International IDEA

The International Institute for Democracy
and Electoral Assistance

**Challenges in delivering services
to the citizens and providing avenues
for development and democratic
accountability in a diverse environment:
The case of Botswana**

www.idea.int

International IDEA
Publications Office
Strömsborg
SE – 103 34 Stockholm
Sweden

Abstract

This paper examines Botswana's regions and how they have addressed issues of governance and leadership, service delivery, development and democratic accountability. It focuses on the historical kingdoms that were converted into chiefdoms during the colonial era and later into districts after Botswana's independence in 1966. It argues that the Tswana practised centralized administration by creating capitals in which human populations were concentrated and from which services were provided. They also practised a form of regional decentralization in which dispersed populations were relocated (through encouragement, compulsion and example) into regional capitals, where services were provided. There were also administrative links between the regional capitals and the main capital. This paper will show that the modernization of pre-colonial states was done cautiously and in a less disruptive manner—therefore it attracted the support of (rather than resistance from) the chieftaincies they replaced.

Local democracy, governance, decentralization and service delivery in Botswana

Pre-colonial and colonial Botswana consisted of numerous autonomous kingdoms that occupied a huge territory. Schapera (1970) notes that the Bakwena, Bangwaketse and Bangwato chiefdoms are commonly held to be the offshoots of what was originally one kingdom—the senior branch of which is represented by the Bahurutshe— while the Batawana chieftaincy is known to have separated from the Bangwato at the end of the 18th century. The local democracy workshops found that different groups gave different reasons for these break-ups. For instance, the Bakwena reported that their separation from the Bangwato and Bangwaketse was amicable, as they gradually drifted away from each other while they were looking for space. In contrast, the Bangwato reported that the separation was full of tension, largely due to a dispute over displaced succession: Ngwato (their founder), who was the later offspring of the king's first wife, provoked his half-brothers (who were born before him, but to the king's second and third wives) to want to kill him. His apparent escape led his mother (Mmangwato) to also break away with her own followers, who were initially named after her, and later after her son (Ngwato). Du Toit (1995: 21) adds that 'the institution of kingship (bogosi) was the pivot of the political structure and a focal point of political, religious, legal, economic and symbolic authority and practice'. It should be acknowledged that the system was based on hereditary succession rather than republican appointments or elections.

With the establishment of a protectorate by Great Britain in 1885, these Tswana kingdoms were down-graded to chiefdoms. This meant that their kings came to be regarded as chiefs, and the people were to recognize only the queen or king of England. This was politically and administratively important because it implied that crucial decisions were now transferred to Great Britain. However the boundaries of what became the Tswana chiefdoms, and their capitals and regional capitals, were preserved during the protectorate era (1885–1966). Rather than modernizing and evolving hereditary succession into merit-based appointments or elected officials, Botswana established separate merit-based institutions in which established bureaucratic practices could be enforced.

But first, the question of how communities and individuals accessed services in large chiefdoms was answered in different ways. The choice of sites for capitals and other large human settlements depended on the discovery of reliable sources of water such as rivers and pans (in the desert) and the availability of farming land and wildlife. For instance, the Bangwato chiefdom established its capital at Serowe because that area had a high water table. The elders of Serowe, led by Shaw Mokgadi of Goo Rammala ward, observed that the name Serowe refers to a place that has plenty of water (*serowa sa metsi*). It was reported that water-rich Serowe was initially a cattle post for the Khama family (Bangwato rulers), and later became the main capital of the Bangwato. Serowe was settled by Bangwato on different occasions (they were displaced by wars of that era as the flat land surrounding Serowe was not easy to defend) and was finally made their permanent home in 1901. This suggests that the community that settled there was displaced by pre-colonial wars.

The capital of the chiefdom of Bakwena, Molepolole, was characterized by an abundance of water resources. Their settlement of the area was also disrupted by pre-colonial wars. It was reported that the Molepolole area was previously populated by the Bakgalagadi (named after the Kalahari Desert) people, who were either displaced by pre-colonial wars or joined the Bakwena chiefdom. In another instance, the Bakwena chiefdom settled a refugee population of the Basetedi (Coloured or mixed blood) people, who practised blacksmithing and gardening (both of which required an abundance of water). The Basetedi had been denied residence by the Bangwaketse, who could not meet their needs, and settled on the perennial Kolobeng River in the Bakwena chiefdom. Letlhakeng—a sub-capital of the Bakwena

chiefdom that was populated by Bakgalagadi people—was characterized by beautiful scenery (because of the presence of dry valleys) and had abundant underground water. Thus, the desert was characterized by pans that held water. In another case, the village of Artesia is historically known for its spring waters, which made the area very good for cattle rearing and attracted Bakgatla chiefs. The Bakgatla chieftaincy survived numerous droughts due to the presence of those waters. The spring waters were also responsible for the Bakgatla-Bakwena wars in the 18th century, which led to the expulsion of the latter.

Instances of forceful relocation of indigenous communities were reported in the regions, but not in the capitals. Relocations were reported in the Boteti, Tswapong and Tonota regions of the Bangwato chiefdom, where water resources or naturally rich agricultural regions exchanged hands in favour of the Bangwato at the main capital, and local residents were relocated elsewhere. In one instance, residents of the Bobirwa region, with its high concentration of rivers, were relocated. The Limpopo River forms the boundary between Botswana in the Bobirwa region and South Africa. It meets the Shashe River at a point called *shalimpo in the Tuli farms*. The Limpopo meets the Tuli River in the Tuli Block. The Bangwato gave this land to the British Government as payment for protecting them. Babirwa communities that lived in the Tuli Block region were relocated, and the area was given to white farmers in what came to be known as Tuli Block farms; this redistribution caused large-scale relocations.

Challenges and successes of service delivery

Research conducted through the local democracy workshops shows that the Tswana kingdoms were organized along a centralized and regionally decentralized model. Each chiefdom had a capital or an administrative and political centre where the paramount chief and his uncles (and the majority of the population) resided. What is often not recognized is that, to create majorities in the main capitals (where services were concentrated), subject people from distant regions were required to settle in the capital to strengthen its population and its political, military and economic power. Subject peoples (some of whom came as refugees) were welcomed into the capitals, while others were encouraged and often compelled to relocate there. For the purposes of assessing governance, the primary question then becomes: which ward did they reside in? What political power did this ward have? The answers

to these questions determined whether some groups were excluded, marginalized and oppressed, or whether they were incorporated on more equal and humane terms that marked their acceptance and mutual co-existence, and their participation in the governance of the capital.

Among the Bangwato (and this was typical of the others as well), the capital Serowe was divided into a few main administrative and political wards. The four wards that founded Serowe in 1902 were arranged hierarchically, with Maaloso ward for the chief. Interestingly, all 'foreign' people (refugees, immigrants and those compelled to move to the capital—such as Batalaote, Bapedi, Bakaa and Bakalanga) were also housed in the Maaloso ward, which meant they were politically and administratively superior to all other wards. The word 'foreign' is misleading in this context, because the Bangwato royals married from these ethnic groups, gave their own daughters for marriage into those ethnic groups and forged mutual bonds with them. It is used here to distinguish the Bangwato clan from those it incorporated into its chiefdom. Marriages were used to help cement strong bonds between the Phuting clan and others that collectively regarded themselves as Bangwato. The hereditary senior headman of the Maaloso ward is Mathodi Mathodi, whose totem is the cow (which suggests Ndebele origins) and not the Duiker or Phuting clans. In addition, Khama III reportedly liked the hardworking Barotse people and invited their young and strong men from Zambia to come and work on the railway line that was being constructed in the Bechuanaland Protectorate in the 1890s and onwards; they ended up establishing villages along this route. Most of these Barotse men married local women and were incorporated into the Maaloso ward in Serowe. The liberation of subject people was most visible in the Tonota region, where the Bakhurutshe in-laws practised a matriarchal culture, which led to the disappearance of Barotse as a group. Barotse men who married Bakhurutshe women had their children and property registered in their wives' names. When Chief Tshekedi Khama of the Bangwato became aware of this practice, Chief Manyaphiri (the chief's representative from Serowe) relocated a substantial part of the Bakhurutshe population to the Boteti region, creating space for the Barotse and their livestock in the Loomboko ward in Tonota village towards the Shashe dam, and helped them appoint their own leaders and build their own facilities such as schools and health clinics. In this manner, the Barotse of the Tonota region gained their identity as a distinct community with its own cultural practices.

The second ward in Serowe was named Basimane ward, after Khama III's first son. This ward was established for Sekgoma II (whose son later became the first president of Botswana) and his followers. A staunch Christian, after his wife's death Khama III remarried and established the third ward, Maaloso a ngwana, for his other son, Tshekedi Khama (who ruled Bangwato as a regent from around 1923 to 1948 when he abdicated). Lastly, the fourth ward at the founding of Serowe was called Di tima Modimo Ward, for royal uncles from the Phuting clan. This is the ward where the descendants of the brothers of Bangwato chiefs were found. In some sense, this was a royalty ward *par excellence*, except that the chief and his sons were based in other wards, where they surrounded themselves with peoples of different ethnic origins.

MESHING LOCAL GOVERNANCE AND DEMOCRATIC ACCOUNTABILITY WITH REGIONAL STRUCTURES

Each ward had numerous administrative wards within it and was led by headmen (hereditary succession excluded women, but it was not uncommon for mothers to act as regents for their young sons). For instance, Maaloso had 47 wards (Rammala, dinokwane, manyadiwa, morongwa, makolojwane, teko, masilo, masoga, mathwane (for Bakaa of Mmashoro), etc.) These headmen met regularly for consultative and policy-making purposes, a practice that promoted democratic governance. In contrast, Basimane Ward had 23 wards (including Bohurutshe, Mosenye, Basimane kgomo, Tshipana, maoba, etc.) All regional capitals in the Bangwato chiefdom (such as Bobonong in the Bobirwa region, Tonota in the Tonota region, Palapye in the Tswapong region, Mahalapye in the Mahalapye region and Letlhakane in the Boteti region) had the four main wards of *Moaloso, Basimane, Di tima Modimo* and *Maaloso a Ngwana*. In this, way, the Bangwato (and other chiefdoms) exported their political systems to all major settlements in their chiefdom or district. The hereditary headmen of all these administrative wards met regularly to debate issues and take decisions. Their meetings, sometimes on camera and other times in public, enhanced democratic accountability. There were also *kgotla* (assembly) meetings in which all headmen conferred with the chief and the public. Even those from the regional capitals were required to attend. This evidence shows that a strong sense of democratic accountability was embedded in the political culture of the chiefdoms. They also exported leaders.

It is also important to point out that there were regional capitals where some of the subject peoples lived. People in distant regions could access services by travelling long distances to the main capital, by establishing homesteads in the main capital or by being regrouped into regional capitals where similar services could be provided on a much smaller scale. In ruling their large chiefdom, the Bangwato exported leaders from Serowe, who reorganized distant ethnic groups, regions and communities in their own image. Others did the same. For instance, Sekonyana was sent from Serowe to administer over Mahalapye, a settlement that started as a train station and attracted migrants. Similarly, Ngwako was sent to administer Palapye, which also started as a train station. The current Palapye Township was initially populated by Barotse and white Europeans who worked on the railway line. Palapye was resettled for the second time around 1910. Bangwato sent Segotso Ngwako from Serowe to become the first chief of modern Palapye, and the primary school was housed on the premises of the London Missionary Church.

These chiefs' representatives reorganized the political systems of the subject people into the image of the Bangwato. In the case of the Tonota region, Rauwe was the founder of Tonota village, which was primarily populated by Bakhurutshe people, and his son Radipitse Rauwe and grandson Ramosinyi Radipitse were his successors. But after Radipitse, there was no local chief from Tonota for 40 years because of chieftainship disputes among the royal sons and their supporters. Bangwato intervened, and Ookame Sedimo was brought from Serowe to run Tonota and its people. He was followed by Manyaphiri (who had liberated the Barotse) and Raditladi, all of whom were from Serowe. Effectively, the Bangwato had taken over the chieftainship of the Bakhurutshe for 40 years even though Bakhurutshe were once considered senior to the Bangwato. The last chief's representative from Serowe was Bobi Tshipana, after which the chieftainship reverted to the Bakhurutshe.

Another typical example of exporting leaders was evident in the Bobirwa region of the Bangwato chiefdom. The three Babirwa chiefs (Madema, Malema and Seromula) had previously gone to Tsetsebye, Semolale and Mathathane villages, respectively, achieving their independence from each other and not recognizing any authority above them. However, Bangwato later compelled them to relocate to Bobonong and to live under Bangwato authority (Bangwato also sent colonies of Batalaote to settle in these same areas). In this instance, the history of the Bobirwa region is summarized in the establishment of Bobonong village.

Chief Modisaotsile (chief's representative) from Serowe resented having to visit the scattered settlements under his control and compelled the local Babirwa chiefs and their communities to settle in Bobonong.

THE BASIS OF ARRANGEMENTS IN MODERN BOTSWANA

Khama III authorized Modisaotsile to relocate the scattered people and build a London Missionary church in Bobonong and turn it into a school. There was only one classroom: the whole church. *Magwasha* (traditional rites of the Babirwa) were abolished and Bangwato regiments forcefully drove Babirwa children to church and school, where they were given English names to prepare them for the new world they were entering. They were also uprooted from their culture and modernized. Interestingly, the Babirwa continue the practice of giving English names to their children; it has become part of their culture. Another Bangwato royal (chief Ngwato) took over from Modisaotsile and continued modernizing the region, including protecting white-owned farms in the Tuli Block. Overseers from Serowe were placed around Bobonong to look after Bangwato cattle posts and crop fields, and to protect white-owned farms.

Bangwato rule over the Babirwa produced a very educated population that has come to dominate Botswana's bureaucracy and economy, making any radical resistance impossible. However, a difficulty recently arose when the position of chief's representative was localized, requiring a local from Babirwa to take over. Unaccustomed to having an imperial local chief with political and administrative powers over all the Babirwa, they have found it extremely difficult to agree on who to appoint, and have appealed to the central government to help resolve the issue.

Bobonong, the capital of the region, originally had 32 original wards; it now has 38. There was a good reason for the village to have so many wards. Each village in the Bobirwa sub-district had a ward in Bobonong, where it was expected to relocate. The main *kgotla* belonged to Bangwato, which was the headquarters of the area. The other wards included Pudipedi, Dandani of Batswapong and Ndebele, Mothobi ward of Bakalanga and Borotse. These wards were generally known as Legigo, which consisted of five wards such as Pudipedi, Makala of Babirwa, Dandani and Mothobi. Bapedi from Zimbabwe also settled in the Bobirwa area. There is a Bakgatla ward for Bakgatla who settled at Lentswe le Meriti and who were expected to relocate

to Bobonong. All these wards were headed by hereditary headmen, who were required to attend all meetings at the main *kgotla* in Bobonong and helped promote democratic accountability. Bobonong acquired a larger population than all the other villages and was later made the headquarters of the Bangwato and the sub-district. At the time of the local democracy workshop, Bobonong had one senior secondary school (for Forms 4 and 5), three junior community secondary schools, eight primary schools, three private day care centres, one primary hospital and three health clinics. One health clinic focused on HIV/AIDS and started home-based care before anywhere else in Botswana. Thus regional capitals have helped to bring services to people in faraway areas.

Another notable development in the Bobirwa and Boteti regions was the fact that Khama III and Tshekedi Khama (who succeeded him) sent colonies to settle among the local people. In the first instance, Batalaotse people were sent to settle in the Bobirwa region. In the second instance, Bakhurutshe were sent to settle in the Boteti region. The aims were primarily political and administrative: to break the power of the seemingly large Batalaote and Bakhurutshe groups that threatened Bangwato dominance and to neutralize the subject people in those regions. The other competing aims were to defuse chieftainship rivalry among the Bakhurutshe (discussed above), which threatened the stability of the Bangwato chiefdom, and to free land for the Barotse who had settled at Tonota and faced identity loss as their children born of Bakhurutshe wives took the mothers' name and ethnicity.

Distant communities also reorganized themselves along the lines of the Bangwato in order to reap the same benefits. This trend was more evident in the Tutume area among the Bapedi, Batalaotse, Bahumbe, Ndebele and Bakaa. It was stated at the local democracy workshop in Tutume that Memwe (Motalaote) was among the first to cross from Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) into Bangwato country. Memwe crossed the Maitengwe River around 1919 and Khama settled him along the border. Memwe was made the overseer of the boundary with Rhodesia. When Mpapho joined him (another Motalaote), Memwe moved his village. Mazua also joined them. Initially each chief was independent and equal to the others, but subordinate to the Bangwato. Some of Memwe's crop fields provided for the Bangwato chieftaincy, and people in the region were required to farm them. All the other Batalaote and non-Batalaoote chiefs were then subsumed under Memwe. A representative of the Bangwato chief, who also doubled as a tax collector, was sent from Serowe and was based

at Memwe village until he moved to Sebina village, which became the headquarters of the region. It was during that time that large white crop storages (*matula machena*) were built in the Maitengwe region to provide Serowe with grain.

Bangwato sent Rasebolao to rule the region in the early 1900s, with a headquarters at BB1 near Majamboba Hill. Rasebolao then moved his administration to Sebina village (whose chieftainship was in the hands of the BaKaa people) and became the senior chief there. As a result, Sebina became the headquarters of what was later the Tutume region, and people from other villages were encouraged to relocate there. Sebina remained the headquarters until Rasebolao went back to Serowe and a sub-chief from the region was promoted to be the senior chief at Sebina. For instance, sub-chief Modie from Madikwa was made senior chief at Sebina, sparking competition from villages around the Tutume River that incorporated themselves into one very large village, which became the regional capital. Most of the large villages in the region, such as Tutume, Nkange and Maitengwe, were named after rivers passing near clusters of small villages that were officially required to join together. The rivers proved to be neutral names that were accepted by the majority of the people in the villages that had to be grouped together. For instance, Maitengwe village (named after a river) consists of Mpapho, Mazua, Matema, Memwe, Guthu and New Sabasi villages. However, it was Tutume that was able to encourage numerous small villages to grow into one large centre that became the headquarters of the region, where services such as hospitals and colleges are concentrated.

DEMOCRATIC ACCOUNTABILITY IN SERVICE DELIVERY: THE ROLE OF LOCAL DEMOCRACY

My argument is that local governance in Botswana was crafted cautiously in ways that incorporated the traditional features of the old administrative structure they replaced. For instance, the old chieftaincy boundaries were largely preserved. This was despite the fact that some of the chiefdoms, such as those of the Balete and Batlokwa were very small in terms of area, measuring only 1,492 km^2 combined. In the new State of Botswana, their territories were merged into the South East district even though they have separate land boards and separate chieftaincies. Fortunately, there was no history of atrocities between them, enabling mutual co-existence, although the two communities requested a separation. Bakgatla, a small kingdom

nearby, measuring 7,600 km^2, became the Kgatleng district. This approach was a very cautious way of modernizing chiefdoms into local governance structures. Another small district was the North East, which measured some 5,993 km^2. It previously belonged to the Tati Mining Company, whose land was bought back by the State of Botswana, freeing its people from company exploitation.

In contrast, some districts were very large in terms of both area and the size of their district councils. For instance, the Central district (the Bangwato chiefdom) covered an area of 146,531 km^2, or one-third of Botswana, making it the largest district (it was 98 times the size of the South East district). At the time of the workshop, the Central District Council had 152 councillors, making it extremely hard for each of them to speak at council meetings. Some of these councillors lived more than 400 km away from Serowe, the district seat. Such long distances made it difficult for the public to attend council meetings, which are supposedly open. Good local governance would require a territory this large to be carved into several districts in accordance with administrative and democratic limitations (involving limited administrative reach, people's ability to travel to get services, inadequate communication facilities, etc.). However, good governance was sacrificed for the political stability that the boundaries of the old chiefdoms provided. There were other very large districts such as the Ngamiland district (Batawana chiefdom), measuring 109,130 km^2; the Kweneng (Bakwena chiefdom) district, measuring 38,122 km^2; and the Southern district (Bangwaketse chiefdom), measuring 26,876 km^2.

In a third world country in which infrastructure, communication and administrative reach were limited and in which modernization was still on-going, good local governance would have required partitioning districts into more manageable territories. Some of these, such as Ngamiland district, were deep in the Kalahari Desert, where deep sands slowed down movement; where the uneducated and unemployed population remained scattered in small settlements; where swamps divided communities; and where livestock diseases were very common, necessitating the erection of numerous fences that further divided these communities. A huge district with a generally poor and uneducated population would have benefited from partitioning and from creating several regional head-quarters.

However, any such redrawing of boundaries would have altered the boundaries of the different chiefdoms,

which had the potential to spark their resistance and even cause them to reject the new state and mobilize into organized (even armed) resistance. A policy of partitioning chiefdoms into manageable districts could have created political instability that could have further limited the administrative and developmental reach of the state. In regions dominated by armed groups opposed to the state, officials were at risk of being abducted or even killed, infrastructure was at risk of being bombed and destroyed and its citizens were at risk of being displaced and made refugees, all of which would have limited the reach of the state in a much more serious sense. Unstable and violent political confrontations also limit the effectiveness of democratic processes and institutions. Luckily for Botswana, the boundaries of the local governance structures (districts and their institutions) coincided with those of previous chiefdoms for the purposes of compromising with the traditional-oriented chieftaincies, thus, avoiding political instability and disruptive political behaviour, as well as rapid modernization that could cause alienation. In short, there was no redrawing of boundaries in terms of administrative governance and easy service delivery. Politically, not redrawing district boundaries was a necessary compromise to accommodate the interests of the Tswana chiefdoms, to encourage their participation in the new state and to promote political stability.

Large districts began being carved into administratively manageable areas only in 2000. The old chiefdoms were divided into sub-districts. For instance the Central district was carved into the Serowe Administrative Authority, the Palapye Administrative Authority, the Tonota sub-district, the Botete sub-district, the Bobirwa sub-district, the Mahalapye Administrative Authority and the Sefhare sub-district. The better-managed districts that replaced the more functional chiefdoms are doing well with the partitioning. However, poor districts such as Ngamiland are struggling to implement the policy. What is worse is that administrators and technicians often refuse to be transferred to such poor districts, preferring instead to resign and join the private sector.

The State of Botswana also created town councils in accordance with the Crown lands (colonially administered territories): Gantsi Farms, Gaborone Farms, Tati Company Concession Lands and Chobe. Most of the first urban centres such as Gaborone (the current capital city, Francistown, and Lobatse) were established on the former Crown lands that belonged to the British Protectorate Government. In short, the Botswana Government did not interfere with the already existing chiefdoms or their traditional boundaries. Expansion of the cities meant buying white-owned farms and retaining their names for the emerging residential and business areas. For instance, Broadhurst Farm was bought and its land added to Gaborone City. The new township came to be known as Broadhurst.

At the district level, the State of Botswana created new institutions to compete with the old and to help modernize its administrative and political system. Botswana created numerous functional-directed institutions that were independent of each other, which were divided into civil servants controlled by a central government minister and elected boards controlled by the civilian leadership of the district or hereditary leaders. Land boards were created to administer tribal land; district commissioners were created to deal with marriages and supervise central government units at the district level, including the police; and district councils were created to democratize local politics, local infrastructure development and to run services such as education and health. The Department of Water Affairs provided water services, the Botswana Power Corporation was established to provide electricity wherever it was feasible and the Botswana Telecommunications Corporation was established to provide telephone services. However, the autonomy of these service providers meant they were delivering fragmented services, which negatively affected the lives of the local people. For instance, the land board is known to demarcate and award plots for occupation in areas where the council has not opened roads or built schools, where the Power Corporation has no plans to extend the electricity grid and where reticulated water is not even being planned. This disjointed manner of providing services is even more visible in the smaller districts.

In contrast, the chiefs and their headmen were grouped under traditional authorities and were mandated to deal with culture, traditional courts and petty crimes. Fragmented service is the norm, and local democracy has not yet improved the situation. The existence of so many local institutions also means that they call for separate *kgotla* meetings and expect the people to attend all of them. This makes people seem apathetic even though it would be impossible to attend all of them. Even non-governmental organizations hardly participated in the debates of these new institutions.

However, these local institutions incorporated an element of democratic accountability, though with heavy central government control. For instance,

Botswana created land boards that consisted of trained administrators and technicians who were hired, promoted and disciplined by a central government ministry, and who constituted the secretariat and carried out the planning and zoning of land use, which had to be approved by the elected members. But the land boards also have elected members from the area who oversee and approve all their transactions. In short, the land board staff is accountable to the central government (which has hiring and firing powers) and an elected component (which lacks the power to interfere in its operations) was created to provide oversight functions only. Similarly, Botswana created a limited number of geographically based district councils and town councils and placed their technical and administrative staff under the control of the central government, thus denying elected officials supervisory and controlling powers. Uneven development is still visible despite strong central government controls in the districts aimed at ensuring the even distribution of resources and personnel. What is more, all mineral rights in the districts were transferred to the central government, and the districts became beneficiaries of evenly distributed hand-outs from the central government.

There are also contentious issues between districts. For instance, the perception of the Kgatleng district local democracy participants was that Gaborone City has constructed its dam in such a way that water flowing through the city, with its industrial pollutants, flows out into the Notwane River. The polluted Notwane River flows into the Kgatleng district, endangering its inhabitants and the livestock industry.

Conclusion

This paper has shown how Botswana handled matters of service delivery in large areas, introduced a measure of local democratic accountability and modernized the development of its rural hinterland. Politically, the establishment of the protectorate rule decreased the status of the kings, who then became chiefs, thereby easing the transformation of their territories into districts. This transition spared the Botswana administration the task of having to confront kingship in order to modernize the country. Supporting all of this, the chiefs had established effective systems that delivered services, taxed the local people and grouped them into population centres. The new State of Botswana preserved the institutions, capitals and boundaries of the chieftaincy system, but transferred all important functions and powers to either new modernizing institutions at the district level or to the central government—thus further enhancing service delivery, promoting even development and democratic accountability, and facilitating development. However, too many institutions were created at the district level, which made coordination difficult, fragmented service delivery and weakened local democratic accountability.

About the author

Professor Zibani Maundeni teaches Political Science at the University of Botswana, with specialization in developmental state theories, civil society, politics of poverty, regional integration, state capacity and human rights. He is an institutional and cultural expert.

Professor Maundeni studied Political Science at the University of Botswana where he was selected as a Staff Development Fellow and subsequently pursued a Masters degree in the Political Philosophy of human rights at the University of Edinburgh and a PhD in institutional capacity of the state at York University in the United Kingdom. He taught at the University of Botswana from 1993 and became the Coordinator of the Democracy Research Project (DRP) from 2000 until 2007.

He has coordinated a number of consultancies among which are: 'The National Integrity System in Botswana' (analyzing institutional structures and processes) for Transparency International which was launched in Harare in 2007; 'Consolidating Democracy in Southern Africa' (analyzing political parties and civil society organizations as institutions) for Electoral Institute for Southern Africa which was published in March 2007, 'Electoral integration in SADC' (analyzing regional elections institutions) for BIDPA which was published in a book in 2008; 'Voter Apathy in Botswana' for the IEC which published the report in 2002.

Professor Maundeni has published four books, three of which he was editor. He has published over a dozen articles in international journals.

REFERENCES

The following local democracy workshops were held:

- Letlhakeng sub-district: *Letlhakeng, 28–29 April 2010*

- Mogoditshane sub-district: *25–27 May 2010*

- Molepolole Administrative Authority: *Molepolole, 5–7 February 2010*

- Tonota sub-district: *Tonota, 31 March–1 April 2009*

- North East district: *Masunga, 17–19 April 2009*

- South East district: *Mokolodi, 29–30 January 2008*

- Bobirwa sub-district: *Selibe Phikwe, 28–29 May 2008*

- Mahalapye Administrative Authority: *17–18 December 2007*

- Tutume sub-district: *23–24 August 2007*

- Boteti sub-district: *Letlhakane, 20–21 August 2007*

- Ngamiland district: *Maun, 30–31 November 2005*

- Kgatleng district: *Rasesa Lodge, 23–24 June 2005*

Du Toit, P., *State-building & Democracy in Southern Africa: A comparative study of Botswana, South Africa and Zimbabwe* (Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council, 1995)

Schapera, I., *Tribal innovators: Tswana chiefs and Social Change, 1795–1940* (London: Athlone Publishers, 1970)