

Presidential candidate selection and factionalism in five dominant parties in Sub-Saharan Africa

著者	Tsubura Machiko
権利	Copyrights 日本貿易振興機構（ジェトロ）アジア経済研究所 / Institute of Developing Economies, Japan External Trade Organization (IDE-JETRO) http://www.ide.go.jp
journal or publication title	IDE Discussion Paper
volume	745
year	2019-03
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2344/00050799

■ IDE Discussion Papers are preliminary materials circulated to stimulate discussions and critical comments

IDE DISCUSSION PAPER No. 745

Presidential Candidate Selection and Factionalism in Five Dominant Parties in Sub-Saharan Africa

Machiko TSUBURA*

March 2019

Abstract

In dominant party states in sub-Saharan Africa where presidential succession occurs regularly, factional competition culminates in the selection of presidential candidates, a process which is frequently more competitive than a general election. It is crucial that dominant parties manage factionalism in presidential candidate selection, maintain party coherence and win elections. Against such a background, this study examines how dominant parties in five African countries with regular presidential succession, namely, Botswana, Namibia, Mozambique, Tanzania and South Africa, have managed factionalism and avoided critical defections. The study finds that presidential candidate selection in all cases except that of South Africa since 2007 have been centralised, albeit to varying degrees, to control factionalism. The study demonstrates a wide variation in methods and practices of presidential candidate selection, including the level of selectorate inclusiveness, which can be explained partially by differences in electoral institutions. The study also finds a common measure taken in three case countries to accommodate rival factions in the interest of reconsolidating party unity after the defection of senior party members. The study aims to help our understanding of succession management as a crucial internal factor in the endurance of one-party dominance in some countries in sub-Saharan Africa.

Keywords: dominant parties, presidential candidate selection, factionalism

* Research Fellow, African Studies Group, Area Studies Center, IDE (Machiko_Tsubura@ide.go.jp)

The Institute of Developing Economies (IDE) is a semigovernmental, nonpartisan, nonprofit research institute, founded in 1958. The Institute merged with the Japan External Trade Organization (JETRO) on July 1, 1998. The Institute conducts basic and comprehensive studies on economic and related affairs in all developing countries and regions, including Asia, the Middle East, Africa, Latin America, Oceania, and Eastern Europe.

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s). Publication does not imply endorsement by the Institute of Developing Economies of any of the views expressed within.

INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPING ECONOMIES (IDE), JETRO
3-2-2, WAKABA, MIHAMA-KU, CHIBA-SHI
CHIBA 261-8545, JAPAN

©2019 by Institute of Developing Economies, JETRO

No part of this publication may be reproduced without the prior permission of the IDE-JETRO.

Presidential Candidate Selection and Factionalism in Five Dominant Parties in Sub-Saharan Africa

Machiko TSUBURA*

Abstract

In dominant party states in sub-Saharan Africa where presidential succession occurs regularly, factional competition culminates in the selection of presidential candidates, a process which is frequently more competitive than a general election. It is crucial that dominant parties manage factionalism in presidential candidate selection, maintain party coherence and win elections. Against such a background, this study examines how dominant parties in five African countries with regular presidential succession, namely, Botswana, Namibia, Mozambique, Tanzania and South Africa, have managed factionalism and avoided critical defections. The study finds that presidential candidate selection in all cases except that of South Africa since 2007 have been centralised, albeit to varying degrees, to control factionalism. The study demonstrates a wide variation in methods and practices of presidential candidate selection, including the level of selectorate inclusiveness, which can be explained partially by differences in electoral institutions. The study also finds a common measure taken in three case countries to accommodate rival factions in the interest of reconsolidating party unity after the defection of senior party members. The study aims to help our understanding of succession management as a crucial internal factor in the endurance of one-party dominance in some countries in sub-Saharan Africa.

Keywords: dominant parties, presidential candidate selection, factionalism

* Research Fellow, African Studies Group, Area Studies Center, IDE (Machiko_Tsubura@ide.go.jp)

1. Introduction

In December 2017, Cyril Ramaphosa was elected president of South Africa's African National Congress (ANC) after defeating Nkosazana Dlamini-Zuma by a narrow margin of 179 votes out of 4,708 at the party's national conference. Subsequently, her ex-husband President Jacob Zuma resigned under ANC pressure mainly due to corruption allegations, and Ramaphosa was sworn in as President in February 2018. He will be the ANC presidential candidate for the legislative election scheduled for May 2019 (Schneidman 2017; The Guardian 14 February 2018; Reuters 7 November 2018). Just two months later, in the neighbouring country of Botswana, Vice President Mokgweetsi Masisi succeeded President Ian Khama and assumed the presidency. Khama had appointed Masisi his deputy in 2014 and voluntarily retired from office a year before the end of his two five-year terms in 2018, which led to Vice President Masisi's automatic presidential succession. The early retirement of the president has become the custom of the ruling Botswana Democratic Party (BDP) to avoid excessive factional infighting and ensure the party's continued electoral success (Republic of Botswana 13 November 2014; Beardsworth 16 April 2018). While both the ANC and BDP are dominant parties in democracies with regular multiparty elections and presidential succession, they have contrasting methods of presidential candidate selection: while ANC presidential candidates are selected by thousands of party delegates in a decentralised and competitive manner, BDP candidates are chosen solely by incumbent presidents.

In dominant party states where presidential succession occurs regularly, factional competition culminates in presidential candidate selection, a process which is frequently more competitive than a general election. It is thus crucial that dominant parties manage factionalism in selecting their presidential candidates, maintain party coherence and win elections. With the stark difference in selection methods between Botswana and South Africa in mind, this study examines how African dominant parties have managed factionalism and avoided serious defections in the presidential candidate selection process. Altogether, the study analyses five dominant party states with regular presidential succession, namely, Botswana, Namibia, Mozambique, Tanzania and South Africa. The presidents of these countries invariably respect term limits and step down from office on or before term completion. Therefore, they differ from other dominant party states such as Uganda and Rwanda where presidential terms have been much more open-ended (Reyntjens 2016: 61).

The study found that the presidential candidate selection of all parties except the ANC since 2007 is generally centralised to control factionalism. The study also suggests

that the variation in the level of selectorate inclusiveness can be explained partially by differences in electoral systems. In South Africa where presidential candidates are elected at the National Assembly after legislative elections under a closed-list Proportional Representation system, citizens do not vote for candidates but for parties in an election. Under this system, ANC's decentralised presidential candidate selection demonstrates intraparty democracy to maintain wide electoral support by providing an opportunity for party members to express their views through local party delegates. The study also found that a common presidential strategy in three countries is to accommodate rival factions to reconsolidate party unity after the defections of senior party members. The study aims to deepen our understanding of the mechanisms of succession management as a crucial internal factor for the endurance of one-party dominance in African countries.

This study takes an inductive approach, applying process tracing in combination with case comparisons (Mason 2002: 179–181; Bennett and Checkel 2015: 7–8)¹ to identify causal mechanisms that may explain the maintenance of party unity in the presidential candidate selection process. It draws mainly on secondary sources except in the case of Tanzania, which is underpinned by the author's in-country interviews with key informants between September and November 2015 (Tsubura 2018).

The paper is divided into four sections. The first reviews the literature on dominant parties in sub-Saharan Africa, factionalism and party leadership selection, and demonstrates the importance of presidential candidate selection in understanding the internal mechanisms of the endurance of dominant parties. The second section examines the selection methods and practices of the five case parties with a focus on the interaction with factional dynamics. The third section analyses the variation and a common tendency among the five cases. Finally, the paper concludes with a few suggestions on the way forward for future research.

2. Dominant Parties, Factionalism and Leadership Selection

This study builds on three interrelated themes in the literature: 1) dominant parties; 2) factionalism in political parties; and 3) leadership selection in political parties. Firstly, there is a growing number of studies on the characteristics of political parties and party systems in sub-Saharan Africa (e.g., Van de Walle and Butler 1999; Salih 2003; Cheeseman 2010: 53–57; LeBas 2011; Riedl 2014; Doorenspleet and Nijzink 2014), and studies focusing on dominant party systems in the region (e.g., Ishiyama and Quinn 2006;

¹ See Bennett and Checkel (2015: 19, 29) for the advantages of combining process tracing and case comparisons, rather than rigidly applying Mill's methods of comparison.

Lindberg and Jones 2010; Doorenspleet and Nijzink 2013). Once largely characterised by the prevalence of one-party dominance in the 1990s, African countries are now following divergent paths (Van de Walle 2002; Bogaards 2004; Cheeseman 2010). While some have experienced repeated electoral turnovers, others have thus far remained dominant party states (For the identification of African dominant parties, see De Jager and Du Toit 2012: 7-12; Bogaards 2014; Erdmann and Basedaw 2013; Bogaards 2004). Thus, the question as to why some dominant party systems endure while others have been replaced is increasingly important in understanding the state of African democracy.

The second and central theme of the literature on which this study builds is factionalism. One of the internal factors for the endurance of dominant parties in Africa has been identified as elite coordination or management of factionalism (Doorenspleet and Nijzink 2013: 198, 202; Doorenspleet and Nijzink 2014: 173; see also Boucek 2012: 34–35 for factionalism of dominant parties in general). Factionalism can be defined as ‘the partitioning of a political party into sub-groups [that are] more or less institutionalised and engage in collective action to achieve their members’ particular objectives’ (Boucek 2012: 37). Factionalism is important in the studies of dominant party states because intra-party competition in such countries tends to be more intense and influential in determining national leadership, thereby shaping political power relations, than inter-party competition in a general election. Indeed, the failure of dominant parties to manage infighting resulting in the defection of powerful leaders is one of the reasons for the end of dominant party rule in African countries such as Senegal in 2000, Zambia in 2001, Kenya in 2002, Sierra Leone in 2007, and Nigeria in 2015 (Cooper 2015: 3; Owen and Usman 2015; Hartmann 2013: 172–174; Simutanyi 2013: 121; Cheeseman 2010: 143–144). It is therefore worth examining how African dominant parties have dealt with factional competition in selecting new leaders and sustained long-term rule.

Among the various causal mechanisms for the endurance and demise of dominant parties cited by political scientists, Garrido de Sierra’s (2014) Clientele Migration Theory, which is based on his analysis of Mexico’s Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI), provides a useful analytical lens to this study. Drawing on studies of dominant party regimes by Van de Walle (1994), Geddes (1999), Greene (2008) and Magaloni (2006), Garrido de Sierra (2014: 47) argues that ‘the survival of a dominant-party regime largely depends on the unity of its factions’. He goes on to posit that factions are likely to remain in a dominant party as long as it provides each of the factional leaders ‘an expected utility that is *relatively* higher than what any other party can offer them’ (Garrido de Sierra 2014: 47, emphasis in original). He also stresses that dominant party regimes are seriously threatened only ‘when many mid- and high-ranked leaders decide

to leave the party along with their clienteles and resources' (Garrido de Sierra 2014: 47). This type of defection can be considered an example of what Boucek (2012: 34) terms 'critical defections [which expand the electoral field for the opposition and become] the main drivers of regime change following long periods of one-party dominance'. Conversely, it can be stated that a dominant party with regular leadership succession represents successful avoidance of such critical defections even if it faces intense intraparty competition in selecting a new leader.

The present study broadly applies Clientele Migration Theory as a basic premise in examining how its five case parties have avoided critical defections, with two additional considerations. Firstly, while dominant parties are viewed as actors that decide and allocate 'an expected utility' (Garrido de Sierra 2014: 47) to factional leaders, this study seeks to identify which actors in particular have the power to do so. Secondly, among the various utilities, this study focuses on patronage, particularly the appointment of cabinet and party posts, with the assumption that such positions strengthen the power of factional leaders over the allocation of resources and enable them to expand their factions. The study also pays attention to the extent to which factional leaders have presidential aspirations, which influences the likelihood of their defection together with their loyalists following failure to secure presidential candidacy.

The final theme on which this study builds is leadership selection in political parties. Academic attention to party leadership, including leadership selection, in the study of contemporary Western democracies is a relatively new and limited field in comparison to party organisation, membership and candidate selection (Pilet and Cross 2015: 4–7). Yet, it is vital given the scale of the power entrusted to party leaders in national politics, and, moreover, the 'particular method that a party uses to select its leader is likely to affect the types of persons that emerge, and the abilities they bring with them' (Punnett 1992: 2). One of the central attributes of leadership selection increasingly discussed is the 'selectorate' or 'the body that selects the party leader' (Kenig 2009: 434). Democratisation of leadership selection 'almost always refers to the process of opening up the selectorate to a wider range of voters' (Kenig 2009: 434), while there is a trend in Europe and Canada for leadership selection methods to become more inclusive and democratic (Pilet and Cross 2015: 5). As illustrated by the cases of Botswana and South Africa in the introduction to the present paper, the most notable difference between them and the other three cases is the level of selectorate inclusiveness and this aspect is therefore examined carefully in this paper.

While most of the literature on leadership selection in African political parties addresses single case studies, Cooper's (2013: 267–318; 2015) comparative analyses of

dominant parties in Botswana, Namibia and South Africa are insightful. Focusing on party cohesion as one aspect of electoral competition, he finds that in dominant parties, defeated leadership candidates and their loyalists are likely to remain in the party if the president mediates between rival factions to create opportunities for the former to advance their careers within the party (Cooper 2013: 300–301). However, while Cooper (2013: 267–318; 2015) regards any defection of a party leader as indicative of party fragmentation and explores how and why this occurs at different points in time, the present paper does not treat the defection which has a limited impact on electoral competition as serious party fragmentation. Rather, it examines how African dominant parties have avoided the type of defection that would be expected to seriously threaten their long-term rule by highlighting the management of factionalism. Indeed, the paper demonstrates that a major but not critical defection may function as a cautionary lesson to the president of a dominant party state, prompting him or her to prioritise party cohesion by accommodating rival factions within the party after such a defection.

3. Five African Dominant Parties with Regular Presidential Succession

An important democratic rule increasingly institutionalised in Africa since 1990 is the setting of presidential term limits (Bogaards 2014: 38; Cheeseman 2015: 176–182; Reyntjens 2016; Posner and Young 2018). The present paper compares presidential candidate selection in dominant parties in which presidents adhere to term limits and there have been multiple leadership successions during the multiparty period. Takeuchi (2016: 43) identifies such states as Botswana, Namibia, Mozambique, Tanzania and South Africa, all of which are located in eastern and southern Africa.² Dominant parties in these countries commonly originated in liberation movements before independence from colonial rule, or in opposition to apartheid in the case of South Africa (Takeuchi 2016: 43).

Interestingly, the parties discussed in the present paper are often distinguished from authoritarian dominant parties according to criteria other than presidential term limit. Lindberg and Jones (2010), for example, classify them as ‘democratic dominant parties’ by analysing the relationship between party system, government effectiveness, economic

² Seychelles is another African dominant party state with regular presidential succession, the presidential term limit being three five-year terms between 1993 and 2016 and changed to two five-year terms in 2016 (Takeuchi 2016: 43; Reyntjens 2016: Supplement 2; Seychelles New Agency 5 April 2016). Yet, Seychelles is excluded from the present study because presidential succession has taken place only once and changes in the process over time therefore cannot be examined (Posner and Young 2018: 266).

development and corruption. Additionally, Bogaards (2008) finds that dominant parties in Botswana, Mozambique, Namibia and South Africa have greater electoral stability than such parties in authoritarian regimes.³

Apart from the aforementioned commonalities, there are some basic differences across the five case parties, three of which are as follows. Firstly, in terms of length of multiparty democracy, while Botswana is one of only two African countries that have operated a multiparty system since independence and has held 11 such elections to date, Tanzania transferred from a one-party state to multiparty system in 1992 and has held only five multiparty elections. Yet, if presidential term limit is taken into account, Botswana, which introduced it in 1997, has held only four elections to date. Indeed, the number of multiparty elections held with presidential term limits are similar among the cases between three (in Mozambique) and five (in Namibia, South Africa and Tanzania) (Reyntjens 2016; African Election Database n.d.; International Foundation for Electoral Systems n.d.).

The second important difference among the five cases concerns their respective electoral systems. While one-party dominance has emerged in all electoral systems in Africa (Erdmann and Basedau 2008), presidents are chosen by direct election using the first-past-the-post (FPTP) system in Namibia, Mozambique and Tanzania, whereas Botswanan and South African presidents are elected by a national assembly after a legislative election in Botswana and South Africa. Furthermore, legislative election systems differ between Botswana and South Africa: while the elections in the former are held under the FPTP system, the latter uses the closed-list proportional representation (PR) system (Reynolds, Reilly and Ellis 2008). The relationship between the electoral systems and their respective methods and practices of presidential candidate selection are examined in the analysis section of this paper.

The third important difference is broader than and affects the first two differences, and concerns historical and socioeconomic background. For example, the case countries were colonised by different European countries or South Africa in the case of Namibia. As discussed by De Jager and Du Toit (2012: 5–7), different colonial and other historical experiences have led to diverse path-dependent trajectories in terms of political development in the case countries, and variations in socioeconomic conditions should also be taken into account. For example, as of 2017, populations ranged from 2.3 million in Botswana to 57.3 million in Tanzania. The level of economic development also differs widely, 2016 gross domestic product (GDP) per capita varying between US\$379 in

³ Bogaards (2008) does not include Tanzania because it had not experienced three consecutive multiparty elections at the time of his study.

Mozambique and US\$6,917 in Botswana (United Nations n.d.). Taking an inductive approach, the present paper seeks to explain whether and to what extent certain historical events and socioeconomic conditions have contributed to variations in the management of factionalism in presidential candidate selection rather than using them as criteria for elimination of cases from the study.

The case studies below are ordered by the level of selectorate inclusiveness of the presidential candidate selection starting with the most centralised. Each of the case studies begins with a brief explanation of the historical background of the dominant party and its method of presidential candidate selection. It then examines selection practices with a focus on interaction with factional dynamics.

3.1. Botswana: Automatic Presidential Succession to Control Factionalism

Botswana's dominant ruling party, the Botswana Development Party (BDP), is characterised by prolonged competition between two factions, which has resulted in the centralisation of presidential power over the selection of successors. Yet, a closer look at the BDP's succession politics reveals that Botswanan presidents do not have full control of factionalism. Rather, the three presidents in office between 1980 and 2018 compromised and accommodated the BDP's rival factions in one way or another in the allocation of cabinet and other government positions to avoid critical defections. Thus, Botswanan presidents seem to be vested with power over leadership succession with the condition that they respect the BDP's 'culture of mutual accommodation' (Maundeni and Lotshwao 2012: 63).

Unlike most African countries, Botswana adopted a multiparty system at independence in 1966 (Lotshwao 2011: 103). Currently, 57 Members of Parliament are elected under the FPTP system, and the presidential candidate of the party winning the majority of parliamentary seats automatically becomes president of the country (Molomo 2000: 106). Botswana's first presidential succession was held without difficulty, President Khama dying in office in July 1980 and being succeeded by Vice President Ketumile Masire, who smoothly acceded to the presidency in accordance with the Constitution maintaining 'more or less the same team that he inherited' (Maundeni and Lotshwao 2012: 60). The BDP won the following legislative elections of 1984, 1989 and 1994, albeit with steadily declining support (68%, 65% and 53% respectively), and Masire was re-elected by the National Assembly each time (African Election Database n.d.).

However, under President Masire's rule in the 1990s, the BDP was seriously affected by factional infighting. The division emerged in 1991 when BDP Secretary

General Daniel Kwelagobe and Vice President and BDP Chairman Peter Mmusi were accused of land grabbing in a presidential inquiry led by Minister of Foreign Affairs Mompoti Merafhe. As a result, Kwelagobe and Mmusi were suspended from their party positions and resigned from the Cabinet (Weekend Post 12 January 2015). Since then, the BDP has been split between two factions. One was led by Kwelagobe and BDP Chairman Ponatshego Kedikilwe (after Mmusi died in 1994), and ‘largely represented the interests of older elites’ (Good and Taylor 2006: 55). The other was headed by Merafhe and attracted ‘newcomers who tried to reform and modernize the party’ (Makgala 2006: 169 cited in Cooper 2013: 297). Merafhe’s group was later supported by President Masire’s successors Festus Mogae and Ian Khama. The two factions were considered to represent north-south divisions in the country and fought for leadership succession, significantly affecting party administration in the process (Molomo 2000: 96; Lotshwao 2011). In response to BDP internal strife, President Masire appointed Minister of Finance and Development Planning Festus Mogae as his new deputy in 1992, bypassing potential candidates of both factions (Sounders 2004: 91; Weekend Post 12 January 2015).

Major amendments were made to the Constitution through a national referendum in 1997. Along with the introduction of a clause restricting presidential incumbency to two five-year terms, it was decided that the vice president, who was appointed by the president, would automatically succeed the incumbent in the case of his death or resignation to ensure a smooth succession (Republic of Botswana 2006; Morton, Ramsay and Mgadla 2008: xxix; Maundeni and Seabo 2015: 30).⁴ The BDP Constitution was also amended so that a special congress would be convened for selecting its presidential candidates during election years. However, in practice, presidents have been succeeded by vice presidents without such a congress (Maundeni and Seabo 2015: 30; Weekend Post 3 September 2018).

In addition to these amendments, President Masire sought to maintain balance between the two BDP factions. In 1997, he brokered a deal for the election of members of the Central Committee by asking delegates in Congress to endorse a list of candidates secretly nominated by each faction rather than voting for them (Molomo 2000: 96; Maundeni and Lotshwao 2012: 60). Masire also allocated the Merafhe faction executive government positions and the Kwelagobe/Kedikilwe faction other positions in the party (Good and Taylor 2006; Maundeni and Seabo 2015).

President Masire retired from office in 1998, one year before the end of his two five-year terms, and Vice President Mogae ascended to the presidency automatically.

⁴ See Otlhogile (1998: 215-216) on the selection of a successor in case of the president’s death or resignation, and the tenure of the presidency in Botswana before 1997.

Masire reportedly chose to retire early despite Kwelagobe and Merafhe's opposition due to suspicion that Mogae would not have beaten either of them if a presidential candidate election had taken place openly within the party (Weekend Post 12 January 2015). In the election of 1999, the BDP increased its number of parliamentary seats from 27 (68%) to 33 (83%) of 40 seats, mainly due to the fragmentation of opposition parties, and Mogae was elected president in Parliament (Lodge, Kadima and Pottie 2002: 47–48; African Elections Database n.d.). Thus, while constitutional amendments and balanced distribution of patronage mitigated intense factionalism within the party, President Masire established a custom that incumbent presidents should control leadership succession within the BDP.

Unlike Masire, President Mogae did not accommodate the rivals and excluded leading members of the Kwelagobe/Kedikilwe faction in appointing cabinet ministers of his choice, which made further compromise between the two groups difficult to reach (Maundeni and Lotshwao 2012: 61). Mogae avoided the leaders of the two factions and appointed Lieutenant-General Ian Khama, eldest son of the first president Seretse Kham, vice president (Molomo 2000: 101). As with his predecessor, President Mogae resigned from office in 2008, a year before the end of his two five-year terms, and Vice President Khama automatically succeeded him. In the election of 2009, the BDP secured 45 (79%) of 57 parliamentary seats and President Khama subsequently took office (African Election Database n.d.). Khama's presidency was reportedly authoritarian and highly personalised relying on trusted loyalists (Good 2009; Lotshwao 2011: 106–108). Initially, he favoured the Merafhe faction over the Kwelagobe/Kedikilwe faction and appointed Merafhe as vice president. When Kwelagobe/Kedikilwe loyalists won all the BDP Central Committee seats in 2009, Khama nominated additional members from the Merafhe faction and appointed 77 Merafhe loyalists to various subcommittees of the party, which infuriated the Kwelagobe/Kedikilwe faction (Good 2009: 323; Lotshwao 2011: 107; Maundeni and Lotshwao 2012: 61–62; Maundeni and Seabo 2015: 29–30).

In 2010, the BDP experienced its first major defection, some members of the Kwelagobe/Kedikilwe faction who could not tolerate Khama's leadership style leaving the BDP to form a new party, the Botswana Movement for Democracy (BMD), which immediately became the main Opposition. Due to this split, President Khama reached a compromise with Kwelagobe/Kedikilwe loyalists who had remained in the BDP (Maundeni and Lotshwao 2012: 62). Thus, after Vice President Merafhe retired from office due to ill health in 2012, Khama appointed Kedikilwe, who had been acting in the absence of Merafhe, as his new deputy until 2014 when Kedikilwe announced his retirement from active politics (Sunday Standard 9 October 2011; Weekend Post 12

January 2015; Botswana Guardian 17 December 2013; Cooper-Knock 2012).

In the election in 2014, the BDP won 37 (65%) of 57 parliamentary seats and Khama was re-elected for a second term. The Umbrella for Democratic Change, an alliance formed by three opposition parties including the BMD, gained 17 (30%) seats (International Foundation for Electoral Systems n.d.). Khama appointed Minister of Education and Skills Development Mokgweetsi Masisi as vice president despite reservations about his capacity for leadership by some senior party members (Republic of Botswana 13 November 2014; Sunday Standard 14 May 2018). From a privileged background, his father having been a cabinet minister in Seretse Khama's administration, Masisi rose rapidly through BDP ranks: he became an MP in 2009, a cabinet minister in 2011, and has been BDP vice president since 2014 (Mail and Guardian 3 April 2018). Meanwhile, Kedikilwe retired from active politics as he had announced earlier, and Merafhe died in January 2015 (Botswana Daily News 7 January 2015).

Like his predecessors, Khama resigned from office in 2018, a year before the end of his two terms, which made Masisi the next president automatically (This is Africa 4 April 2018). Since then, a further division has emerged within the BDP between Masisi and Khama loyalists, and it is reported that Khama has become increasingly dissatisfied with Masisi's disrespect for him (Weekend Post 18 June 2018; Botswana Guardian 15 August 2018). While it is critical that the BDP solve this discord in preparation for the forthcoming election scheduled for October 2019, its dominant rule seems to be solid as the opposition remains fragmented (For the evolution of the opposition coalition in Botswana, see Poteete 2012: 84; Reuters 4 February 2017; Botswana Guardian 5 November 2018; Botswana Guardian 12 November 2018).

In summary, Botswana's BDP presidential candidate selection has been controlled by incumbent presidents for two decades in order to avoid excessive competition between its two factions and critical defections. As a result, even the first major split from the BDP and creation of the BMD in 2010 did not amount to a serious threat as the factional leader decided to remain in the BDP. The custom of automatic vice presidential succession has accommodated opposing factions through presidential appointments. As major factional leaders are either no longer alive or active in politics, division has recently focused on that between the incumbent and former presidents. Yet, given continued opposition fragmentation, the BDP is likely to retain its dominant power as long as it succeeds in controlling potential serious defections.

3.2. Namibia: the Incumbent's Power over Presidential Candidate Selection

Presidential candidate selection in Namibia's dominant party, the South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO), was initially characterised by the overwhelming power of the founding president, Sam Nujoma, and marginalisation of his opponents. His successor, Hifikepunye Pohamba, was imposed internally by Nujoma. While Nujoma's power waned over time, President Pohamba campaigned for the election of Hage Geingob in secret.

SWAPO was established in 1960 as a liberation movement in opposition to South African rule, and Namibia achieved independence in 1990 with the support of the international community. SWAPO gained dominance in the country when the United Nations General Assembly recognised it as the only legitimate representative of Namibians in 1976 (Melber 2006: 99, 113). Namibia has held regular multiparty elections since independence and presidents are elected directly by citizens using the FPTP system (Reynolds, Reilly and Ellis 2008). SWAPO has three national organs: the Political Bureau (21 members), Central Committee (70 members) and Congress (over 700 delegates). The Central Committee elects members of the Political Bureau and the party president. Until 2007, SWAPO presidential candidate selection was an independent process whereby the Central Committee nominated three candidates and the winner was elected by an Extraordinary Congress. Since 2007, the party's vice president has automatically become a presidential candidate (South West Africa People's Organisation: 5–8; Cooper 2015: 11; New Era 4 December 2018).

Nujoma was elected as the first Namibian president by the Constituent Assembly before independence in 1990 (Melber 2015: 50). As the Constitution had been amended to introduce a presidential term limit of two five years in 1989, before official independence, he served a three-term presidency on the grounds that he was not directly elected by citizens in 1990 (Melber 2006: 98; Melber 2015: 52). In August 2002, Nujoma chose Minister of Land and co-founder of SWAPO Hifikepunye Pohamba as his successor. Despite Pohamba's reluctance to accept the role, he was imposed on the party as the only candidate for the party's vice presidency (The Namibian 6 August 2002; Africa Research Bulletin 2004: 15639; Melber 2015: 56).

In April 2004, SWAPO Central Committee nominated three presidential candidates for the general election in November (New Era 5 April 2004) and in May, an Extraordinary Congress was held to select the winner. Nujoma campaigned for Pohamba, dismissing main rival Foreign Minister Hidipo Hamutenya from the Cabinet four days before the Congress for allegedly inciting party disunity (Africa Research Bulletin 2004:

15752, 15836). There were two rounds of ballots in Congress. Pohamba and Hamutenya received 213 (41%) and 166 (32%) respectively of a total of 516 votes in the first round. In the second round, Pohamba won and was duly elected the party's presidential candidate (Africa Research Bulletin 2004: 15752, 15986-8). In November 2004, Pohamba won the presidential election with a 76% majority (International Foundation for Electoral Systems n.d.). Nujoma remained the president of SWAPO and continued to exert power in the party until 2007 (Melber 2015: 56).

With the strong backing of Nujoma, President Pohamba marginalised Hamutenya and other dissidents by excluding them from the government and the party. Consequently, Hamutenya and other opponents of Nujoma and Pohamba defected from SWAPO and formed a new party, the Rally for Democracy and Progress (RDP), in November 2007. On the day Hamutenya left SWAPO, the Political Bureau announced the nomination of former Prime Minister Hage Geingob as the sole candidate for the vice presidency and Pohamba as party president in the forthcoming meeting of Congress. SWAPO also changed its rules such that if a party president does not seek re-election as the national president, he or she is succeeded as presidential candidate by the party's vice president (Cooper 2015: 11). In April 2008, Pohamba and Geingob were elected unopposed as party president and vice president respectively, and Geingob was appointed Minister of Trade and Industry. Geingob had been Prime Minister until 2002 when he was appointed as a local government minister by then President Nujoma. Geingob rejected the demotion and moved abroad. He returned to Namibia and was elected a Member of Parliament in March 2005 (Africa Research Bulletin 2007: 17303; Africa Research Bulletin 2012: 19518; Melber, Kromrey and Welz 2017: 295).

Although President Pohamba was reportedly ill and planned to step down early, allowing Geingob to take over as president without facing a direct election (Africa Research Bulletin 2007: 17303), he nevertheless served for two terms, being re-elected with a 75% majority in November 2009. The defection of Hamutenya and other opponents of Nujoma and Pohamba from SWAPO did not have a major impact on SWAPO's electoral dominance, Hamutenya gaining just 11% in the presidential election and his party, RDP, 11% in the legislative election in 2009, while Pohamba's support declined by only 1 percentage point from the previous election (International Foundation for Electoral Systems n.d.).

In December 2012, two years before the 2014 presidential election, Geingob was re-elected as the party's vice president and its presidential candidate with 52% of votes in Congress and was reappointed Prime Minister. Presidential candidate selection was relatively open for the first time in SWAPO's history (Africa Research Bulletin 2012:

19518; Melber 2015: 51–59; Cooper 2015: 11). Pohamba reportedly campaigned for Geingob’s re-election as the party’s vice-president in secret, while Nujoma had no influence on the selection (The Namibian 24 September 2012, November 2012, December 2012; Africa Research Bulletin 2012: 19518).

In November 2014, Geingob was elected president with an 87% majority (International Foundation for Electoral Systems n.d.). As Hamutenya had polled only 3% and his party, the RDP, only 4%, he surrendered the party presidency and returned to SWAPO in August 2015 (Melber 2015: 56). Thus, the first defection of a presidential candidate and other party members from SWAPO was a far from critical defection and did not threaten its electoral dominance.

Without a solid support base in the party as with Pohamba backed by Nujoma, Geingob adopted an inclusive approach in running the government by incorporating his predecessors, the old guard and his rivals in SWAPO presidential candidate selection process (Melber 2015: 60; Melber, Kromrey and Welz 2017: 294–299). This can be seen from his formation of a Presidential Council comprising himself, his two predecessors (i.e., Nujoma and Pohamba), previous prime ministers and their deputies in February 2015. Geingob also appointed Nickey Iyambo, the eldest of the first generation of party members, as the country’s first vice-president (Melber, Kromrey and Welz 2017: 297). In April 2015, Geingob consolidated power by taking over the party presidency from Pohamba (The Namibian 20 April 2015; Melber, Kromrey and Welz 2017: 299).

In summary, SWAPO’s presidential candidate selection has been influenced mainly by incumbent presidents; in particular, the first, Nujoma, visibly imposed the successor of his choice on the party’s leadership selection. The marginalisation of his opponents in the party triggered their defection and the formation of a splinter party. While these defections had no significant influence on election results, President Geingob, with support from former President Pohamba, has taken measures to accommodate his predecessors and rival factions to unite the party. Yet, overall, SWAPO represents another case of centralised presidential candidate selection by the incumbent.

3.3. Mozambique: Collective Management of Presidential Candidate Selection and Factionalism by the Party Elite

In Mozambique, the *Frente de Libertação de Moçambique* (Mozambique Liberation Front: FRELIMO) has maintained dominant rule since the first multiparty elections in 1994, following a peace agreement between President Joachim Chissano and Afonso Dhlakama, leader of the *Resistência Nacional Moçambicana* (Mozambican National

Resistance: RENAMO) in 1992. Mozambican presidents are directly elected by citizens through the FPTP system, while members of parliament are elected using a closed-list PR system (Reynolds, Reilly and Ellis 2008). In contrast to Botswana's BDP and Namibia's SWAPO, whereby incumbent presidents have been influential in the selection of their successors, FRELIMO is characterised by collective management of factionalism and leadership succession by the party elite with the strong influence of former freedom fighters in Mozambique's independence struggle (Carbone 2003: 11; Hanlon 2011).

Founded in 1962 and led by Samora Machel, FRELIMO was central in achieving Mozambique's independence from Portugal in 1975. Having evolved into a Marxist-Leninist party in 1977, with restricted membership of the working class, urban proletariat and bureaucrats, FRELIMO began to incorporate all social classes and dramatically increased party membership in the late 1990s (Carbone 2005: 424, 430). Although FRELIMO's administrative division reportedly begins with 30,000 local *células* (cells), as is the case with most communist parties, the party as a whole, including its presidential candidate selection process, operates in a top-down fashion (Carbone 2003: 10).

Since 2002, FRELIMO presidential candidate selection has been organised in stages representing the party's three organs. Firstly, the Political Commission (17 members) nominates three to five candidates. Secondly, the Central Committee (approximately 190 members) selects a single candidate through a vote. Finally, a meeting of Congress (approximately 2,300 delegates) either approves or disapproves the candidate proposed by the Central Committee. In practice, presidential candidates selected by the Central Committee in 2002 and 2014 were endorsed by Congress (Carbone 2005: 439; Aim News Cast 8 June 2002; Carbone 2003: 11; Think Africa Press 25 October 2012; Club of Mozambique 30 September 2017). The Political Commission and Central Committee are characterised by the continuing power and privileges of former combatants in the anti-colonial struggle, who are viewed as 'guarantors of the superior ethics of the national leadership in the face of the new and allegedly more corruptible politicians brought to the fore by multiparty politics' (Carbone 2003: 11).

In October 1986, President Machel died in a plane crash and Foreign Minister Joaquim Chissano was unanimously elected as his successor at a meeting of the FRELIMO Central Committee (Legum 1988: B681). Following the peace agreement signed in 1992, Mozambique held its first multiparty elections in 1994 and Chissano won with a 53% majority. Chissano was re-elected by the same margin in 1999 albeit amid widespread accusations of corruption (African Election Database n.d.; Carbone 2005; Hanlon 2011). As the Constitution had been amended in 1990 to allow the president to serve up to three five-year terms, Chissano was eligible for re-election in 2004 and sought

to stand for a third term. However, this proposal was reportedly rejected at Congress on the grounds that he might well lose the forthcoming election (PanAfrican News Agency 9 May 2001; Think Africa Press 25 October 2012).

Chissano's successor was selected in June 2002, two years before the end of his two terms in office, 'in a largely consensual and disciplined, but explicitly top-down and undemocratic, manner' (Carbone 2005: 43–431). The party's Central Committee upgraded the position of Secretary General to enable him or her to stand for the 2004 presidential election and instructed the Political Commission, then consisting of 15 party members, to select between three and five candidates for the position. After five candidates had been selected by the Political Commission, the Central Committee, then comprising 156 members, selected a single candidate. Former Interior Minister and prosperous businessman Armando Guebuza received 109 (73%) of 150 votes and was duly nominated as Secretary General and presidential candidate at the Central Committee (Cravinho 2003: 705). While Guebuza had been a member of the senior party leadership since 1968 and had served in various cabinet posts during the Machel and Chissano administrations (Aim News Cast 8 June 2002), he was not Chissano's choice. This was Agricultural Minister Helder Muteia, who was rumoured to succeed him but polled only 18 votes. Finally, Guebuza was selected as the new Secretary General and 2004 presidential candidate by polling 92% of votes in Congress (Cravinho 2003: 705).

As the newly elected Secretary General, Gueuza toured the country to rebuild local party structures that had been neglected by Chissano (Aim News Cast 8 June 2002). Chissano compromised and campaigned for Guebuza in the 2004 election (Hanlon 2011; Think Africa Press 25 October 2012; Verdade 25 September 2013). Guebuza was subsequently elected with a 64% majority (11 percentage points more than Chissano had polled when he was elected) and assumed the party presidency from Chissano a month later. Guebuza was re-elected with a 75% majority in October 2009 (International Foundation for Electoral Systems n.d.; *Agência de Informação de Moçambique* 12 March 2015).

Despite his consolidation of power through national and party elections, President Guebuza's authority was constrained by FRELIMO leaders. For example, the appointment of cabinet ministers was negotiated by the Political Commission and his first two choices for justice minister were rejected. While the Constitution had been revised in 2004 to limit presidential incumbency to two five-year terms, he sought to repeal it to allow himself a third term. However, FRELIMO rejected the proposal to provide opportunities for the younger generation of the party (Think Africa Press 25 October 2012).

Having been re-elected party president unopposed in 2012, Guebuza sought to make relatively weak Prime Minister Aires Ali his successor, while maintaining his power as party chairman. On the other hand, an anti-Guebuza faction led by Grace Machel, wife of the first president, and former President Chissano promoted former Prime Minister Luisa Diogo for the presidential candidacy. However, neither Ali nor Diogo was elected as a member of the Political Commission at a meeting of the Central Committee in 2012 (*Agência de Informação de Moçambique* 27 September 2012; Think Africa Press 25 October 2012; Reuters 2 March 2014). Thus, factional competition between Guebuza loyalists and opponents was mitigated by the party's Central Committee. In March 2014, the FRELIMO's Central Committee elected Defence Minister Filipe Nyusi, Guebuza's close ally, as the FRELIMO candidate for the presidential election in October. While Guebuza loyalists at the Political Commission had selected three pro-Guebuza candidates including Nyusi, his opponents forced Diogo and Ali onto the list. At the Central Committee meeting, Nyusi gained 91 (46%) of 196 votes, while Diogo received 46 votes (24%) and Ali 19 votes (10%). As none of the five candidates won a majority in the first round, the voting went to a second round which Nyusi won with 135 votes (68%) (Think Africa Press 27 February 2014; Mozambique News Reports and Clippings 1 March 2014).

While FRELIMO's 2014 presidential candidate selection represented a generational shift in the party as none of the five candidates had fought in the independence war, Nyusi had close links with the liberation movement through his parents who were FRELIMO war veterans. Nyusi advanced in his political career rapidly. Although he served as Defence Minister since 2008, he was not elected to the Central Committee until 2012 and was the least well known nationally of the five candidates (*Agência de Informação de Moçambique* 10 March 2014; Club of Mozambique 15 September 2017). Yet, his roots in the north of the country apparently helped him win support within FRELIMO, as the party sought to incorporate the needs of northerners after the discovery of huge off-shore natural gas reserves in the region (*African Research Bulletin* 2014: 20062). As Nyusi was close to President Guebuza, the latter was expected to maintain power by continuing to hold the party presidency (Reuters 2 March 2014).

In October 2014, Nyusi won the presidential election with 57% of valid votes. Since he had polled only 52% of all cast votes including spoiled ballots, it was argued that there would have been a second round if it had not been for electoral fraud on the part of FRELIMO (*Africa Confidential* 7 November 2014). In March 2015, Nyusi succeeded Guebuza as party president (*Agência de Informação de Moçambique* 29 March 2015). In September 2017, Nyusi was re-elected party president, won the presidential candidacy for the 2019 election with a better than 99% majority at the FRELIMO

Congress, and gained effective control over the party the following month since no one in the Political Commission was linked to Guebuza any longer (Club of Mozambique 30 September 2017, 2 October 2017).

From a comparative perspective, FRELIMO is the only one of the five case parties discussed in this paper that has never experienced the defection of a senior party member. FRELIMO unity, with its tradition of collective and inclusive decision making, may be attributed to its origin as a Marxist-Leninist party and the fact that electoral margins between FRELIMO and RENAMO were narrow in the early years of multipartyism, FRELIMO's share of the vote being 53% in the presidential elections of both 1994 and 1999 (African Election Database n.d.).

Furthermore, Mozambican electoral competition is influenced by a fragile political environment. In 2014, armed conflict between the government and RENAMO erupted after the leader of the latter, Afonso Dhlakama, refused to accept the election result and threatened to use force to take control of the provinces, which he believed had won the majority of votes. Although Nyusi and Dhlakama reached a peace agreement in February 2018, Dhlakama died suddenly in May and the prospect of a permanent peace accord remains uncertain (Sanches and Macuane 28 May 2018).

Electoral competition with RENAMO and the fragile political environment may have contributed to the strengthening of solidarity amongst FRELIMO leaders; yet, FRELIMO unity has recently been challenged by generational division. While the party's old guard has been reluctant to cede power to the younger generation (Hanlon 2011; Melber, Kromrey and Welz 2017: 310), Samora Machel Junior, son of the first president, has emerged as a potential threat to party unity. In June 2018, his bid for the FRELIMO candidacy for Mayor of Maputo was blocked by the Political Commission with the support of President Nyusi, and Machel Junior's subsequent attempt to stand as an independent candidate backed by a coalition of civil society organisations was rejected by the National Elections Commission and Constitutional Council (*Agência de Informação de Moçambique* 14 August 2018; Hanlon 20 August 2018; Africa Confidential 26 October 2018; Club of Mozambique 14 November 2018). This development seems to contrast with FRELIMO accommodation of potential young opponents in the 1990s. For example, the party co-opted a young trade union leader, Soares Nhaca, by appointing him Governor of Maputo in 1999 and Minister of Agriculture in 2008 (Hanlon 6 October 2011).

In summary, FRELIMO presidential candidate selection has been collectively managed by the party elite in the Political Commission and Central Committee, which has in turn constrained the power of incumbent and former presidents. FRELIMO has

remained inclusive and co-opted potential dissidents and there has not been any defection of party leaders. Competition with a relatively strong opposition party and the fragile political environment may have contributed to enforcing the solidarity of party leaders and it is only recently that party unity has begun to be challenged by the emergence of generational division.

3.4. Tanzania: the Changing Party Elite Influencing Presidential Candidate Selection

Tanzania's dominant party, *Chama Cha Mapinduzi* (Party of Revolution: CCM) is characterised by growing factionalism and the concerns of different party leaders who have exercised power over presidential candidate selection for the last two decades. Unlike the other cases, CCM's presidential candidate selection is an independent process that takes place several months before a general election, and separate from the selection of party leadership positions. The first presidential succession under the multiparty system in 1995 was influenced by the first president, Julius Nyerere. The second succession in 2005 was dominated by a powerful clientelist faction, which subsequently created a sharp division in the party. The most recent succession in 2015 was characterised by collective control by senior party leaders with the strong influence of former presidents, particularly Benjamin Mkapa. The CCM's presidential nomination of 2015 led to the defection of the frontrunner, who was eliminated at the first stage of the selection process, posing serious challenges to the CCM election campaign. Yet, this defection did not prove to be critical as the number of defectors was limited (Tsubura 2018).

CCM presidential candidate selection has four stages. Firstly, the National Security and Ethics Committee (NSEC) (11 members including the national president who doubles as party chairman) evaluates the qualifications of all nominees. Secondly, the Central Committee (up to 34 members) takes into account NSEC recommendations and selects no more than five candidates. Thirdly, the National Executive Committee (NEC) (378 members) selects not more than three candidates.⁵ Lastly, the final candidate is selected by over 2,000 delegates in a poll at the National Congress (Chama Cha Mapinduzi 2002, 2012; Nyamajeje 2015: 1; Daily News 24 June 2015; Daily News 11 July 2015; Daily News 17 September 2015). Thus, CCM presidential nomination is partially centralised in that the Central Committee and NEC short-list candidates before selection at the National Congress.

⁵ In March 2017, the CCM constitution was amended, and the number of Central Committee members was reduced to 24 and NEC members to 163 (Daily News 13 March 2017).

After Tanzania reintroduced a multiparty system in 1992 under its second president, Ali Hassan Mwinyi, CCM presidential candidate selection in 1995 was particularly influenced by President Nyerere. He reportedly favoured Minister for Science, Technology and Higher Education Benjamin Mkapa of the three candidates selected by the NEC and campaigned for him behind the scenes. Although Mkapa had been a cabinet minister for two decades, he was not popularly known compared to some other candidates (Warrema 2012: 27; Makulio 2013: 178; Mwananchi 14 October 2015). However, he was elected as the party's presidential candidate after two rounds of voting at the National Congress and elected as president with a 62% majority in 1995. Mkapa's closest challenger, former Minister for Home Affairs and Deputy Prime Minister Augustine Mrema, who had defected from the CCM, polled 28% of valid votes. In 2000, President Mkapa was re-elected with a 72% majority, an increase of about 10 percentage points from the 1995 election (The Citizen 31 May 2015; Chachage 13 February 2015; African Election Database n.d.).

Following the 1995 election, a group of CCM leaders began to build a network in preparation for the presidential candidacy of Foreign Minister Jakaya Kikwete after President Mkapa's two-terms in office. The network was led by Kikwete's friend and cabinet minister Edward Lowassa. They established close connections with the business sector and relied heavily on financial resources to mobilise support from inside and outside the party (Makulilo 2013: 68; The Citizen 31 May 2015). Kikwete was elected as the CCM presidential candidate with 1,072 (64%) of 1,678 votes at the party's National Congress in May 2005. Subsequently, he was elected president with 80% of the popular vote in the general election in December (Kelsall 2007: 525; Africa Election Database n.d.). Lowassa led Kikwete's presidential campaign and was appointed prime minister after the election. Outgoing President Mkapa was reportedly not in favour of Kikwete's candidacy but surrendered to his strong network (The East African 22 February 2014). Thus, unlike the presidential succession in 1995, which was influenced by former President Nyerere, CCM presidential candidate selection in 2005 was characterised by the overwhelming power of Kikwete and Lowassa's faction in the party.

CCM and the Kikwete administration were seriously plagued by grand corruption scandals, one of which led to the resignation of Prime Minister Lowassa and two other ministers due to political prudence (The Citizen 31 October 2007; Sitta, Slaa and Cheyo 2008: 82–86; Slaa 2011: 90). CCM leaders were divided on how to address corruption, and the public image of the Kikwete government and the party in general deteriorated (The Citizen 17 February 2010). Kikwete started to distance himself from Lowassa after the resignation of the latter, who began to build his own network of support

within the CCM.⁶ Although President Kikwete tried to resolve party divisions, corruption allegations and lack of party coherence affected the election in 2010 (Legal and Human Rights Centre and Tanzania Civil Society Consortium for Election Observation 2010: 55). Kikwete was re-elected with 61% of the popular vote, a 19 percentage point decline from the 2005 election (African Election Database n.d.). President Kikwete subsequently redoubled his efforts to control the influence of Lowassa's faction in an attempt to regain public trust in the CCM, yet he continued to struggle to control it until the end of his second two-year term (Tanzania Election Monitoring Committee 2015b: 7).

In July 2015, the CCM selected Kikwete's successor. Of the 38 candidates who submitted presidential nomination forms, Lowassa seemed to be the strongest contender, with his extensive leadership experience, wide financial network, and active campaign teams of urban youth (Daily News 3 July 2015; Mwananchi 11 May 2015; Mwananchi 29 July 2015b). Indeed, Lowassa was chosen as the most popular CCM candidate in an opinion poll in June 2015 and almost three-quarters of the NEC membership were reportedly Lowassa supporters (Nipashe 6 July 2015; The East African 23 May 2015; Mwananchi 11 July 2015).

However, Lowassa was not chosen by the CCM Central Committee as one of the five presidential candidates in July (The Citizen 11 July 2015). Based on the recommendations of the NSEC, which had reviewed all the presidential candidates, five other candidates were selected at the meeting of the Central Committee, which was also attended by senior party leaders including former presidents Mwinyi and Mkapa (Mwananchi 7 July 2015; Nipashe 8 July 2015; Mwananchi 9 July 2015).⁷ Immediately after the committee's announcement of its five chosen candidates, Lowassa and three committee members who were allegedly Lowassa loyalists publicly rejected the decision, complaining that the NSEC had pre-selected the candidates before the Central Committee meeting (Mwananchi 11 July 2015; The Citizen 12 July 2015; Mwananchi 29 July 2015a; Britain-Tanzania Society 2015).

The final selection by the NEC was intensely competitive, the meeting opening with a number of NEC members chanting their support for Lowassa (Simu TV 11 July 2015). It was reported that senior party leaders had consultations with Lowassa's camp, and the former presidents and a former prime minister advised NEC members to think carefully about their decision (The Citizen 12 July 2015; Mwananchi 12 July 2015). Three candidates were selected by the NEC, and finally, Minister of Works John Magufuli was

⁶ Interview, Humphrey Polepole, political analyst, 3 November 2013, Dar es Salaam (the author).

⁷ Interview, Humphrey Polepole, political analyst, 3 November 2013, Dar es Salaam (the author).

elected as the CCM presidential candidate at a National Congress meeting with the large majority of 2,104 (87%) of 2,416 votes (Mwananchi twitter 11 July 2015; Azam TV twitter 12 July 2015).

While Magufuli had served as a cabinet minister throughout the Mkapa and Kikwete administrations, he had not publicly campaigned for the presidency before the 2015 CCM selection process. Yet, he was considered the perfect candidate to unite the party because he distanced himself from party factionalism (Nyamajeje 2015; Mwananchi 6 November 2015). His nomination was not arbitrary but orchestrated by President Kikwete and other senior party leaders (The Citizen 4 November 2015). In particular, former President Mkapa was reportedly active in consolidating support for Magufuli's candidacy behind the scenes.⁸

A month later, Lowassa defected to the main opposition party, *Chama Cha Demokrasia na Maendeleo* (Party for Democracy and Progress: CHADEMA), and was officially declared the presidential candidate of an opposition coalition, *Umoja wa Katiba ya Wananchi* (Coalition of the People's Constitution: UKAWA), which included CHADEMA. Despite CHADEMA's expectation that Lowassa would encourage more than a million CCM members to join him, other than a few senior party leaders, there was a disappointing number of defectors to the opposition (Tanzania Election Monitoring Committee 2015a: 33; Mwananchi 10 October 2015). For example, the three Central Committee members who had opposed the committee's decision to eliminate Lowassa from presidential nomination remained in the CCM and campaigned for Magufuli (Mwananchi 13 July 2015; Daily News 8 August 2015; Habari Leo 10 August 2015; Mwananchi 13 August 2015; The Citizen 22 August 2015).

This lack of support was partly because UKAWA had already selected its parliamentary candidates and CCM MPs would not have been able to contest the parliamentary election if they had defected to the opposition (Mwananchi 24 August 2015). Moreover, there was limited time for potential defectors to prepare effective campaigns as the general election was scheduled only a few months after CCM presidential candidate selection. However, some CCM members who had remained in the party secretly supported Lowassa and challenged Magufuli's election campaign (The Citizen 6 November 2015). As a result, in the presidential election in October 2015, Magufuli won with a meagre 59% majority, the lowest support rate of any CCM presidential candidate since the reintroduction of multiparty democracy in 1992 (International Foundation for Electoral Systems). Lowassa left CHADEMA and returned to CCM in March 2019 (Mwananchi 2 March 2019).

⁸ Interview, political scientist, 13 November 2013, Dar es Salaam (the author).

In summary, the case of Tanzania's CCM illustrates growing factionalism and the changing party elite who have had significant influence on the presidential candidate selection. Thus, while the 1995 selection process was led by former President Nyerere, in 2005, it was influenced by Kikwete and Lowassa's faction. The CCM 2015 presidential nomination represents a revival of centralised control of selection, with the strong influence of former President Mkapa. This led to the defection of the frontrunner in the presidential race as he had been eliminated from the selection process by senior party leaders. Yet, this did not transpire to be critical for the CCM as the number of defectors was limited, partly due to lack of time to prepare election campaigns on the part of the opposition.

3.5. South Africa: A Shift to Decentralised and Competitive Presidential Candidate Selection

Leadership succession battles have been increasingly fraught for the African National Congress (ANC) in South Africa over the years. Whereas Thabo Mbeki succeeded President Nelson Mandela without difficulty in 1999, Jacob Zuma's accession to the presidency in 2007 was accompanied by the early resignation of Mbeki and the subsequent marginalisation of his loyalists, which resulted in the first major ANC defection and the formation of a breakaway party. Zuma's succession in 2017 was also highly competitive and current President Cyril Ramaphosa faces challenges in uniting the party in preparation for the 2019 elections. However, the significant influence of factional division on party operations notwithstanding, the ANC has maintained its decentralised and competitive methods of presidential candidate selection since 2007 to stay true to its origins as a mass party.

In 1912, the South African Native National Congress (SANNC) was founded by various organisations representing indigenous Africans and the professional elite to consolidate the struggle of oppressed South Africans for freedom and civil rights. The SANNC changed its name to the ANC in 1923 and grew into a mass movement that organised public pressure against the white government's discrimination against blacks (Reddy 2014: 77; Salih 2003: 16). The ANC was central in the abolition of apartheid in 1994 and has won all national elections since the first democratic election that year by a margin of not less than 62 percent, while the opposition has remained fragmented (De Jager 2013; International Foundation for Electoral Systems n.d.).

The ANC is structured according to conferences, meetings and committees at national, provincial, regional and branch levels. The supreme body of the party is the

National Conference with over 5,000 voting delegates, 90% of whom represent over 4,700 branches across the country, each consisting of 100 party members, and the remainder representing the other three party wings. The NEC is the highest organ of the party, consisting of six leadership positions (president, deputy president, secretary general, deputy secretary general, national chairperson, and treasurer general) and 80 members elected by secret ballot at the National Conference every five years. Candidates for each leadership position are nominated by party branches, and delegates at the National Conference expressly reflect the wishes of their branches in voting (African National Congress 2017; Times Live 11 December 2017; The South African 17 December 2017; Eyewitness News 14 December 2017). Since it is customary that the party's president automatically becomes the national president if the ANC wins a legislative election (Walentek 2015: 93), there is no stage at which presidential candidates are shortlisted by higher organs of the party. The selectorate of presidential candidate selection is thus the most inclusive of the five dominant parties examined in this paper.

In practice, when the ANC was banned during the apartheid era between 1960 and 1990, its leadership selection was controlled and facilitated by party leaders who agreed on a single candidacy, a practice that continued for a decade after the end of apartheid. The top six positions were selected collectively by party executives, the National Conference only approving each pre-determined leader, and until 2007, many of the six positions were selected uncontested (Booyesen 2011: 39). This illustrates ANC discipline and solidarity and its preference for the appointment of successors rather than open competition (Lodge 2004: 211; Handley, Murray and Simeon 2008: 198-199).

Mandela became ANC president in 1991 and national president after the country's first democratic election in 1994, in which ANC won a 63% majority and 252 of 400 parliamentary seats (African Election Database n.d.). As Mandela had announced his intention to retire from office after one term, ANC Secretary General Cyril Ramaphosa and National Chairperson Thabo Mbeki were both rumoured to be a potential successor. Although Ramaphosa was close to Mandela, Mbeki enjoyed greater support from senior figures who had managed the party from its headquarters in Lusaka, Zambia during the apartheid era. Ramaphosa chose to leave politics rather than contesting the ANC presidency and Mbeki was elected party president at the National Conference in December 1997 (Walentek 2015: 94; Cooper 2015: 7-9). In the 1999 election, the ANC won a 66% majority securing 266 of 400 parliamentary seats, and Mbeki took presidential office. In the 2004 election, the ANC slightly increased its parliamentary majority by polling 67% of valid votes and obtaining 279 of 400 seats, and Mbeki was re-elected for a second-term (African Election Database n.d.; International Foundation for Electoral

Systems n.d.).

ANC practice of facilitated leadership selection dramatically changed in June 2005 when President Mbeki dismissed once loyal ally Deputy President Jacob Zuma over corruption allegations (Wieczorek 2012: 31). At the same time, Mbeki's leadership style was losing touch with ordinary citizens and his market-oriented economic policy was increasingly disapproved of the public. Zuma, on the other hand, was popular among ANC members, particularly by the youth wing and the ANC's partners (i.e., the Congress of South African Trade Unions, the South African Communist Party) because of his closeness to the people and political credentials including ten years in prison on Robben Island. As a result, there was intense competition between Mbeki and Zuma loyalists, leading to a move away from the party norm which meant that 'the ANC should deal with internal disputes privately and thus always present a unified public face' (Handley, Murray and Simeon 2008: 199). As a result, Zuma loyalists succeeded in forcing Mbeki and the ANC leadership to reinstate Zuma as party deputy president, but Mbeki refused to reappoint him as the country's deputy president (Myburgh and Giliomee 2010: 193; Wieczorek 2012: 31).

At the ANC National Conference in Polokwane, Limpopo Province in December 2007, Zuma and Mbeki loyalists openly competed for leadership positions for the first time since the unbanning of the ANC in 1990. Although Mbeki could not stand for the 2009 election due to the presidential term limit, he sought re-election as party president for another five years to retain some power. Yet, Zuma won the party presidency with 2,329 (58%) of 3,974 votes, while Mbeki only gained 1,505 votes (38%) (Booyesen 2011: 67). Furthermore, Zuma loyalists obtained all five remaining leadership positions, thus dominating the newly elected NEC, Mbeki's power over the Cabinet and incumbent NEC notwithstanding. Mbeki's defeat was due in part to his detachment from the local party structure: while Zuma successfully mobilised support in his strongholds, Mbeki had neglected some powerful provincial leaders, ultimately losing their support at Polokwane (Darracq 2008a: 449; Mac Giollabhui 2017: 394–410). Thus, Zuma's reinstatement as ANC deputy president and his victory at Polokwane illustrates the strength of the ANC rank and file in leadership selection (Darracq 2008a: 440, 448–449).

Zuma's victory at Polokwane resulted in intense factional competition within the party (Booyesen 2011). President Mbeki and cabinet ministers loyal to him allegedly used their influence over the prosecuting authority to ensure that Zuma would be found guilty on the corruption charge, while Zuma's allies sought to marginalise Mbeki's faction in relation to ANC administrative staff, the parliamentary caucus and provincial governments (Cooper 2015: 9). As a result, in September 2008, Mbeki was declared unfit

to be president by the NEC, he resigned six months before the end of his term, and eleven ministers and three deputy ministers loyal to Mbeki resigned a week later. ANC Deputy President Kgalema Motlanthe was elected as caretaker president of the country and five cabinet members who had resigned were reappointed (Booyesen 2011: 68–69; Wieczorek 2012: 31). In the election in April 2009, the ANC won 66% of the popular vote, gained 264 of 400 parliamentary seats, and, having had his trial dismissed, Zuma was elected the new president (International Foundation for Electoral Systems n.d.).

In December 2008, a group of ANC members sympathetic to Mbeki and dissatisfied with Zuma's rise to power had defected from the party and formed the country's first black opposition party, the Congress of the People (COPE), drawing wide public attention (Booyesen 2011: 69–70; Walentek 2015: 98–99). Yet, COPE did not have a major impact on the election in 2009, polling only 7% of valid votes and being allocated 30 parliamentary seats. In the 2014 election, when the ANC won a 62% majority and Zuma was re-elected for a second term, support for COPE declined to 1% and 3 parliamentary seats (International Foundation for Electoral Systems n.d.). Thus, although the defection of Zuma's opponents and the formation of COPE was a major event in ANC history, it did not threaten its electoral dominance.

Despite the high public expectations of Zuma at the beginning of his administration, his presidency was characterised by serious corruption charges including misuse of public funds for his private residence, the loss of powerful party members, and collapse of the partnership with the trade unions and the communist party (Booyesen 2015: 47–51, 296–297; Booyesen 15 December 2017).

In December 2017, Cyril Ramaphosa won the party presidency with 179 of 4,708 votes at the ANC National Conference, the slimmest margin in any leadership selection undertaken by the party. Unlike Zuma's victory at Polokwane in 2008, the six leadership positions were equally divided among allies of reformist Ramaphosa and populist Zuma, while the majority of newly elected NEC members were reportedly Zuma loyalists. Subsequently, Zuma resigned under ANC pressure mainly due to corruption allegations, and Ramaphosa succeeded the presidency in February. He will be the ANC presidential candidate for the legislative election scheduled for May 2019 (Schneidman 2017; The Guardian 14 February 2018; Reuters 7 November 2018). Given that Ramaphosa lacks control over the party's national executive and four out of the nine provinces where Zuma support remains strong, he is struggling to unite the ANC in preparation for the forthcoming election (Africa Confidential 4 May 2018; Southall 28 October 2018). In an attempt to rise to the challenge, Ramaphosa has sought to accommodate his rivals by, for example, appointing Zuma's ex-wife Nkosazana Dlamini-Zuma Minister in the

Presidency for the National Planning Commission for Monitoring and Evaluation (The Independent 26 February 2018).

Despite the intense factional infighting since 2007, the ANC has maintained its methods of decentralised and competitive leadership selection, unlike other parties examined in this paper. While the ANC seems to be finding it difficult to control factionalism and regain party coherence after intense competition over leadership positions, its leadership selection method is associated with its historical development as a mass party with well-organised local branches and an active party membership (Darracq 2008a, 2008b; Lodge 2004). Darracq (2008a: 439) argues that ‘membership, through the delegatory democratic practices of the National Conference, has the power to decide between competing agendas promoted by different leadership factions.’ Consequently, branches have over the years become increasingly influential in intraparty competition for party posts and policy direction. ANC provincial offices function as mediators between national leaders and local branches, and factional competition at the national level interacts with provincial factionalism (Darracq 2008a: 440–441).

Mac Giollabhui (2017) further analyses ANC leadership selection methods and Zuma’s victory at the ANC 2007 National Conference. Following the assumption of power in 1994, the ANC leaders sought to modernise party organisation through the centralisation of power over policymaking and appointments in the hands of President Mbeki and disengaging party activists. Yet, reform has failed to fully centralise power over leadership selection due to endogenous pressure to maintain the ANC as a congress-like party and accommodate diverse societal interests. Mbeki’s opponents took advantage of this and widely mobilised public support for Zuma through the effective use of a clientelist strategy which proved successful in removing Mbeki from office in 2007 (Mac Giollabhui 2017). Thus, the strategy of decentralised presidential candidate selection has been a central ANC approach in establishing its support base.

From a comparative perspective, ANC employment of decentralised leadership selection despite intense factional competition may well be related to South Africa’s closed-list PR electoral system, through which citizens do not vote for candidates but for parties in a legislative election and presidents are elected in Parliament. Such an electoral system allows the ANC to demonstrate intraparty democracy by engaging party members in leadership selection through party delegates. Mbeki’s loss of support within the ANC due in the main to his negligence of local party members also suggests that decentralised leadership selection contributes to the ANC’s enhancement of electoral legitimacy.

In summary, the ANC has been increasingly afflicted by factional competition which leads to shake-ups in its leadership, while it has maintained a method of

decentralised and competitive selection since 2007. Although the defection of Mbeki loyalists and the formation of an opposition party in 2008 represented the first major split in the ANC, the impact on electoral competition was limited. The ANC's decentralised method of selecting party leaders, including presidential candidates, is attributed to its historical development as a mass party and its appeal to party members under the closed-list PR electoral system.

4. Analysis

Through an inductive analysis of the five case parties with the broad application of Clientele Migration Theory as a premise, two characteristics seem to have emerged as important factors in explaining how these parties have avoided critical defections and major party splits: 1) level of selectorate inclusiveness and 2) effective deployment of electoral institutions. Firstly, most presidential candidates examined in this paper were selected in a relatively centralised way, meaning that party leaders could control factionalism in seeking to avoid critical defections. Yet, despite this general tendency, there is a wide variation in level of selectorate inclusiveness among the five parties, which suggests that there are multiple ways in which dominant parties seek to maintain party unity. The cases can be broadly grouped according to three patterns.

The first includes cases in which incumbent or former presidents play a decisive role in selecting forthcoming presidential candidates for their parties. An extreme example of such a case is Botswana's BDP, in which, in the interest of avoiding intraparty splits, incumbent presidents have been exclusively responsible for selecting their successors since 1997, and presidential successions have thus run smoothly. The presidential candidate selection of Namibia's SWAPO since 2002 and Tanzania's CCM in 1995 and 2005 also represent this pattern in varying degrees. In these cases, outgoing presidents Nujoma and Pohamba as well as former presidents Nyerere and Mkapa exercised their power to select forthcoming presidential candidates to maintain their own power and/or party coherence behind the scenes. The second pattern is characterised by collective control of presidential candidate selection and factionalism on the part of the party elite, particularly under the strong influence of former freedom fighters, a situation which has constrained presidential power. Mozambique's FRELIMO consistently illustrates this pattern. Other examples are South Africa's ANC until 2007 and, to a certain extent, the CCM 2005 succession. The third pattern is the decentralised and competitive presidential candidate selection exemplified by the ANC since 2007, whereby candidates have been selected by thousands of party delegates, invariably resulting in the defeat of

the outgoing president in the ensuing succession struggle.

The first two patterns exhibit various types of centralised selection process which seem to be effective in controlling internal splits and avoiding critical defections in a top-down manner. By contrast, ANC's decentralised and open competition since 2007 seems to intensify factional division and be unsuitable for consolidating party unity. Yet, the ANC has maintained it by adhering to its origin as a mass party and prioritising intraparty democracy to maintain wide electoral support.

Secondly, variation in the methods and practices of presidential candidate selection seems to be associated with two types of institution: electoral system and election cycle. In South Africa, where presidents are elected at the National Assembly after legislative elections under a closed-list PR system, ANC's decentralised presidential candidate selection process provides an opportunity for party members to express their views on leadership selection through local party delegates. The election cycle also affects the way in which factionalism is managed by a dominant party. In the case of Tanzania's CCM, where presidential candidate selection takes place only a few months before a general election, senior party leaders can take the risk of eliminating a powerful but divisive contender in the presidential race because party defectors will not have enough time to prepare effective election campaigns and the probability of critical defections is thus relatively low. These examples suggest that the differing presidential candidate selection practices of the cases are partially explained by varying institutional arrangements.

Conversely, a common tendency among the cases is the influence of major but not critical defections whereby rival factions seem to contribute to the strengthening of dominant party coherence. In all cases except Mozambique, the marginalisation of rival factions by incumbent presidents has triggered the defection of factional leaders and/or their loyalists (i.e., Khama's marginalisation of the Kwelagobe and Kedikilwe faction, Nujoma and Pohamba's side-lining of the Hamutenya faction, Zuma's marginalisation of the Mbeki faction, and Kikwete and Mkapa's exclusion of Lowassa). Three of these defections resulted in the formation of a breakaway party (i.e., BMD in Botswana, RDP in Namibia, and COPE in South Africa).

However, none of these defections posed a serious threat to the dominant party in the subsequent election. Rather, the presidents of all three countries took measures to accommodate opposing factions (i.e. Khama's temporary appointment of Kedikilwe as vice president, Geingob's accommodation of his rivals in running the government, and Ramaphosa's appointment of Dlamini-Zuma as a cabinet minister). In all cases, defections may have served as a lesson for the incumbent president, who then prioritised

party coherence through the accommodation of rival factions to mitigate factional tensions. Even in Mozambique, where such defections have not troubled the ruling party, uncertainty created by intense competition with the opposition and the fragile political environment may have had a similar effect to those of the breakaway groups that have made the accommodation of dissidents a high priority for the party elite.

5. Conclusion

In applying Clientele Migration Theory as a premise, this paper has examined the ways in which five African dominant parties with regular presidential succession have selected their presidential candidates and managed factionalism to avoid critical defections. It has demonstrated that presidential candidate selection is centrally controlled by either former or incumbent presidents or by the party elite in all cases except that of South Africa's ANC since 2007. The paper highlights the wide variation in methods of presidential candidate selection, particularly in terms of selectorate inclusiveness, which suggests that there are multiple ways in which parties can avoid critical defections and maintain long-term electoral dominance. In all the cases, methods and practices of presidential candidate selection are influenced by institutional arrangements and underpinned by the ways in which parties have established support bases both internally and externally over the years.

The next step in this research is to further examine variations in levels of selectorate inclusiveness and types of electoral institution. To explore reasons for differences in the selectorate, the study proposes to analyse party organisation, particularly in terms of sources of legitimacy, of the five parties. While party leaders are motivated to centrally control presidential candidate selection to manage factionalism, the rank and file are expected to prefer decentralised selection methods so that they can participate in decision making. Variations in the level of selectorate inclusiveness signify the extent to which these two competing demands are balanced and resolved by parties on the basis of sources of legitimacy. Here, it is important to investigate changes in this balance in the case of South Africa's ANC in 2007. To shed further light on types of electoral institution, historical background will be analysed with the aim of ascertaining why certain rules and institutions have been adopted in particular countries.

The research can also be expanded to explore factors beyond the scope of Clientele Migration Theory. While the theory emphasises the benefits for dissidents of remaining in a dominant party, there also expected to be various costs to leaving the party (e.g., loss of access to resources, government oppression). The study therefore proposes to widen its scope by incorporating the analysis of such costs. Furthermore, while this

paper analyses presidential candidate selection in dominant parties with the assumption that factional competition will naturally arise and defections are likely to occur as a result, it is also worth examining mechanisms for avoiding critical defections which may be implemented outside the presidential candidate selection process.

Bibliography

- Africa Confidential* 2014. "Unbowed, Zuma Seeks Revenge." 4 May.
_____ 2018. "Poll Knocks Frelimo Confidence." 26 October.
- Africa Research Bulletin: Political, Cultural and Social Series,
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/1467825x>, accessed 25 January 2019.
- African Election Database, <http://africanelections.tripod.com/>, accessed 25 January 2019.
- African National Congress. 2017, *The Constitution of the ANC*,
<http://www.anc1912.org.za/constitution-anc>, accessed 25 January 2019.
- Agência de Informação de Moçambique* (Mozambique News Agency) 2012. "Frelimo – Guebuza Re-Elected Party President." 27 September.
_____ 2014. "Filipe Nyussi Elected Frelimo Presidential Candidate." 10 March.
_____ 2015. "Frelimo Central Committee to Meet on 26 March." 12 March.
_____ 2015. "Guebuza Resigns as President of Frelimo." 29 March.
_____ 2018. "Samora Machel's Son Running for Mayor of Maputo." 14 August.
- Aim News Cast* 2002. "Central Committee Opts for Guebuza." 8 June.
- Azam TV twitter 2015, 12 July.
<https://twitter.com/azamtvz/status/620180782146060288>, accessed 25 January 2019.
- Beardsworth, Nicole 2018. "Incumbency and Elections: The 2019 Polls in Botswana and South Africa." *Presidential Power*, 16 April,
<http://democracyinafrica.org/incumbency-elections-2019-polls-botswana-south-africa/>, accessed 25 January 2019.
- Bogaards, Matthijs 2004. "Counting Parties and Identifying Dominant Party Systems in Africa." *European Journal of Political Research* 43(2): 173–197.
_____ 2008. "Dominant Party Systems and Electoral Volatility in Africa: A Comment on Mozaffar and Scarritt." *Party Politics* 14(1): 113–130.
_____ 2014. "Multiparty Elections in Africa: For Better or Worse." in *Party Systems and Democracy in Africa*. eds. Renske Doorenspleet and Lia Nijzink. New York: Palgrave: Macmillan.
- Booyesen, Susan 2011. *The African National Congress and the Regeneration of Political*

- Power*, Johannesburg: Wits University Press.
- _____ 2015. *Dominance and Decline: The ANC in the Time of Zuma*, Johannesburg: Wits University Press.
- _____ 2017. "Opinion: Are ANC Delegates Listening to Rumbblings beyond Conference Walls?" *eNCA*, 15 December, <https://www.enca.com/opinion/are-anc-delegates-listening-to-rumbblings-beyond-conference-walls>, accessed 25 January 2019.
- Botswana Daily News* 2015. "General Merafhe Passes On." 7 January.
- Botswana Guardian* 2013 "The Changing Faces of 'Tamed' Kedikilwe." 17 December.
- _____ 2018. "Khama Marshals Anti-Masisi Troops in BDP's Internecine Feud." 15 August.
- _____ 2018. "BMD Issue Haunts UDC." 5 November.
- _____ 2018. "UDC is a Castle Built in the Air – Molefhabangwe." 12 November.
- Boucek, Françoise 2012. *Factional Politics: How Dominant Parties Implode or Stabilize*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Britain-Tanzania Society 2015. "Surprising Change on the Political Scene." *Tanzanian Affairs* 112, London: Britain-Tanzania Society.
- Bunnett, Andrew and Jeffrey T. Checkel. eds. 2015. *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carbone, Giovanni 2003. "Emerging Pluralist politics in Mozambique: The Frelimo-Renamo Party System." *Crisis States Programme Working Paper* 23.
- _____ 2005. "Continuidade na Renovação? Ten Years of Multiparty Politics in Mozambique: Roots, Evolution and Stabilisation of the Frelimo-Renamo Party System." *Journal of Modern African Studies* 43(3): 417–442.
- Chachage, Chambi 2015. "Nyerere Alimkosesha Urais Kikwete Mwaka 1995? [Did Nyerere Make Kikwete Fail in His Presidential Bid in 1995?]" *Udadisi*, <http://udadisi.blogspot.com/2015/02/nyerere-alimkosesha-urais-kikwete-mwaka.html>, 13 February, accessed 25 January 2019.
- Chama Cha Mapinduzi [Party of Revolution] 2002. *Kanuni za Uongozi na Maadili, Toleo la 2002* [Leadership and Ethics Regulations, 2002 Edition], Dar es Salaam: Chama Cha Mapinduzi.
- _____ 2012. *Katiba ya Chama Cha Mapinduzi 1977, Toleo la 2012* [Constitution of the Party of Revolution 1977, 2012 Edition], s.l. : Chama Cha Mapinduzi.
- Cheeseman, Nic 2010. "African Elections as Vehicle for Change." *Journal of Democracy* 21. 4: 139-153.
- _____ 2015. *Democracy in Africa: Successes, Failures, and the Struggle for*

- Political Reform*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Club of Mozambique* 2017. "More on Political Commission Backing Nyusi for President of Frelimo – AIM". 15 September.
- _____ 2017. "Filipe Nyusi Re-elected President of Frelimo with 99.72% of the Votes Expressed." 30 September.
- _____ 2017. "Nyusi Wins Control of Political Commission – By Joseph Hanlon." 2 October.
- _____ 2018. "Corrected: The Article that Banned Samora Machel Junior from Mozambique October Elections Has Just Been Considered Unconstitutional." 14 November.
- Cooper, Sarah Jane 2012 "Reconciliation or Realpolitik? Botswana's New Vice President." *Democracy in Africa*, 22 August, <http://democracyinafrica.org/reconciliation-or-realpolitik-botswanas-new-vice-president/>, accessed 21 January 2019.
- Cooper, Ian 2013. "Parties, Factions and Votes: A Comparative Study of Electoral Politics in Post-Colonial Namibia." A PhD dissertation submitted to the University of Oxford.
- _____ 2015. "Dominant Party Cohesion in Comparative Perspective: Evidence from South Africa and Namibia." *Democratization* 24: 1–19.
- Cooper-Knock, SJ 2012. "Reconciliation or Realpolitik?: Botswana's New Vice President." *Democracy in Africa*, <http://democracyinafrica.org/reconciliation-or-realpolitik-botswanas-new-vice-president/>, accessed 21 January 2019.
- Cravinho, João Gomez 2003. "Mozambique: Recent History." in *Africa South of the Sahara 2003, 32nd Edition*. ed. Murison, Katherine. London and New York: Europa Publications.
- Daily News* 2015 "CCM Advisory Team Meets in Dar Today." 24 June.
- _____ 2015. "CCM Meetings Raise Tension, Anxiety." 11 July.
- _____ 2015. "Is CCM of 2015 Different from One of Yesteryear?" 17 September.
- _____ 2015. "Four Presidential Aspirants Fai to Beat Deadline." 3 July.
- _____ 2015. "I Have No Plans to Leave Chama Cha Mapinduzi." 8 August.
- _____ 2017. "CCM Endorses Sweeping Reforms." 13 March.
- Darracq, Vincent 2008a. "Being a 'Movement of the People' and a Governing Party: Study of the African National Congress Mass Character." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 34(2): 429–449.
- _____ 2008b. "The African National Congress (ANC) Organization at the Grassroots." *African Affairs* 107(429): 589–609.
- De Jager, Nicola 2013. "South Africa: A Democracy in the Balance." in *Friend or Foe? Dominant Party Systems in Southern Africa: Insights from the Developing World*. eds.

- Nicola de Jager and Pierre du Toit. Claremont: UCT Press.
- De Jager, Nicola and Pierre du Toit. 2013. *Friend or Foe? Dominant Party Systems in Southern Africa: Insights from the Developing World*. Claremont: UCT Press.
- Doorenspleet, Renske and Lia Nijzink. eds. 2013. *One-Party Dominance in African Democracies*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- _____ 2014. *Party Systems and Democracy in Africa*. New York: Pulgrave Macmillan.
- Erdmann, Gero and Matthias Basedau 2008. "Party Systems in Africa: Problems of Categorising and Explaining Party Systems." *Journal of Contemporary African Studies* 26(3): 241–258.
- _____ 2013. "An Overview of African Party Systems." in *One-Party Dominance in African Democracies*, eds. Renske Doorenspleet and Lia Nijzink. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Eyewitness News* 2017. "Inside the ANC Election Process." 14 December.
- Garrido de Sierra, Sebastian. 2014. *The Definitive Reform. How the 1996 Electoral Reform Triggered the Demise of the PRI's Dominant-Party Regime*. A PhD dissertation submitted to the University of California Los Angeles. <https://cloudfront.escholarship.org/dist/prd/content/qt92f462vv/qt92f462vv.pdf?t=in6a7>, accessed 21 January 2019.
- Geddes, Barbara 1999. "Authoritarian Breakdown: Empirical Test of a Game Theoretic Argument." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Association, September.
- Good, Kenneth 2009. "Briefing: The Presidency of General Ian Khama: The Militarization of the Botswana 'Miracle'." *African Affairs* 109(435): 315–324.
- Good, Kenneth and Ian Taylor 2006. "Unpacking the 'Model': Presidential Succession in Botswana." in *Legacies of Power: Leadership Change and Former Presidents in African Politics*. eds. Roger Southall and Henning Melber. Capetown and Uppsala: HSRC Press and Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.
- Greene, Kenneth F. 2008. *Why Dominant Parties Lose: Mexico's Democratization in Comparative Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Habari Leo* 2015. "Kimbisa: Sijahama na Sitahama CCM [Kimbisa: I Have Not and Will Not Defect from CCM]." 10 August.
- Handley, Antoinette, Christina Murray and Richard Simeon 2008. "Learning to Lose, Learning to Win: Government and Opposition in South Africa's Transition to Democracy." in *Political Transitions in Dominant Party Systems: Learning To Lose*. eds. Edward Friedman and Joseph Wong. London and New York: Routledge.

- Hanlon, Joseph 2011. "Mozambique – Can Frelimo Remain the Predominant Party?" *African Arguments*. 6 October, <https://africanarguments.org/2011/10/06/mozambique-can-frelimo-remain-the-predominant-party-by-joe-hanlon/>, accessed 21 January 2019.
- _____ 2018. "First Frelimo Split in 40 Years as Samito Jumps Ship." *Mozambique News Reports and Clippings*. 20 August.
- Hartmann, Christof. 2013. "Senegal: The Rise and Fall of a One-Party-Dominant System." in *One-Party Dominance in African Democracies*. eds. Renske Doorenspleet and Lia Nijzink. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- International Foundation for Electoral Systems, Election Guide, <http://www.electionguide.org/>, accessed 25 January 2019.
- Ishiyama, John and John James Quinn 2006 "African Phoenix? Explaining the Electoral Performance of the Formerly Dominant Parties in Africa." *Party Politics* 12(3): 317–340.
- Kelsall, Tim 2007. "The Presidential and Parliamentary Elections in Tanzania, October and December 2005." *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics* 41(2): 55–82.
- Kenig, Ofer 2009. "Classifying Party Leaders' Selection Methods in Parliamentary Democracies, *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 19(4): 433–447.
- Nyamajeje, Emmanuel 2015. *Tanzania in Focus: CCM Nomination Intrigues and the Road Ahead*, Dar es Salaam: Africa Practice.
- Posner, Daniel N. and Daniel J. Young 2018. "Term Limits: Leadership, Political Competition and the Transfer of Power." in *Institutions and Democracy in Africa: How the Rule of the Game Shape Political Developments*. ed. Nic Cheeseman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lebas, Adrienne. 2011. *From Protest to Parties: Party-Building and Democratization in Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Legal and Human Rights Centre and Tanzania Civil Society Consortium for Election Observation, *Report on the United Republic of Tanzania General Elections of 2010*, Dar es Salam: Legal and Human Rights Centre and Tanzania Civil Society Consortium for Election Observation.
- Legum, Colin. ed. 1988. *Africa Contemporary Record 1986–87 Annual Survey and Documents*, New York and London: Africana Publishing Company.
- Lindberg, Staffan I. and Jonathan Jones 2010. "Laying a Foundation for Democracy or Undermining It?" in *Dominant Political Parties and Democracies: Concepts, Measures, Cases and Comparison*. eds. Matthijs Bogaards and Françoise Boucek. Oxon: Routledge.

- Lodge, Tom 2004. "The ANC and the Development of Party Politics in Modern South Africa." *Journal of Modern African Studies* 42(2): 189–219.
- Lodge, Tom, Denis Kadima and David Pottie. eds. 2002. *Compendium of Elections in Southern Africa*. Johannesburg: Electoral institute for Sustainable Democracy in Africa.
- Lotshwao, Kebapetse 2011. "The Weakness of Opposition Parties in Botswana: A Justification for More Internal-Party Democracy in the Dominant Botswana Democratic Party (BDP)." *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations* 5(2): 103–111.
- Mac Giollabhui, Shane 2017. "The Fall of an African President: How and Why Did The ANC Unseat Thabo Mbeki?" *African Affairs* 116(464): 391–413.
- Magaloni, Beatriz. 2006. *Voting for Autocracy: Hegemonic Party Survival and Its Demise in Mexico*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mail and Guardian* 2018. "Who is Botswana's New President Mokgweetsi Masisi?" 3 April.
- Makulilo, Alexander B. 2013. "Populism and Democracy in Africa." in *Contemporary Populism: A Controversial Concept and Its Diverse Forms*. eds. Gherghina, Sergiu, et al. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Mason, Jennifer. 2002. *Qualitative Researching, 2nd Edition*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Maundeni, Zibani and Kebapetse Lotshwao 2012. "International Organisation of Political Parties in Botswana." *Global Journal of Human Social Science* 12.9: 55-63.
- Maundeni, Zibani and Batlang Seabo 2015. "Management and Mismanagement of factionalism in Political Parties in Botswana, 1962-2013." *Botswana Notes and Records* 45: 27–38.
- Melber, Henning 2006. "'Presidential Indispensability' in Namibia: Moving Out of Office But Staying in Power?" in *Legacies of Power: Leadership Change and Former Presidents in African Politics*. eds. Roger Southall and Henning Melber. Cape Town and Uppsala: HSRC Press and Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.
- _____ 2015. "From Nujoma to Geingob: 25 Years of Presidential Democracy." *Journal of Namibian Studies* 18: 49–65.
- Melber, Henning, Daniela Kromrey and Martin Welz 2017. "Changing of the Guard? An Anatomy of Power within SWAPO of Namibia." *African Affairs* 116(463): 284–310.
- Molomo, Mpho G. 2000. "Democracy under Siege: the Presidency and Executive Powers in Botswana." *Pula: Botswana Journal of African Studies* 14(1): 95–108.
- Morton, Fred, Jeff Ramsay and Part Themba Mgadla 2008. *Historical Dictionary of*

- Botswana, Fifth Edition.* Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Mozambique News Reports and Clippings* 2014. "Filipe Nyussi to be Frelimo Presidential Candidate." 1 March.
- Mwananchi* 2015. "Uchaguzi CCM 2015: Edward Lowassa: Mbunge wa Monduli [CCM Election 2015: Edward Lowassa: MP of Monduli]." 11 May.
- _____ 2015. "Kiunzi cha Kwanza Urais CCM Kesho [The First Hurdle for CCM Presidency Tomorrow]." 7 July.
- _____ 2015. "Mwisho Vichwa 33 Leo [The End of 33 Heads Today]." 9 July.
- _____ 2015. "Edward Lowassa Akatwa CCM [Edward Lowassa Eliminated by CCM]." 11 July.
- _____ 2015. "Mkapa, Mwinyi na Karume Wainusuru NEC [Mkapa, Mwinyi and Karume Save NEC]." 12 July.
- _____ 2015. "Dk Nchimbi: Tumemkubali Dk John Magufuli [Dr Nchimbi: We Have Accepted Dr John Magufuli]." 13 July.
- _____ 2015a. "Lowassa, Mkewe Watua CHADEMA, Wakabidhiwa Kadi [Lowassa and His Wife Settle in CHADEMA and Presented Cards]." 29 July.
- _____ 2015b. "Hotuba ya Lowassa Kujiunga Chadema [Lowassa's Speech to Join Chadema]." 29 July.
- _____ 2015. "Mgeja, Guninita Wajiengua CCM, Wajiunga Chadema [Mgeja, Guninita Defect from CCM, Joins Chadema], 13 August.
- _____ 2015. "Nkumba Arejea CCM, Aibukia Uzinduzi wa Magufuli [Nkumba Returns to CCM, He Appears at the Opening of Magufuli]." 24 August.
- _____ 2015. "Mbowe: Kwa Nini Lowassa, Si Dk Slaa [Mbowe: Why It Is Lowassa, and Not Dr Slaa]." 10 October.
- _____ 2015. "Athari za Nyerere katika Chaguzi za Tanzania [Nyerere's Influence on the Elections of Tanzania]." 14 October.
- _____ 2015. "Tofauti ya Rais Magufuli na Watangulizi Wake [Difference between Magufuli and His Predecessors]." 6 November.
- _____ 2019. "Lowassa Arejea CCM, Asindikizwa na Rostam [Lowassa Returns to the CCM, Accompanied by Rostam]." 2 March.
- Mwananchi twitter, URL, 11 July 2015,
<https://twitter.com/MwananchiNews/status/619930111316480000>, accessed 25 January 2019.
- Myburgh, James and Hermann Giliomee 2010. "One-Party Dominance in South Africa." in *Dominant Political Parties and Democracies: Concepts, Measures, Cases and Comparison.* eds. Matthijs Bogaards and Françoise Boucek. Oxon: Routledge.

- New Era* 2004. “Presidential Race Swapo Nominates Three Candidates.” 5 April.
 _____ 2018. “‘United’ Swapo Differs on Disunity.” 4 December.
- Nipashe* 2015. “Ni Lowassa s Slaa [It’s Lowassa vs Slaa].” 6 July.
 _____ 2015. “Kazi Yaanza [Work Begins].” 8 July.
- Owen, Olly and Zainab Usman 2015 “Briefing: Why Goodluck Jonathan Lost the Nigerian Presidential Election of 2015.” *African Affairs* 114(456): 455–471.
- Otlhogile, B 1998. “The President: His Office, Functions and Powers.” in *Botswana: Politics and Society*. eds. W. A. Edge and M. H. Lekorwe. Pretoria: J. L. van Schaik Publishers.
- Panafrican News Agency* 2001. “Chissano Says He Will Not Run for a Third Term.” 9 May.
- Pereira, Fivejoão C. G., Sandra Manuel and Carlos Shenga 2011. “Mozambique from Civil War to Loyal Opposition.” in *Against All Odds: Opposition Political Parties in Southern Africa*. ed. Solomon, Hussein. Johannesburg: South African Institute of International Affairs.
- Pilet, Jean-Benoit and William P. Cross 2015. “Uncovering the Politics of Party Leadership: A Cross-National Perspective.” in *The Politics of Party Leadership: A Cross-National Perspective*. eds. William P. Cross and Jean-Benoit Pilet. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Poteete, Amy R. 2012. “Electoral Competition, Factionalism, and Persistent Party Dominance in Botswana.” *Journal of Modern African Studies* 50(1): 75–102.
- Punnett, Robert Malcolm 1992. *Selecting the Party Leader: Britain in Comparative Perspective*, New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Reddy, Thiven 2014. “South Africa: Racialized Discourse in the Context of Deteriorating Performance.” in *Party Systems and Democracy in Africa*. eds. Doorenspleet, Renske and Lia Nijzink. New York: Pulgrave Macmillan.
- Republic of Botswana 2006. *Constitution of the Republic of Botswana 1966, as amended to 2006*. <https://www.wipo.int/edocs/lexdocs/laws/en/bw/bw008en.pdf>, accessed 25 January 2019.
 _____ 2014. “Masisi is the Vice President of the Republic of Botswana.” 13 November.
- Reuters* 2014. “Mozambique’s Frelimo Selects Guebuza Loyalist as Presidential Candidate.” 2 March.
 _____ 2017. “Botswana Opposition Groups Unite to Challenge Ruling BDP.” 4 February.
 _____ 2018. “South Africa Likely to Hold Elections in May Next Year.” 7

November.

- Reyntjens, Filip 2016. "The Struggle Over Term Limits in Africa: A New Look at the Evidence." *Journal of Democracy* 27(3): 61–68.
- Reynolds, Andrew, Ben Reilly and Andrew Ellis 2008. *Electoral System Design: The New International IDEA Handbook*. Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance.
- Riedl, Rachel Beatty 2014. *Authoritarian Origins of Democratic Party Systems in Africa*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Salih, M. A. Mohamed 2003. *African Political Parties: Evolution, Institutionalisation and Governance*. London: Pluto Press.
- Sanches, Edalina Rodrigues and José Jaime Macuane. 2018 "The End of an Era? The Death of Afonso Dhlakama and the Reconfiguration of Power in Mozambique." *Presidential Power*, <https://presidential-power.com/?p=8194>, accessed 25 January 2019.
- Saunders, Christopher 2004. "Botswana: Recent History." in *Africa South of the Sahara 2004, 33rd Edition*. ed. Katherine Murison. London and New York: Europa Publications.
- Schneidman, Witney 2017. "Ramaphosa's Victory: Progress or Paralysis?" *Africa in Focus*, The Brookings Institution, 21 December, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/africa-in-focus/2017/12/21/ramaphosas-victory-progress-or-paralysis/>, accessed 25 January 2019.
- Seychelles New Agency, 'Seychelles' National Assembly Approves Constitutional Amendment to Limit Presidential Terms', 5 April 2016.
- Simu TV 2015, 'Safari ya Uchaguzi – July 11, 2015 | Azam TV [Journey of Elections – July 11, 2015 | Azam TV]', <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f83rfPiPHgA>, accessed 25 January 2019.
- Simutanyi, Neo. 2013. "Zambia: Manufactured One-Party Dominance and Its Collapse." in *One-Party Dominance in African Democracies*. eds. Renske Doorenspleet and Lia Nizjink. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Sitta, Samuel, Willibrod Slaa and John M. Cheyo 2008. *Bunge Lenye Meno: A Parliament with Teeth, for Tanzania*, London: Africa Research Institute.
- Slaa, Willibrod 2011. "Changing the Standing Order of Parliament in Tanzania." in *African Parliamentary Reform*. eds. Frederick Stapenhurst, et al. Oxon: Routledge.
- South West Africa People's Organisation, *The SWAPO Party Constitution*, http://www.swapoparty.org/swapo_constitution.pdf, accessed 25 January 2019.
- Southall, Roger 2018. "ANC Will Go to the Polls with Only One Major Asset: Its

- President Ramaphosa.” *The Conversation*, 28 October.
- Sunday Standard* 2011. “Kedikilwe to Replace Merafhe as VP.” 9 October.
- _____ 2018. “Khama Publicly Endorses Masisi for BDP Chair.” 14 May.
- Takeuchi, Shinichi. 2016. “Reisengo Africa no Funso to Funsogo: Sono Gaikan [Conflicts and Post-Conflicts in Africa after the Cold War: An Overview.” in *Buryoku Funso wo Koeru: Semegiau Seido to Senryaku no Nakade [Beyond Violent Conflicts: Between Competing Institutions and Strategies]*. ed. Mitsugi Endo. Kyoto: Kyoto Daigaku Gakujiyutsu Shuppankai.
- Tanzania Election Monitoring Committee 2015a. *TEMCO Newsletter* 1.5–6, Dar es Salaam: Tanzania Election Monitoring Committee.
- _____ 2015b. *TEMCO Newsletter* 1.7–8, Dar es Salaam: Tanzania Election Monitoring Committee.
- The Citizen* 2007. “List of Shame and Its Impact on Presidency.” 31 October.
- _____ 2010. “CCM Finally Admits Split within Party.” 17 February.
- _____ 2015. “I Expect JK Backing, Lowassa Tells Rally.” 31 May.
- _____ 2015. “Fallout within Tanzania’s Ruling Party as Former Prime Minister is Eliminated from Nomination Race.” 11 July.
- _____ 2015. “CCM Candidate for Ikulu to be Announced Today,” 12 July.
- _____ 2015. “Sumaye Decamps CCM, Joins Ukawa.” 22 August.
- _____ 2015. “Was Magufuli CCM’s Best Kept Secret?” 4 November.
- _____ 2015. “‘The Bulldozer’ Magufuli and Envisaged Ruling Party Reforms.” 6 November.
- The East African* 2014. “As the Race to Succeed Kikwete Hots Up, Lowassa is the Man to Watch.” 22 February.
- _____ 2015. “CCM Allows ‘Banned Six’ to Vie for Presidency.” 23 May.
- The Guardian* 2018. “Jacob Zuma Resigns as South Africa’s President on Eve of No-Confidence Vote.” 14 February.
- The Independent* 2018. “Ramaphosa Names Zuma in New South Africa Cabinet.” 26 February.
- The Namibian* 2002. “Pohamba Gets President Nujoma's Vote for Vice President Swapo Post.” 6 August.
- _____ 2012. “Ekandjo Definitely in the Race.” 24 September.
- _____ 2012. “Attempts to Change Congress Rules Fail.” 26 November.
- _____ 2012. “The Rise and Fall of the Mighty in Swapo.” 12 December.
- _____ 2015. “Geingob Takes Charge of Swapo.” 20 April.
- The South African* 2017. “ANC Elective Conference 2017: How the Voting Works.” 17

- December.
- Think Africa Press* 2012. “Mozambique: Frelimo Balances Keep President Guebuza in Check.” 25 October.
- _____ 2014. “Mozambique: Will Guebuza Get His way in Choosing Frelimo’s Presidential Candidate?” 27 February.
- This is Africa* 2018. “President Mokgweetsi Masisi Sworn in As Botswana’s Fifth President.” 4 April.
- Times Live* 2017. “History in the Making: How the ANC Will Elect Its New Leader.” 11 December.
- Tsubura, Machiko 2018. “‘Umoja ni Ushindi (Unity is Victory)’: Management of Factionalism in the Presidential Nomination of Tanzania’s Dominant Party in 2015, *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 12(1): 63–82.
- United Nations, UN Data, <http://data.un.org/>, accessed 25 January 2019.
- Van de Walle, Nicolas. 1994. “Neopatrimonialism and Democracy in Africa, with an Illustration from Cameroon.” in *Economic Change and Political Liberalization in Sub-Saharan Africa*. ed. Jennifer A. Widner. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Van de Walle, Nicolas and Kimberly Smiddy Butler. 1999. “Political Parties and Party Systems in Africa’s Illiberal Democracies.” *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 13.1 (Autumn–Winter): 14–28.
- Verdade* 2013. “Guebuza and the Eternal Dilemma of His Succession.” 25 September.
- Warentek, David 2015. “South African Politics after the Mangaung Conference.” *The Polish Quarterly of International Affairs* 3: 91–105.
- Warrema, Ibrahim J. 2012. *After 50 Years: The Promised Land is Still Too Far! 1961-2011*, Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers.
- Weekend Post* 2015. “Merafhe: A Factionalist Who Survived the Fury.” 12 January.
- _____ 2018. “My Bond with Masisi is No More – Khama.” 18 June.
- _____ 2018. “BDP to Cancel 2019 Congress to Save Masisi.” 3 September.
- Wieczorek, Robert 2012. “ANC Dominance and Democratic Consolidation in South Africa.” *Penn State Journal of International Affairs*: 27–38.