

The Role of Leadership and Re-Colonization: A Postcolonial Look at Botswana and Zimbabwe

Sevinç ASLAN

PhD Student, National Defence University, Atatürk Strategic Studies and Graduate Institute, sewasl24@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-6817-0247.

Levent ÜRER

Prof. Dr., Istanbul Aydın University, Political Science and International Relations, leventurer@aydin.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-5609-1189.

Araştırma Makalesi Research Article

Geliş Tarihi / Submitted
6 Mart 2024

Kabul Tarihi / Accepted
3 Haziran 2024

Keywords: Colonialism,
Re-colonization,
Leadership, Botswana,
Zimbabwe.

Abstract

This paper employs postcolonial criticism to examine the roles of leaders of independence movements in the decolonization process. The objective is to ascertain the extent to which the policies of the colonial period are reflected in the leadership understanding and roles of the administrative culture in colonist-colony-colonized relations and to what extent the policies of the colonial period are related to re-colonization. This paper examines how the dominant themes of the debates during the colonial period were reflected in the attitudes and policies of the post-independence leaders. In conclusion, this study asserts that a comparable experience in the process of re-colonization is reflected in the dominance of certain policies and debates surrounding nationalization, despite the movements of independence that originated against the colonists. In this regard, the article compares the leaders of Botswana and Zimbabwe, two neighboring countries with similar historical backgrounds but disparate experiences. This comparison, based on postcolonial criticism, has revealed that although the decolonization process has been experienced, it offers examples of leadership, one positive and the other negative, as a continuation of re-colonialism.



Introduction

In the field of international relations, the postcolonial approach offers a critical lens through which to examine sociological, political, economic, humanitarian, and environmental experiences during and after the colonial period. This paper employs postcolonial criticism to compare leadership roles in the decolonization process. The objective is to ascertain the extent to which the policies of the colonial period are reflected in the leadership understanding and roles of the administrative culture in the relations between colonists, colonies, and colonized peoples. Additionally, the paper seeks to determine the degree to which the policies of the colonial period are related to re-colonization. Consequently, the objective is to contribute to the postcolonial criticism literature by providing examples of leaders' attitudes through the concept of recolonization and hybridization.

This article compares the leaders of Botswana and Zimbabwe, two countries with similar historical backgrounds and shared borders that nevertheless underwent different colonization periods and processes of decolonization. The objective of this comparison is to elucidate how the leaders of two distinct colonial countries approached the management of the independence process, considering the cultural legacy inherited from the colonial period. A comparison of the two cases serves to elucidate the disparate roles of the colonial process in the formation of dominant classes and in the differentiation of the experience and perspectives of these classes.

This paper is distinctive in its examination of the circumstances of two leaders in both traditional and colonial periods. The paper examines the effects of these periods on the leaders who carried out the decolonization process and the reflections of these effects on the independence processes of the countries through the method of comparative analysis. The objective of this comparison is to elucidate how the leaders of two distinct colonial countries perceived the management culture inherited from the colonial period and how they managed the independence process.

In the initial section, the interrelationship between decolonization, re-colonization, and leadership is explored through the lens of postcolonial criticism. In the second chapter, the traditional understanding of leadership in the two countries prior to colonization is examined, along with the roles of leaders in that context. Additionally, the practices and methods employed by colonialists during the colonial period are revealed. In the third chapter, the post-independence

policies of the leaders are revealed by investigating how the decisions and roles of the leaders who led the independence movements were reflected in the decolonization process. In the fourth chapter, the similarities and differences between the two cases are determined. This comparison, based on postcolonial criticism, has determined that although there is a process of decolonization, there are leadership examples, one positive and the other negative, which can be considered a continuation of re-colonialism.

1. The Relationality of Decolonization, Re-colonization, and Leadership

Postcolonial theory endeavors to elucidate the active transformation movements of the present day (Young, 2016: 5) by associating the past with the present and perpetuating vestiges of the past in its perspective. The theory employs the concepts of decolonization and neo-colonization (Saul, 1993: x-xii) to offer a critical perspective on the continued influence of colonial relations, often observed to persist beyond the colonial period. In this context, the concept of re-colonization, which is discussed in conjunction with globalization in postcolonial criticism, represents a more comprehensive and explanatory basis. Re-colonization is a process by which former colonial powers retain their influence over a formerly colonized, but currently independent, nation-state by effectively multiplying or reproducing the former colony's conditions (Mohanty, 2003: 2-3). The process of decolonization and the role of leadership in the process of recolonization should be examined in the context of the three-component formulation (colonist-colony-colonized) (Bhabha, 1994: 173). Additionally, the relationship between the leaders of the colonial independence movements during decolonization and recolonization should be compared and their roles critically evaluated.

A widely accepted academic theory of colonialism has yet to be established. (Horvath, 1972: 45). The study of colonialism encompasses a range of disciplines, including economics, politics, and culture. In essence, colonialism can be defined as a relationship of sovereignty (Loomba, 1998: 19) or as a power seizing a country or region outside its borders and using it for its own benefit (İpek and Oyman, 2017: 406). In this context, the term “colonizer” refers to the entity that exercises its sovereign power to place its own population in a specific geographical region, thereby transforming it into a colony and establishing administrative mechanisms (Horvath, 1972: 47). Conversely, the term “settled geographical region” refers to the colonized entity (İpek and Oyman, 2017: 420-421). In this relational context, the role of the ruling class in shaping the cycle and that of leaders in managing the process become crucial.



The Role of Leadership and Re-Colonization: A Postcolonial Look at Botswana and Zimbabwe

When examined in a postcolonial framework, this cycle is observed to move in an interactive process. The term “postcolonialism” can be understood not only as the end of the colonial period, but also as opposition to colonial rule and the various legacies it leaves behind for the colonized (Loomba, 1998: 29-30). This implies that secessionist movements in former colonies become intertwined with the political, economic, and cultural legacies left behind by the colonizer. The intertwined cultural legacies do not, in fact, bring an end to colonialism; rather, they transform it, creating new states that have gained some independence but continue to be relatively dependent.

As discussions of the process of decolonization advanced, the term “neo-colonialism” emerged as a key concept in the field. In conjunction with the term “globalization,” the term acquired a more general meaning as a result of the phenomenon of globalization. Neo-colonialization is defined as the failure or incompleteness of decolonization. The term refers to new nation-states that were previously colonies but are currently officially independent and sovereign nations. However, they remain subject to their former colonizers (Kimche, 1971: 205; Saul, 1993: x-xii). During the period of colonization, the colonizer establishes a population within the region and establishes the colony under its rule. During the subsequent period of decolonization, the colony actively separates from the colonizer (Emerson, 1965: 45-46).

In this context, it can be posited that the relations between colonists, colonies, and colonized peoples are characterized by an intricate, two-way factual dynamic. The colonized entity, in turn, imitates the colonizer, becoming hybridized while separating from the colonizer through a treaty or a war of liberation (Ashcroft, 1998: 10; Bhabha, 1994: 126). It lives within both its own culture and the political and economic culture in which it was governed by the colonizer (Sawant, 2012: 120). This overlapping context transforms the newly independent state, creating a hybrid culture that is a combination of its traditional culture and the culture it inherited from the colonizer. Consequently, a complete decolonization cannot be achieved; instead, the process becomes one of re-colonization. In this context, the leadership of the people or groups needed to manage and direct this process assumes new importance. This phenomenon has historically occurred in Africa.

The leaders played a pivotal role in the independence movements that led to the decolonization of much of Africa. It is not possible to examine the leadership and the process separately from the cultural context (Baba, 2014: 3). Once more, the concept of hybridization

emerges in Bhabha's postcolonial critique, and it is possible to observe this hybridization in leadership culture and in political and economic policies and practices that resulted (Bhabha, 1984:130-133).

The primary focus of leadership studies in colonized Africa was the examination of the nature of leadership cultures that were characteristic of Africa as a colony. The nature of African leadership during the colonial period was largely shaped by the interests and priorities of the colonizer. The appointment of colonial administrators, such as governors, district officers, security chiefs, and other political officials by the colonizer (Baba, 2014: 6-7), exerted a powerful influence in shaping the political landscape of Africa today. Three distinct types of leaders emerged during this period: colonial administrators, chiefs, and nationalist leaders, which included nationalist politicians and guerrilla leaders. These three leadership categories are conceptually distinct yet semantically intertwined.

Colonial administrators relied heavily on local intermediaries and traditional power structures to achieve their goals. This transformation of tribal chiefs in traditional power structures into "subject leaders" (Rathbone, 2000: 10) is a notable consequence of this approach.

The third category of leaders comprises educated elites who assumed leadership of the nationalist movement for independence (Baba, 2014: 7). This category of leaders was born and raised during the colonial period, attended European schools, and visited European capitals. With some exceptions, they held salaried positions in the colony's civil service (Emerson, 1965: 58-59). In this historical context, hybridization, which plays a pivotal role in postcolonial criticism, reflects the leaders and their roles and represents the initial stage of re-colonization.

2. Colonization Policies in Botswana and Zimbabwe

Prior to the year 1900, the primary focus of international relations between Africa and Europe was trade. However, as the 20th century approached, the nature of this interaction shifted from one of trade and exchange to one of subordination and control. This shift paved the way for competition between European countries to colonize Africa. To mitigate the conflicts that arose over the unpopulated territories in Africa, European countries established colonies and initiated colonization processes. In the end, the conflicting interests of European countries over African lands and the resulting aggression between European powers led to the 1884-1885 Berlin Conference, where European powers seeking expansionist and economic advantages in non-



The Role of Leadership and Re-Colonization: A Postcolonial Look at Botswana and Zimbabwe

European regions discussed the division of Africa. The Berlin Conference's decisions were instrumental in establishing the parameters for the partition of Africa (Falola and Chukwuemeka, 2018: 79-83) and formalizing colonial policies. It can be argued that the classical colonial perspective, as developed by missionary understanding, has undergone a transformation and evolution, giving rise to a new process that can be defined as imperialism.

The question of control over the inland areas adjacent to the coast remained unresolved at the Berlin Conference. European powers engaged in conflict with one another in areas removed from the coastline until the 1890 Brussels Conference, at which point it was agreed that the principle of effective occupation would be applied to the interior regions. Subsequently, a European power's claim to a specific region was validated by the presence of traders and missionaries from that country in the region, as well as by the existence of agreements between that country and local chiefs in the region. Additionally, physical occupation and/or the presence of settlements of that country in the region were considered evidence of effective occupation. Evidence of effective occupation was documented in the form of a joint agreement between representatives of the European power and African chiefs, or between two European powers. In consequence of these agreements, the European powers delineated the boundaries of their colonies and established the parameters of their spheres of influence (Falola and Chukwuemeka, 2018: 84).

During this period, Britain expanded its presence on the African continent, establishing colonies and effecting its occupation activities toward the north. These included Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) and Bechuanaland (now Botswana), which were occupied in 1889 (Sandler, 2017: 230; Güneş, 2018: 636). From this point forward, Cecil Rhodes, a private entrepreneur in South Africa, intensified his efforts to secure valuable territory for the British in Rhodesia and Bechuanaland and to establish British control from Cape Town to Cairo. The British consolidated their control during the Boer War (1899-1902), establishing the Union of South Africa by joining the Boer republics of the Orange Free State and Transvaal. The British East Africa Company and the British South Africa Company played a role in the administration of the colonies (Falola and Chukwuemeka, 2018: 84). Subsequently, Britain pursued an indirect rule and administration policy in its relations with its colonies and those who were colonized by them.

The British Empire did not treat all African countries in an identical manner. The British regarded colonies that were adaptable to the conditions of conquest as separate and distinctive

entities. To these, they introduced and developed administrative systems (Falola and Chukwuemeka, 2018: 87), granting these colonies (or the authorities in such colonies) limited powers of self-governance (Emerson, 1965: 72). Each such colony was governed by a governor in an autonomous capacity. The governor presided over the central government with the assistance of the executive and legislative councils. While the legislative councils included a few Africans, the executive councils were exclusively composed of British officers. The authority of each council was constrained to the colony (Falola and Chukwuemeka, 2018: 87). It would appear that Europeans accorded tribal chiefs a status that was greater than that accorded to them by indigenous traditions. However, this was done in a way that was tailored to the needs of European officials, who relied on the cooperation of the tribal chiefs. The centralized authority of the tribal chief was a convenient tool to employ when a certain tribal chief acted inconsistently. In such instances, a more obedient successor was replaced (Emerson, 1965: 237-238) in order to maintain the administrative order.

The colonial policies implemented by Britain in Botswana and Zimbabwe were based on the same principles but had different purposes and forms of practice. Colonial rule presented a challenge for some Africans and an opportunity for others. The fact that both realities were experienced and felt in the general environment created a complex dilemma (Parker and Rathbone, 2007: 92). Ultimately, in implementing and applying its colonial policies in a differentiated manner across regions, Britain as a colonizer established the foundations for a perceived unevenness of approach and a distinct cultural understanding among tribal leaders, particularly in the case of Botswana and Zimbabwe.

In the case of Botswana, the indigenous conditions of the pre-colonial period exhibited cultural and ethnic homogeneity in general, and Botswana's pre-colonial tribalism was conducted in a way that was relatively tolerant compared to other African tribes. The tribal chiefs were held in high esteem and, despite their considerable political influence, were regarded as equals to the people. The most significant institution in guaranteeing equality between the chief and his constituents was the tradition of tribal assemblies, or kgotla. These facilitated a close connection between the chief and his people, establishing and reinforcing political and economic bonds for all concerned (Beaulier, 2003: 228). This form of local government was not significantly altered by the advent of British colonial rule in the region.



The Role of Leadership and Re-Colonization: A Postcolonial Look at Botswana and Zimbabwe

As early as 1853, the chief of the Bakwena tribe, Sechele, traveled to Cape Town with the intention of requesting British protection for Botswana from the Boers. However, the British had largely ignored such appeals until 1885. The Berlin Conference of 1884-1885, which formalized the colonization of Africa, marked a shift in British attention from the Cape Colony to central Africa and Botswana. This was due to the fact that Botswana had begun to appear more valuable to the British, and their views on Botswana's importance had changed during the 30-year period leading up to the conference. This was due to a number of interrelated factors. First, the discovery of diamond mines in 1867 and then gold mines in Witwatersrand in 1884-1885 led to an increase in the perceived economic value of Botswana. Secondly, Botswana was identified as a strategically vital territory, serving as a barrier to Germany's Southwest Africa on one hand and the Boer states on the other. Consequently, Britain unquestionably proclaimed a crown colony in British Bechuanaland in 1885 and established the Bechuanaland Protectorate in the same year (Acemoğlu et al., 2001: 11-12).

In 1895, following the establishment of the Protectorate, three Tswana chiefs—the Bangwato chief Khama III, the Bangwaketse chief Bathoen, and the Bakwena chief Sebele—traveled to Britain and pledged to oversee the Protectorate in collaboration with Queen Victoria. In contrast to numerous other pre-colonial African tribes, the Tswana tribes exhibited an exceptional capacity for collaboration in the face of external challenges (Acemoğlu et al., 2001: 13). The collaboration of tribal leaders with colonizers, coupled with the manner in which Botswana was colonized and the presumed unification with South Africa, prompted the implementation of a relatively lenient colonial policy (Picard, 1987: 36).

The British government did not extend its involvement in Bechuanaland beyond defense expenditures and commercial activities. It did not establish any kind of administrative system in the territory, as evidenced by Parson (1984: 22). Instead, it focused on pursuing its own strategic and commercial interests.

The colonization process of Zimbabwe was notable for its divergence from that of Botswana. Prior to colonization, Zimbabwe did not possess a homogeneous culture in the same way that Botswana did. Instead, the region was dominated by a long-standing and intense conflict between the Shona and Ndebele peoples. During this period, the discovery of gold mines in the region attracted the attention of Britain. Consequently, the Ndebele chief, Lobengula, granted several land concessions to the British in exchange for arms. The most extensive of these

concessions was granted in 1888 to Cecil John Rhodes, who was engaged in missionary activities at the time. This was the Rudd concession, which included exclusive mining rights to most of the areas in the east of the mainland (Mlambo, 2014: 41) and was one of the most influential gains in the colonization of Zimbabwe.

However, the British South Africa Company encountered significant challenges in its efforts to colonize the region during the 1896-97 period. In early 1896, Lobengula led the Ndebele people to revolt against both the colonizing conquerors and the Shona people in an uprising known as the siege of Bulawayo. This was suppressed by colonial forces from Kimberley and Mafikeng in present-day South Africa. Although the siege was lifted, hostilities between the British and the Ndebele people continued until mid-1896, when the Ndebele negotiated a separate peace treaty with Cecil Rhodes (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2008: 56). The Shona leaders, with the support of Britain, continued their conflicts with the Ndebele people until they were ultimately vanquished. In 1898, all the leaders of the rebellion were either captured or exiled.

The establishment of Rhodesia as a settler colony, rather than an indirect administrative colony, was a consequence of the struggles and conflicts that had preceded it. Britain's central colonizing policies included the seizure of Rhodesia's lands, the introduction of segregated colonial rule, and the installation of European settlers. The nascent colony's inherent weakness and the considerable distance between London and Salisbury (present-day Harare) necessitated the formation of alliances with local African leaders to effectively administer the area and suppress rebellion. To illustrate, cattle looted in the 1890s were returned to the Ndebele chiefs in exchange for their cooperation (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2009: 150). A complex system of racial discrimination and hierarchy was established with the intention of effectively controlling the local indigenous population. The colony population from Europe was granted citizenship, civil rights, and access to cosmopolitan centers, while indigenous people were excluded from these privileges.

The loosely administered colonization process in Botswana, the willingness of the Botswanian tribal chiefs to collaborate, and the policies implemented as a result of their agreements with Britain have been posited as factors that may have contributed to Botswana's more seamless transition to independence than Zimbabwe. The colonization of Zimbabwe was conducted in an atmosphere of conflict and without compromise, although concessions were granted. Consequently, due to the disparities in the independence processes of both countries and the legacies of the colonization processes in terms of administrative culture and leadership



understanding, the comparison of the leaders' reflections on the process management is of particular significance in order to elucidate the post-colonial leaders' approaches to process management.

3. Leaders' Attitudes During and After the Independence Process

During the colonial period, a variety of techniques were employed with the objective of erasing the identities of the colonized colonies. For example, as with the alteration of country names, numerous street and city names have also been modified in accordance with the colonial identity and culture. In the context of the decolonization process, the majority of indigenous and local city and street names were reinstated in the countries that achieved independence. As with numerous other efforts in Africa, the decolonization process sought to eradicate numerous symbols of colonialism, with a similar objective to that of the colonial administrations in Botswana and Zimbabwe (Manatsha, 2014: 275-278). A review of the historical record reveals that the majority of countries that gained independence during the decolonization period employed a similar method to reconstruct their identities. Nevertheless, the independence of most countries has resulted in disparate trajectories being pursued.

The countries of Botswana and Zimbabwe, which were previously British colonies, achieved their independence through disparate pathways. Botswana sought to address its challenges through a culture of reconciliation, achieving independence in 1966 without conflict, civil war, or resistance. In the context of British efforts to unite South Africa and Bechuanaland, the Botswana National Party was established in 1948 and led by Seretse Khama until his marriage to a British citizen rendered his leadership untenable and resulted in his removal from office (Acemoğlu et al., 2001: 13).

In 1960, the anti-racist and anti-colonial Botswana People's Party (BPP) was established, and Khama responded by founding the Botswana Democratic Party (BDP), which appealed to rural people and tribal chiefs (Beaulier, 2003: 228-230). Subsequently, Khama collaborated with the opposition on the path to independence. Botswana's independence was formally recognized in 1965, when Khama was elected president in the inaugural national elections. Botswana was thus established with a democratic system similar to the Westminster parliamentary system and made English common law its legal framework, though it still managed to preserve some important features of its tribal law (Parson, 1984: 39).

In contrast to Botswana, Zimbabwe achieved independence in 1980 following a lengthy period of armed conflict. With the cessation of hostilities, the New Rhodesia-Zimbabwe state was established (Hulec, 2019: 58-59) and a new provisional government and then a new Constitution was adopted on the principle of universal suffrage in 1979. The nascent parliament included twenty-eight members of the colonial settler community and seventy-two members of the indigenous population. The primary objective of Abel Muzoreva, the newly appointed prime minister and head of the United African National Council (UANC), was to maintain the ceasefire. However, he faced significant opposition from Joshua Nkomo, the president of the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU), and Robert Mugabe, the president of the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) and head of the High Command of guerrillas abroad. Mugabe repeatedly proclaimed that the colonial government must be overthrown by military force and that a socialist Zimbabwe must be established. In contrast, the provisional government adopted a policy of "safe return" for guerrillas (Hulec, 2019: 60).

In the context of these developments, the Lancaster House conference resulted in the holding of free elections in March 1980. The previously established unity between Joshua Nkomo and Robert Mugabe, known as the Patriotic Front, disintegrated. Both leaders participated in the elections separately. Mugabe represented his new party, the Zimbabwe African National Union (Patriotic Front)-ZANU (PF), while Nkomo represented his former party, the Zimbabwe African People's Party-ZAPU. Rather than ideological differences, their disparate ethnic affiliations were the primary source of contention between them (Zimbabwe Review, 2019: 12). This is indicative of the impact of Mugabe's electoral success.

Following Botswana's independence in 1966, Khama pursued the policy of active neutrality in foreign affairs, focusing on the rectification of bureaucratic and economic programs during his presidency until 1980 (Tlou et al., 1995: 20). This period is regarded as the period during which Botswana's national and international identity was formed (Morton et al., 2008: 16). During this period, when Zimbabwe declared its independence and initiated new regulations, Botswana sought to maintain its own structural and developmental framework. However, when the Mugabe administration in Zimbabwe introduced plans for economic restructuring and new reforms in rural areas with its National Development Plan, it faced a tense reaction from the opposition party (Wekwete, 1989: 131).



The Role of Leadership and Re-Colonization: A Postcolonial Look at Botswana and Zimbabwe

Tensions and conflicts in the political and governmental arenas of Zimbabwe persisted intermittently throughout the period following its independence. The political rivalry between the ruling and opposition parties and their leaders was reflected in society, and the polarization of society was further intensified by tribalism, land issues, and ideological divisions. Although Zimbabwe initially continued to develop economically, the increasing unemployment and unequal distribution of income in an increasingly tense environment disrupted any lasting balance.

Conversely, Botswana permitted tribal chiefs the right to speak in parliament during its independence process and continued its development in a planned way (Parson, 1984: 39). The country's social and economic development was shaped by its positive political structure. Between 1980 and 1998, the centralization of the state administration continued, accompanied by investments in education, health, and infrastructure under President Quett Masire, who succeeded Khama upon his death. Moreover, the country's foreign policy underwent significant developments. As a result of the indirect support extended to Namibia's independence process, relations with the Republic of South Africa became strained (Williams and Hackland, 1988: 147-148). Following Masire, Festus Mogae assumed the presidency and confronted mounting unemployment and the AIDS epidemic (Fredriksen, 2003: 339).

The conditions imposed by the land distribution clause of the Lancaster House Treaty in Zimbabwe constrained the government's ability to address the country's economic challenges, including inflation and poverty. This situation began to have an economic impact on Zimbabwe, which had previously been a country that could even export. Between 1990 and 1995, the price of food in Zimbabwe increased by 516%, while prices for medical care, transportation, and education increased by 300%. A significant proportion of the population, 62%, was unable to meet their basic needs. The occurrence of farm occupations and the country's deteriorating economy collectively contributed to the emergence of new levels of instability, which in turn led to a surge in immigration to neighboring countries. It is noteworthy that Botswana was also adversely affected by this influx of immigrants. Mugabe was unable to maintain the economic stability that had been established by the European colonialists. This was compounded by poor land reform management and increasing drought, which led to a crisis in Zimbabwe's economy (Dinç, 2012: 339).

The authoritarian and oppressive nature of the regime established by Mugabe, which was based on the British colonial model, initially appeared to be a pragmatic approach that relieved

British colonial farmers and seemed to offer the opportunity for compromise. Nevertheless, as time progressed, it became increasingly challenging to ignore the negative aspects of Mugabe's rule, including his self-perception as Zimbabwe's savior and his refusal to tolerate opposition. These factors contributed to the emergence of overt conflict within the country (Moore, 2010: 756). In such an environment, it is relatively straightforward to argue that Mugabe's administration transformed the country into a dictatorship. However, it is also evident that the political, economic, and social structures of the country presented significant challenges to the government's ability to overcome these weaknesses.

The country was weakened by this process, and it faced a crisis when the 5th Brigade, supported by North Korea, began killing guerrillas from the Zimbabwe African National Liberation Army (ZANLA), which was the rival party led by Joshua Nkomo (Dinç, 2012: 340). This resulted in the country being dragged further into internal conflict. Ultimately, Mugabe emerged as the executive president of Zimbabwe, effectively consolidating political power. As a consequence of the aforementioned developments, the country was governed under a state of emergency until 1990, during the tenure of the Mugabe administration.

Following Zimbabwe's independence, it became necessary for the country to transition to a participatory system. However, the Mugabe regime was unable to effectively manage this process. The regime became increasingly authoritarian, particularly in the 2000s. For over half a century, constitutions in this region did not impose any restrictions on leaders with regard to the distribution of land rights. The regime perceived land distribution as a more attractive and secure means of garnering voter support than providing education, health, or public services. This was particularly evident in competitive multi-party elections. Furthermore, land distribution became a means of prolonging the political control that was losing support due to economic crises and the waning financial capacity of the state (Kriger, 2010: 175). Indeed, Mugabe defined land reform as the conquest of the conquered and saw it as an inevitable part of owning the country (Dinç, 2012: 342-343). In Zimbabwe, the upper echelon of society exercised control and imposed reforms and policies on the population, thereby weakening the country and contributing to the emergence of discontent and instability. In Botswana, however, the situation was quite different. The public accepted and followed policies without any rift between the rural and urban sectors. With regard to this matter, the decision-making processes and the policies of the leaders of these two neighboring countries exhibit a considerable degree of divergence rather than convergence.



4. Similarities and Differences Between the Leaders of Botswana and Zimbabwe

Ian Khama, who ascended to the presidency of Botswana in 2008, introduced more radical policies than those previously implemented by previous administrations. One of the most controversial aspects of his presidency was his establishment of an internal security unit that bore resemblance to the FBI. This move greatly concerned politicians of the opposition. Furthermore, his appointment of military and police officers to numerous significant state positions, including the vice presidency, led to perceptions that the government had become militarized (Good, 2010: 320). Khama publicly criticized Zimbabwe's failure to include the opposition in the administration and also condemned the Sudanese president for the Darfur incident, indicating that the country's foreign policy was becoming increasingly affected. It is evident that Botswana had commenced the process of adopting a more Western-oriented foreign policy than other African countries. In light of these developments in foreign policy and politics, Botswana's economy began to utilise its resources in a more efficient manner. In particular, the equal distribution of Botswana's diamond mine profits across all echelons of society (Beaulier, 2003: 228-230) significantly impacted the country's development.

The government of Botswana invested the majority of the country's diamond profits in education, health, and infrastructure programs, prioritizing sustainability and development (Acemoğlu et al., 2001: 13). The Botswana economy exhibited an average growth rate of 7% between 1965 and 1995, making it the fastest-growing economy in the world (Beaulier, 2003: 231). This growth resulted in the country's transition from being the world's poorest to a middle-income country (Bayram, 2014: 83). The education and decision-making processes of Botswana's leaders, which were influenced by Western ideals, played a pivotal role in the implementation of utilitarian policies that facilitated the country's economic growth.

Botswana's history and culture set it apart from other African countries, contributing to its stability. Botswana exhibited greater homogeneity in ethnicity and language compared to other African countries, with a tribal culture that could be described as semi-democratic even in the pre-colonial period (Düsing, 2002: 182). The acceptance of Christianity and British protection during the colonial rivalry afforded Botswana's Tswana tribes protection from both Boer and German threats and from attacks from neighboring peoples (Gulbrandsen, 2012: 239). This prevented the formation of deep-rooted enmity and distrust with neighboring states. Moreover, Botswana did not experience the civil wars, military coups, and long-term political instability that plague many

African countries. In fact, the country demonstrated its political effectiveness before forming an army (N'Diaye, 2001: 75-80). Finally, Botswana's leaders concentrated their efforts on achieving good leadership and good governance. This entailed the legitimacy of the structural organization of the state and how Botswana's successive administrations took office, maintained their mandates, and implemented their policies. Such features as democratic elections, judicial independence, and transparency in Botswana (Robinson, 2009: 6-7) were regarded as remarkable by the Western world and placed Botswana at a significant advantage relative to other African countries.

Zimbabwe's process differed from that of other countries. Mugabe took action to ensure the legitimacy of his regime and to increase the support he received. The pressures from elite indigenous groups and the farm occupiers had an impact on the 1999 constitutional amendment. A referendum for this was held in 2000, but it failed, mustering support from just 20% of the urban population. The land problem became a chronic problem for the country. In response to the aforementioned challenges, the government initiated a program of rapid land reform and introduced sanctions. The state became increasingly radicalized by the land reform sanctions, and when necessary resorted to violence to enforce them, which led to a deterioration in relations with the West (Moyo, 2010: 250). Meanwhile, those who supported the land reform viewed it as the completion of the interrupted revolution.

The distribution of lands that changed hands was also a source of contention. The implementation of land reform was not conducted in an open and transparent manner, and it was utilized for political gain, becoming a tool to secure the allegiance of military officers. This resulted in the formation of a new wealthy indigenous class that lacked the requisite agricultural expertise, which in turn negatively impacted agricultural yields (Nnoma, 2008: 383). Another source of problems was the intervention of political parties in the political, social, and economic sectors (Scarnecchia, 2006: 227).

Operation "Move the Rubbish" in 2005 served as another indicator of the Mugabe regime's attitudes and inclinations. The government implemented the operation with little advance notice in Zimbabwe's major urban areas. In just two months, 700,000 citizens were forcibly evicted from their homes and properties. The public was led to believe that this operation targeted those who had voted for the opposition and who were attempting to survive within the informal economy. The opposition contended that the government was seizing profitable



The Role of Leadership and Re-Colonization: A Postcolonial Look at Botswana and Zimbabwe

activities in urban centers and expanding ZANU patronage (Tibaijuka, 2005: 64). The country was experiencing a series of negative developments.

These policies and actions ultimately resulted in a chronic failure of agricultural production during Mugabe's tenure. The degeneration and loss of discipline of the armed forces, namely the army and the police, and the self-interested relations of the bureaucracy contributed to the continued unresolved expropriation problem. Consequently, the economic downturn constrained the resources available to ZANU and the distribution of these resources. Those who benefited from the activities of the regime were the party leaders and political and military bureaucrats. As corruption spread throughout the entire economy, investments in education and health were disrupted, crime rates increased, and outward migration began (Bratton and Masunungure, 2008: 52). The legitimacy of elections was called into question, particularly in the wake of the referendum's defeat in 2000. To retain power, Mugabe became increasingly dictatorial, accused the opposition of treason, and resorted to torture and assassination to achieve his objectives (Maudeni, 2004: 191). Throughout this period, ZANU failed to transition from a military complex engaged in the struggle for independence to a political structure capable of governing.

There are numerous reasons why ZANU was unable to transform. The state was unable to establish its institutions as autonomous entities, and these institutions were perceived as the exclusive domain of the party. Furthermore, there was a proliferation of economic corruption within the party structure. The roles of propaganda and the military in politics became institutionalized. Finally, the opposition was accused of using propaganda and subcontracted forces to support a permanent armed struggle within the country (Bratton and Masunungure, 2008: 54).

It is evident that the processes of state management in both countries underwent disparate developments both during and after the attainment of independence. In one case, a conciliatory political understanding emerged; in the other, an authoritarian political regime dominated by a leader who achieved his objectives through the use of violence and conflict. The two states held disparate understandings of the opposition, which were reflected in their respective social and political policies, public relations, and the role of the military in their governments. The two states share only one similarity: their tribal origins and the legacy of British colonial administration.

Conclusion

Postcolonial criticism encompasses the social and administrative culture of the colonized region both before and during the colonial period. It serves as a foundation for the analysis of independence movements. Prior understandings of leadership and forms of administration that had become established in the region were disrupted by the colonial period. Nevertheless, they persisted in the indigenous culture. This phenomenon was most evident in the social movements that emerged during the decolonization period and the leadership administering them. The separation movements were intricately intertwined with the native culture of the colonized regions and the social, political, and economic cultural legacies left by the colonizer.

Botswana and Zimbabwe both emerged from a pre-colonial tribal understanding, yet each saw different political cultures emerge. In Botswana, a relatively conciliatory understanding existed, in contrast to Zimbabwe, where a more confrontational political culture developed in the competition between different tribes for dominance. During the colonial period, the administration policies of Britain were indirect, with the leaders being used for social control according to the interests and priorities of the British in the region. In this context, traditional tribal power structures were employed, with the colonizer transforming tribal chiefs in the colonized region into subject leaders who served the colonizing administration. The decolonization process revealed that leaders were equally influenced by traditional political culture as well as the colonial experience. Cultural hybridization is thus reflected in leadership understanding and roles.

The colonial policies of Britain differed from one region to another, laying the foundation for approaches that synthesized traditional culture and colonial culture in the leadership of Botswana and Zimbabwe. In colonizing Botswana, Britain exploited the country's pre-colonial tribal practices to meet its own ends. This involved maintaining the kgotla meetings, which tolerated opposition, established a political bond between the chief and his people, and reinforced the economic bond of the people with the chief. In Botswana, the traditional understanding that emphasized cooperation rather than intertribal rivalry created an environment of reconciliation and succeeded in avoiding conflict with the colonizer during the independence process. The smooth transition to independence was facilitated by leaders who were educated in Europe and able to maintain traditional and local cultural attitudes toward administration. In Botswana, a hybrid social and political culture positively affected the country's understanding of leadership and



The Role of Leadership and Re-Colonization: A Postcolonial Look at Botswana and Zimbabwe

continued to influence the country's understanding of its politics, social practices, and practices for economic sustainability even after it gained its independence from Britain. As the process of dependency continued, the decisions and practices of the leaders in the independence movements evolved into a form of re-colonization rather than a decline into decolonization.

It can be observed that Botswana exhibits a notable distinction from Zimbabwe. Zimbabwe, for instance, is characterised by a cultural milieu that is less homogenous and conciliatory in nature. Zimbabwe's social structure is such that it is inherently susceptible to conflict. This is due to the fact that the country developed on the basis of competition between different tribes. Prior to colonization, different tribal leaders in Zimbabwe engaged in a struggle for dominance. During the colonial period, the country continued to be a region characterized by revolts against the colonizer. However, with the advent of British colonial rule, these rebellions were quelled, the local population was marginalized, and the leaders were either apprehended or exiled. In Zimbabwe, the colonizer pursued a colonial settlement policy rather than an indirect one with the objective of establishing a traditional administration structure that would serve their own interests.

In Zimbabwe, a culture of confrontation and conflict has historically prevailed. These paths and methods served to reinforce the exclusion of the indigenous people from the government and policy-making, thereby highlighting the aggression of the governed toward the colonizer during the independence process. This aggression also facilitated the implementation of a socialist framework for the administration of the country, which was predicated on the denial of the colonizers and colonial culture. The leaders of Zimbabwe, who historically espoused a confrontational social and political culture, sought to perpetuate these attitudes and adopted a stance of East versus West. An examination of the prominent leadership role reveals the ascendancy of leaders who ideologically assimilated socialist leadership and defended independence by transforming rather than combining traditional and local culture and governance. Nevertheless, the opposition in Zimbabwe appeared to espouse a more liberal stance.

It is therefore notable that the understanding of leadership that played a role in Zimbabwe had a bilateral interaction, and that this situation also conflicted under various opposing views. From this perspective, a two-sided and more negative hybridization in Zimbabwe's political and leadership culture established an east-versus-west attitude that directed action. This negative hybridization created a state of antagonism toward the Western Bloc, while simultaneously

depending on the Eastern Bloc. This situation can be expressed negatively as a re-colonization of Zimbabwe, which contrasts with the colonial period.

The divergent political developments of Botswana and Zimbabwe were due to their inherent cultural traditions and to the presence of a hybridized leadership that occurred exclusively in Botswana. It seems plausible to explain this phenomenon of divergent development through the concept of re-colonization rather than decolonization. This is because the leader's practices, decisions, or preferences were unable to transform the countries into fully independent states.

References

- Acemoğlu, D., Johnson, S. and Robinson, J. A. (2001). *An African Success Story: Botswana*. Cambridge MIT Working Paper, 01-37.
- Ashcroft Bill, G., G. and Tiffin, H. (2007). *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts*. (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge Press.
- Baba, Ja. G. (Ed.). (2014). *Leadership in Colonial Africa Disruption of Traditional Frameworks and Patterns*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Bayram, M. (2014). Afrika Geneline İstisnai Bir Devlet: Botswana. *Adam Akademi*, 4(1), 74-88.
- Beaulier, S. A. (2003). Explaining Botswana's Success: The Critical Role of Post-Colonial Policy. *Cato Journal*, 23(2), 224-240.
- Bhabha, H. (1984). Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse. *A Special Issue on Psychoanalysis*, 28, 125-133.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge Press.
- Bratton, M. and Masunungure, E. (2008). Zimbabwe's Long Agony. *Journal of Democracy*, 19(4), 41-55.
- Dinç, C. (2012). Zimbabwe Krizinin Kökenleri ve Geçiş Süreci. *Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi*, 7 (1), 337-368.

The Role of Leadership and Re-Colonization: A Postcolonial Look at Botswana and Zimbabwe

- Düsing, S. (2002). *Traditional Leadership and Democratisation in Southern Africa: A Comparative Study of Botswana, Namibia, and South Africa*. Hamburg: LIT Verlag.
- Emerson, R. (1965). *Sömürgelerin Uluslaşması*. (T. Ataöv, Çev.). Ankara: Türk Siyasi İlimler Derneği Yayınları.
- Falola, T. and Chukwuemeka, A. (2018). Colonial and Postcolonial History. M. S. Shanguhya and T. Falola (Ed.). *Colonial Administrations and the Africans* (pp. 81-101). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fredriksen, J. C. (2003). *Biographical Dictionary of Modern World Leaders: 1992 to the Present*. New York: Facts on File.
- Fontein, J. (2009). Anticipating The Tsunami: Rumours, Planning and The Arbitrary State in Zimbabwe. *Africa*, 79(3), 369-398.
- Good, K. (2010). The Presidency of General Ian Khama: The Militarization of the Botswana Miracle. *African Affairs*, 109(435), 315-324.
- Gulbrandsen, Ø. (2012). *The State and The Social: State Formation in Botswana and its Precolonial and Colonial Genealogies*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Güneş, B. (2018). Diplomasi Tarihi 1. B. Özdal ve R. K. Karaca (Ed.). *Afrika'nın Paylaşılması* (pp. 634-641). (3th Ed.). Bursa: Dora Yayınları.
- Hovarth, R. J. (1972). A Definition of Colonialism. *Current Anthropology*, 13(1), 45-57.
- Hulec, O. (2019). The Development of an Authoritarian Regime in Zimbabwe from 1980 to the Present Day. *Asian and African Studies*, 28(1), 57-90.
- İpek, V. ve Oyman, Ç. (2017). Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri. R. Gözen (Ed.). *Postkolonyal Teori ve Uluslararası İlişkiler* (pp. 405-441). (4th Ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Kimche, J. (1971). *People and Politics in the Middle East: The Arab-Israeli Conflict-Its Background and the Prognosis for Peace*. Transaction Publishers.
- Kruger, B. and Kruger, N. (2010). Multiparty Elections and Land Patronage: Zimbabwe and Côte d'Ivoire. *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, 48(2), 173-202.
- Loomba, A. (2000). *Kolonyalizm Postkolonyalizm*. (M. Küçük, Trans.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

- Manatsha, Boga Thura, (2014). The Politics of Renaming “colonial” Streets in Francistown, Botswana. *Historia* 59 (2), 269-288.
- Maudeni, Z. (2004). Why the African Renaissance is Likely to Fail: The Case of Zimbabwe. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 22(2), 189-202.
- Mlambo, A. S. (2014). *A History of Zimbabwe*. Pretoria: Cambridge University Press.
- Mohanty T. C. (2003). *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. London: Duke University Press.
- Moore, D. (2010). *A Decade of Disquieting Diplomacy: South Africa, Zimbabwe and the Ideology of the National Democratic Revolution 1999-2009*. History Compass 8/8, Blackwell Publishing.
- Morton, F., J. Ramsay, and T. Mgadla. (2008). *Historical Dictionary of Botswana*. Maryland: Scarecrow Press.
- Moyo, S. (2010). The Struggle over Land in Africa: Conflicts, Politics and Change. W. Anseeuw and C. Alden (Ed.). *The Zimbabwe Crisis, Land Reform and Normalisation* (pp. 245-263). Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Nelson, H. D. (1983). *Zimbabwe A Country Study* (2nd Ed.). Washington D.C.: United States Govt Printing Office.
- N'diaye, B. (2001). *The Challenge of Institutionalizing Civilian Control: Botswana, Ivory Coast and Kenya in Comparative Perspective*. Lexington Books.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2008). Becoming Zimbabwe: A history from the pre-colonial period to 2008. B. Raftopoulos and A. Mlambo (Ed.). *Mapping Cultural and Colonial Encounters, 1880s – 1930s* (pp. 39-74). Harare: Published by Weaver Press.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2009). *The Ndebele Nation: Reflections on Hegemony, Memory and Historiography*. Amsterdam: Rozenberg Publishers.
- Nnoma, V. (2008). Son of the Soil: Reclaiming the Land in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 43(4), 371-397.
- Parker, J. and Rathbone, R. (2007). *African History: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford Press.

**The Role of Leadership and Re-Colonization: A Postcolonial Look at Botswana and Zimbabwe**

- Parson, J. (1984). *Botswana: Liberal Democracy and the Labor Reserve in Southern Africa*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Picard, L. A. (1987). *The Politics of Development in Botswana: A Model for Success?*. Lynne Rienner, Boulder CO.
- Rathbone, R. (2000). *Nkrumah and the Chiefs: The Politics of Chieftaincy in Ghana, 1951-1960*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Robinson, J. (2009). Botswana as a Role Model for Country Success. *UNU-WIDER*, Research Paper No. 40.
- Sandler, O. (2017). *Siyasi Tarih İlkçağdan 1918'e*. (32th Ed.). Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Shrikant, B. S. (2012). Postcolonial Theory: Meaning and Significance. *Proceedings of National Seminar on Postmodern Literary Theory and Literature*. Nanded, Jan. 27-28.
- Scarnecchia, T. (2006). The 'Fascist Cycle' in Zimbabwe 2000-2005. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 32(2), 221-237.
- Saul, J. S. (1993). *Recolonization and Resistance: Southern Africa in the 1990s*. Africa World Press.
- Tibaijuka, A. (2005). Report of the Fact-Finding Mission to Zimbabwe to Assess the Scope and Impact of Operation Murambatsvina by the UN Special Envoy on Human Settlements Issues in Zimbabwe. www.un.org.
- Tlou T., Parsons, N. and Henderson, W. (1995). *Seretse Khama 1921-1980*, Macmillan.
- Young, R. J. (2016). *Postkolonyalizm Tarihsel Bir Giriş*. (B. T. Köprülü and S. Şen, Trans.). İstanbul: Matbu Kitap.
- Zimbabwe Review. (2019). Country Watch Report.
- Wekwete, K. H. (1989). Growth Centre Policy in Zimbabwe. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 80(3), 131-146.
- Williams, G. and Hackland, B. (1988). *The Dictionary of Contemporary Politics of Southern Africa*. London: Routledge.