurrence	Significance
Tanzania	Yes	Democracy assistance was made in Tanzania through the work made by the IMF. The SAPs that the country received came with conditions that tried to reform the government towards a more liberal way of governing. Furthermore assistance was made through empowering the civil society throughout donations. This created a stronger civil society with an increasing number of CSOs and NGOs, which later started to monitor the government in order to demand accountability.
Botswana	Yes	The civil society within Botswana received democracy assistance through external donors that tried to empower and engage people within the population. In doing this the possibilities in having organizations that promote a democratic process were increased.

Table 11 Democratization by force

Country	Occurrence	Significance
Tanzania	None	Democratization by force has not been applied on the country and is has not had vital effect on the country's democratization process.

Botswana	None	Democratization by force has not been applied on the country and is has not had vital effect on the country's democratization process.

5 Comparative Conclusion

When studying the different figures within the analytical apparatus one can find 3 main differences concerning Tanzania's and Botswana's democratization processes between the years of 1961-2015. These differences will be considered being explanatory factors to why Tanzania has not consolidated into a strong democracy.

The first main explanatory factor to why Tanzania has not developed a full-scale democracy is the *economy*. In Botswana economic prosperity resulted in socio-economic development, which enabled the population to form and promote democratic values towards one another and also towards the government. This never happened in Tanzania where the economy stayed weak and the population had to focus upon basic needs instead of mobilizing. The lack of socio-economic development in Tanzania hindered the emerging of a middle class. Additionally, the absence of information and education resulted in lack of knowledge concerning individual- and political rights, which has made it almost impossible for a civil society to emerge and endorse democracy.

The first explanatory factor is strongly interwoven into the second one, which is the lack of *free values* in Tanzania. In Botswana democratic values have been promoted through the civil society, where different ethnic groups and tribes have been the key to a full-working democracy in Botswana. The free values have been treated and sustained through the economic prosperity, which has enabled the population of Botswana to stay optimistic and to affect the democratization process positively. Tanzania missed out on this democratic foundation within the country, when the government not made it possible for a civil society to evolve. The civil society has without any doubts had a great impact on Botswana's democratization process and they have had the opportunity to grow due to governmental choices and policies. If the government in Tanzania had focused on socio-economic development within the country, the political and social polarization inside in the country would not be as large and a united civil society would have had the possibility to transpire and to develop free values, which would have affected Tanzania's democratization process in a positive way through liberal ideas and accountability amongst the population.

The last main explanatory factor in why Tanzania has not consolidated into a strong democracy is the *authoritarian division*. When Tanzania first became independent they immediately gained an authoritarian president with an elitist and arrogant agenda. Since the state had a one-party system it was impossible for citizens to

affect an opposition and to promote democratic values towards “soft-liners”. The governance in Tanzania was centralized and the citizens had nowhere to submit their democratic needs. This is a main explanatory factor due to the fact that Botswana’s government had both “hard-liners” and soft-liners”. The president had an elitist view, yet considering the multi-party system he had to take the opposition in mind in order to remain office. Botswana developed a decentralized way of governing, where citizens got to affect decision-making and policies on a local level. This involvement created a greater interest in the democratic values in Botswana, which it could have done in Tanzania if there had been competition in the office to which the population could have turned when demanding democratic changes.

Tanzania had positive factors affecting their democratization process between the years 1961-2015 such as peaceful pressure and democratic assistance. However, due to the three main explanatory factors above the positive affects were out conquered since the economy, free values and authoritarian divisions are proven being crucial in Tanzania’s process towards democratization. These explanatory factors resulted in that Tanzania lacked state legitimacy, a democratic culture, and democracy and good governance. Those factors did not get the chance to develop, which put a strain upon the country’s democratization and they are the main reasons why contemporary Tanzania has not consolidated into a solid democracy.

Bibliography

Alexander, Karin & Kaboyakgosi, Gape. (2012) *A fine Balance: Assessing the Quality of Governance in Botswana*. Oxford: African Books Collective. p. 2-3, 86

Babeiya, Edwin. (2011) 'Multiparty Elections and Party Support in Tanzania', *Journal of Asian and African Studies*. Volume 47 [issue 1], p. 83-85 [Online] DOI: 10.1177/00219096 [accessed 2017-05-24]

Beetham, David. (2009) 'The Contradictions of Democratization by force: the case of Iraq', *Democratization*. June, Volume 16 [issue 3], p. 444 [Online] DOI: 10.1080/13510340902914338 [accessed 2016-11-29]

Bernhagen, Patrick. (2009) 'Democracy, Business, and the Economy', in Haerpfer, Christian. W. & Bernhagen, Patrick & Inglehart, Ronald F. & Welzel, Christian. *Democratization*. New York: Oxford Univeristy Press. p. 123

Biermann, Werner & Wagao, Jumanne. (1986) 'The Quest for Adjustment: Tanzania and the IMF, 1980-1986', *African Studies Review*. December, Volume 20 [issue 4], p. 94-95 [Online] DOI: 10.2307/524008 [accessed 2016-12-13]

Boateng, Ernest A. (1978) *A political geography of Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univeristy Press. p. 61

Bratton, Michael. (2009) 'Sub-Saharan Africa', in Haerpfer, Christian. W. & Bernhagen, Patrick & Inglehart, Ronald F. & Welzel, Christian. *Democratization*. New York: Oxford Univeristy Press. p. 342, 352

Brown, Stephen & Kaiser, Paul. (2007) 'Democratisations in Africa: Attemps, hindrances and prospects', *The World Quarterly*. September, Volume 28 [issue 6], p. 1133-1134 [Online] DOI: 10.1080/01436590701507552 [accessed 2017-03-26]

Bryman, Alan. (2002) *Samhällsvetenskapliga Metoder*. 2., [rev] Malmö: Liber. p. 341

Carothers, Thomas. (2002) 'The End of the Transition Paradigm', *Journal of Democracy*. January, Volume 12 [issue 1], p. 9-11 [Online] DOI: 10.1353/jod.2002-0003 [accessed 2016-12-02]

Charlton, Roger. (1993) 'The Politics of Elections in Botswana', *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*. January, Volume 63 [issue 3], p. 330, 332, 335 [Online] http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lnu.se/stable/1161426 [accessed 2017-04-29]

Coulson, Andrew. (1982) *Tanzania: A Political Economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. p. 140, 241, 274

Dahl, Robert A. (1989) *Democracy and its Critics*. New Haven: Yale Univeristy Press. p. 19, 222

De Jager, Nicola & Sebudubudu, David. (2017) 'Towards understandning Botswana and South Africa's ambivalence to liberl democracy', *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*. January, Volume 35 [issue 1], p. 19 [Online] DOI: 10.1080/02589001.2016.1246682 [accessed 2017-03-26]

Diamonds, Larry. (1999) *Developing Democracy: Towards Consolidation*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press. p. 8-11

Diamond, Larry. (2008) *The Spirit of Democracy: The struggle to Build Free Socities Throughout the World*. New York: Times Books/Henry Holt and Company. p. 90-95, 97-99, 102-103, 108, 110, 112, 114, 116, 118, 120-124, 127

Diamond, Larry. (2010) 'Introduction', in Diamond, Larry & Plattner, Marc F. (second edition) *Democratization in Africa: Progress and Retreat* (Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins University Press. p. ix-xi

Esaiasson, Peter, Gilljam, Mikael Oscarsson, Henrik och Wängnerud, Lena. (2012) *Metodpraktikan. Konsten att studera samhälle, individ och marknad.* Stockholm: Norstedts Juridik. p. 36, 41-42

Ewald, Jonas. (2014) *Challenges for the Democratizaion Process in Tanzania: Moving Towards Consolidation 50 years after independence?*. Göteborg: Ineko AB. p. 96-97, 100, 102-103, 222-225

Frame, Mariko L. (2015) 'Economic Integration in Tanzania (1970-2011): A Biophysical Assessment', *Journal of Industrial Ecology*. October, Volume 20 [issue 5], p. 1083, 1085 [Online] DOI: 10.1111/jiec.12350 [accessed 2016-12-05]

Freedom House, (2012) Gambia.

Freedom House, (2014) 10 Positive Developments in Africa in 2013.

Freedom House, (2015) Botswana.

Freedom House, (2015) Tanzania.

George, Alexander L. & Bennett, Andrew. (2005) *Case Studies and Theory development in the Social Sciences*. Massachusetts: MIT Press. p. 153, 156, 181-182, 185

Good, Kenneth. (1992) 'Interpreting the Exceptionality of Botswana', *The Journal of Modern African Studies*. March, Volume 30 [issue 1], p. 72 [Online] http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lnu.se/stable/161047 [accessed 2017-03-26]

Havnevik, Kjell J. (1993) *Tanzania: the Limits to Development from Above*. Uppsala: Nordiska Afrkainstitutet. p. 29-31, 38-39, 48

Hermansson, Jörgen. (2003) 'Vad är det som är bra med demokrati?', in Gilljam, Mikael & Hermansson, Jörgen (red.), *Demokratins Mekanismer*. Malmö: Liber AB. p. 291

Hjort, Jonas. (2010) 'Pre-colonial culture, post-colonial economic success? The Tswana and the African Economic Miracle', *The Economic History Review*. August, Volume 63 [issue 3], p. 689-692, 695 [Online] [accessed 2017-04-23]

Holm, John D. (1988) 'Botswana: A Paternalistic Democracy, in Diamond, Larry & Linz, Juan J. & Lipset, Seymore M. *Democracy in Developing Countries*. Colorado: Lynne Reinner Publishers. p. 180

Hydén, Göran. (1999) 'Top-Down Democratization in Tanzania', *Journal of Democracy*. October, Volume 10, [issue 4], p. 142-143 [Online] DOI: 10.1353/jod.1999.0066 [accessed 2016-11-08]

Huntington, Samuel P. (1991) 'How Countries Democratize', *Political Science Quarterly*. Winter, Volume 106 [issue 4], p. 581, 593 [Online] DOI: 10.2307/2151795 [accessed 2016-11-29]

Huntington, Samuel P. (1993) *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. University of Oaklahoma Press, Norman. p. 19, 32-33, 123-125

Ihonvbere, Julius O. (1997) 'Democratization in Africa', *A Jornal of Social Justice*. September, Volume 9 [issue 3], p. 371 [Online] DOI: 10.1080/10402659708426079 [accessed 2016-12-05]

Inglehart, Ronald F. &Welzel, Christian. (2009) 'Political Culture, Mass Beliefs, and Value Change', in Haerpfer, Christian. W. & Bernhagen, Patrick & Inglehart, Ronald F. & Welzel, Christian. *Democratization*. New York: Oxford Univeristy Press. p. 143

Inglehart, Ronald F. &Welzel, Christian. (2009) 'How Development Leads to Democracy: What We Know About Modernization', *Foreign Affairs*. January, Volume 88 [issue 2], p. 34, 36, JSTORE Journals, EBSCO*host* [accessed 2016-11-29]

Kiondo, Andrew. (1995) 'When the State Withdraws: Local Development, Politics, and Liberlisation in Tanzania, in Gibbon, Peter. (ed) *Liberalised Development in Tanzania*. Uppsala: Nordic Africs Institute. p. 110

Landman, Todd & Robinson, Neil. (2009) *The SAGE Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications Ltd. p. 14

Lekorwe, Mogopodi & Mpabanga, Dorothy. (2007) 'Managing Non-Governmental Organizations in Botswana', *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*. Volume 12 [issue 3], p. 8 [Online] [accessed 2017-04-29]

Letki, Natalia. (2009) 'Social Capital and Civil Society', in Haerpfer, Christian. W. & Bernhagen, Patrick & Inglehart, Ronald F. & Welzel, Christian. *Democratization*. New York: Oxford Univeristy Press. p. 161

Lewis, Peter. (2010). 'Growth Without Prosperity in Africa', in Diamond, Larry & Plattner, Marc F. *Democratization in Africa: Progress and Retreat*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Univerity Press. p. 89

Linz, Juan J. & Stepan, Alfred. (1996) *Problems of Democartic Transitions and Consolidation*. Balitmore: The John Hopkins University Press. p. 3-6

Liviga, Athumani J. (2011) 'Economic and Political Liberalization in Tanzania and its Unintended Outcomes'. January, Volume 27 [issue 1], p. 17 [Online] edspmu.S1684417311100001 [accessed 2016-11-08]

Macartney, Allan W. J. (1974) 'Local Government and Development in Botswana', *Botswana Notes nad Records*. Volume 6, p. 223 [Online] [accessed 2017-04-23]

Makgala, Christian J. (2009) 'History and Perceptions of Regionalism in Botswana, 1891-2005', *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*. April, Volume 27 [issue 2], p. 229 [Online] DOI: 10.1080/02589000902867329 [accessed 2016-12-02]

Marinov, Nikolay & Nili, Samuel. (2015) 'Sanctions and Democracy', *International Interaction*. July, Volue 41 [issue 4], p. 760 [Online] DOI: 10.1080/03050629.2015.1036723 [accessed 2016-11-29]

Mawere, Munyaradzi & Mubaya, Tapuwa R. (2016). *African Philosophy and Thought Systems: A Search for a Culture and Philosophy of Belonging*. Oxford: African Books Collective. p. 221

Mbogoni, Lawrence E. Y. (2013) *Aspects of Colonial Tanzania History*. Dar es Salaam: Mkuki Na Nyota Publishers. p. 3

McFaul, Michael. (2010) 'Democracy Promotion as a World Value', *The Washington Quarterly*. January, Volume 28 [issue 1], p. 155 [Online] DOI: 10.1162/0163660042518189 [accessed 2016-11-29]

Mercer, Claire & Green, Maia. (2013) 'Making Civil Society Work: Contracting, Cosmopolitaism and Community Development in Tanzania', *Geoforum*. March, Volume 45. p. 109, 112 [Online] DOI: 10.1016/j.geoforum.2012.10.008 [accessed 2016-12-14]

Morlino, Leonardo. (2009). 'Political Parties', in Haerpfer, Christian. W. & Bernhagen, Patrick & Inglehart, Ronald F. & Welzel, Christian. *Democratization*. New York: Oxford Univeristy Press. p. 206

Maundeni, Zibani. (2005) *49 Years of Democracy in Botswana: 1965-2005*. Cape Town: Mills Litho. p. 181-182

Nyerere, Julius K. (1968) 'Socialism and Rural Development', in *Freedom and Socialism*. *Uhuru nu Ujamaa: A Selection from Writings and Speeches 1956-1973.* Edited by J. K. Nyerere. Dar es Salaam: Oxford Univerity Press. p. 110

Osei-Hwdie, Bertha Z. (2010) 'Botswana: Indigenous Institution, Cicil Sociaty and Government in Peace Buildeing in Southern Africa', *Journal of International Development and Cooperation*. Volume 16 [issue 2], p. 119, 121-122, 125 [Online] DOI: 10.15027/29809 [accessed 2017-04-23]

Papaioannou, Elias & Siourounis, Gregorios. (2008) 'Economic and Social Factors Driving the Third Wave of Democratization', *Journal of Comparative Economics*. Septermber, Volume 36 [issue 3], p. 387 [Online] DOI: 10.1016/j.jce.2008.04.005 [accessed 2016-11-29]

Rathbun, Brian. (2014) Diplomacy's Value: Creating Security in 1920s Europe and the Contemporary Middle East. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. p. 2

Riedl, Rachel & Dickovick, Tyler J. (2014) 'Party Systems and decentralization in Africa', *Studies in Comparative International Development*. September, Volume 29 [issue 3], p. 334-335 [Online] DOI: 10.1007/s12116-013-

9144-9 [accessed 2017-03-26]

Saine, Abdoulaye. (2002) 'Post-Coup Politics in Gambia', *Journal of Democracy*. October, Volume 13 [issue 4], p. 167 [Online] DOI: 10.1353/jod.2002.0079 [accessed 2016-12-05]

Sandbrook, Richard. (1996) 'Transitions without consolidation: democratization in six African cases', *Third World Quarterly*. March, Volume 17 [issue 1], p. 70 [Online] DOI: 10.1080/01436599650035789 [accessed 2016-11-08]

Schedler, Andreas. (2001) 'Measuring Democratic Consolidation', *Studies in Comparative International Development*. Spring, Volume 36 [issue 1], p. 67 [Online] DOI: 10.1007/BF02687585 [accessed 2016-12-08]

Schneider, Leander. (2014) 'Liberating Development? Rule and Liberation in Post Independence Tanzania', *Journal of Contemporary Adrican Studies*. July, Volume 32 [issue 3], p. 320 [Online] DOI: 10.1080/02589001.2014.956502 [accessed 2016-12-09]

Schumpeter, Joseph A. (1947) *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2003. p. 250-252

Sebudubudu, David & Osei-Hwedie, Bertha Z. (2006) 'Pitfalls of Parlimentary Democracy in Botswana', *African Spectrum*. Volume 41 [issie 1], p. 35, 37 [Online] http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lnu.se/stable/40175112 [accessed 2017-03-26]

Transparancy International, (2015) Botswana.

Yilmaz, Hakan. (2009) 'The International Context', in Haerpfer, Christian. W. & Bernhagen, Patrick & Inglehart, Ronald F. & Welzel, Christian. *Democratization*. New York: Oxford Univeristy Press. p. 94-95

Voltmer, Katrin & Rawnsley, Gary. (2009). 'The Media', in Haerpfer, Christian. W. & Bernhagen, Patrick & Inglehart, Ronald F. & Welzel, Christian. *Democratization*. New York: Oxford Univeristy Press. p. 237

Wallerstein, Immanuel. (1979) *The Capitalist World-Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 81-82

Weale, Albert. (2007) *Democracy*. New York: Palgarve Macmillan. p. 18-19

Zaffiro, James. (2014) 'In Service of Two Masters: a Political History of Radio in Pre independence Botswana', *Critical Arts Projets*. December, Volume 28 [issue 6], p. 959-960 [Online] DOI: 10.1080/02560046.2014.990658 [accessed 2016-12-02]