EXPLORING THE ROLE OF POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY SYSTEMS ON DEMOCRACY IN LESOTHO

by

MPHO RAKHARE

Student number: 2009083300

Submitted in the fulfilment of the requirements for the
Magister Degree
in
Governance and Political Transformation
in the
Programme of Governance and Political Transformation
at the
University of Free State
Bloemfontein

February 2019

Supervisor: **Dr Tania Coetzee**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Pages

DECLARATION 4
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 5
List of abbreviations and acronyms 6
LIST OF TABLES 8
Chapter 1 9
Introduction to research 9
1.1 Motivation 9
1.2 Problem statement 14
1.3 Aims and objectives of the study 21
1.4 Research methodology 22
1.5 Research design 23
Chapter 2 24
Theoretical framework 24
2.1 Introduction 24
2.2 The doctrine of separation of powers 25
2.3 Separation of powers in branches of government 29
2.3.1 Legislative authority 29
2.3.2 Executive authority 30
2.3.3 Judiciary authority 31
2.4 Parliamentary, presidential and semi-presidential systems 34
2.4.1 Parliamentary system 34
2.4.1.1 Advantages of the parliamentary system 37
2.4.1.2 Disadvantages of the parliamentary system 37
2.4.2 The presidential system 37
2.4.2.1 Advantages of the presidential system 39
2.4.2.2 Disadvantages of the presidential system 40
2.4.3 Comparison between the presidential and parliamentary systems 40
2.4.4 Semi-presidential system 41
2.4.4.1 Advantages of the semi-presidential system 44
2.4.4.2 Disadvantages of the semi-presidential system 44
2.5 Military intervention in a state 45

2.6 Summary 48
Chapter 3 49
Theoretical framework of political parties and party system on democracy 49
3.1 Introduction 49
3.2 Representative democracy 49
3.3 Political parties and party systems 51
3.4 Functions of political parties 53
3.5 Party systems types 55
3.5.1 One-party system 55
3.5.1.1 Advantages of the one-party system 56
3.5.1.2 Disadvantages of the one-party system 57
3.5.2 One party dominance 57
3.5.2.1 Advantages of the party dominant system 58
3.5.2.2 Disadvantages of the party dominant system 58
3.5.3 The two-party system 59
3.5.3.1 Advantages of the two-party system 59
3.5.3.2 Disadvantages of the two-party system 60
3.5.4 The multi-party system 60
3.5.4.1 Advantages of the multi-party system 61
3.5.4.2 Disadvantages of the multi-party system 61
3.6 Democratic elections 61
3.6.1 Functions of elections 63
3.6.2 Elements of elections 64
3.6.3 Election violence 64
3.7 Electoral system 66
3.7.1 Types of electoral systems 70
3.7.1.1 The First-Past-the-Post (FPTP) System 70
3.7.1.1.1 Advantages of the FPTP system 71
3.7.1.1.2 Disadvantages of the FPTP system 72
3.7.1.2 The Proportional Representation (PR) system 72
3.7.1.2.1 Advantages of the PR system 73
3.7.1.2.2 Disadvantages of the PR system 74
3.7.1.3 The Mixed Member Proportional (MMP) system 74
3.7.1.3.1 Advantages of the MMP system 75

3.7.1.3.2 Disadvantages of the MMP system 76
3.8 Coalition governments 76
3.8.1 Classical coalition governments 77
3.8.2 Consociational coalition governments 77
3.9 Summary 78
Chapter 4 79
Political background of Lesotho 79
4. 1 Introduction 79
4.2 Democratic rule in 1993 81
4.3 Democratic rule in 1998 83
4.4 Democratic rule in 2002 87
4.5 Democratic rule in 2007 89
4.6 Democratic rule in 2012: the first coalition government 91
4.7 Democratic rule in 2015: the second coalition government 94
4.8 Democratic rule in 2017: The third coalition government 97
4.9 The 2005 local government elections 99
4.10 Coalition government 104
4.10.1 Coalition government of 2012: Thabane's administration 105
4.10.2 Coalition government of 2015: Mosisili's administration 106
4.10.3 Coalition government of 2017: Thabane's administration 107
4.11 Summary 109
Chapter 5 110
Research summary, findings and recommendations 110
5.1 Introduction 110
5.2 Summary of chapters 111
5.3 Data interpretation 116
5.3.1 Parliamentary system and separation of powers 117
5.3.2 Lesotho's political instability 118
5.4 Research findings 125
5.5 Recommendations 128
5.6 Conclusion 130
References 133

DECLARATION

I, **Mpho Rakhare**, declare that this dissertation hereby submitted by me for the degree in Master's **Governance and Political Transformation, titled: "Exploring the role of Political Parties and Party Systems on Democracy in Lesotho",** at the University of the Free State is my independent work that I have not previously submitted for a qualification at another institution of higher education. I therefore declare that I am aware that the copyright is vested in the University of the Free State. I declare that all the royalties as regards to intellectual property that was established during the course of and or in connection with the study at the University of the Free State will accrue to the University. I declare that I am also aware that the research may only be published with the Dean's approval.

……

Mpho Rakhare

February 2019

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My sincere appreciation goes to God Almighty for granting me grace and the strength throughout the journey of the research study. Your faithfulness has brought me this far and I will persistently be grateful.

I would like to thank my gregarious and kind supervisor, Dr Tania Coetzee, for the support, guidance, commitment, patience and endless motivation she provided during my research project. You have brought out the best in me. I would also like to extend my appreciation to Cathy De Lange and Juanita Potgieter for always going the extra mile.

I am very thankful to my twin sister, Mphonyane Rakhare, and my family who supported me through this journey.

List of abbreviations and acronyms

ABC	All Basotho Convention
ACP	Alliance of Congress Parties
AD	Alliance of Democrats
BAC	Basutoland African Congress
BBDP	Basotho Batho Democratic Party
BCP	Basotho Congress Party
BDNP	Basotho Democratic National Party
BFP	Basutoland Freedom Party
BNP	Basotho National Party Lesotho
CPL	Communist Party Lesotho
DC	Democratic Alliance
FPTP	First-Past-The-Post
GNU	Government for National Unity
IDEA	International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance
IEC	Independent Electoral Commission
IMF	International Monetary Fund
LCD	Lesotho Congress for Democracy
LCP	Lesotho Communist Party
LDF	Lesotho Defence Force
LMPS	Lesotho Mounted Police Service
LPC	Lesotho People’s Congress
LWP	Lesotho Workers Party
MEC	Movement for Economic Change
MFP	Marema-Tlou Freedom Party
MMP	Mixed Member Proportional
MTP	Marema-Tlou Party
NDPs	National Development Plans
NIP	National Independent Party
NPP	National Progressive Party
NSS	National Security Service
PFD	Popular Front

PR	Proportional Representation
PRS	Poverty Reduction Strategy
RCL	Reformed Congress for Lesotho
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SMDs	Single-member districts
TRC	Transformation Resource Centre
UDP	United Democratic Party
UN	United Nations
USA	Unites States of America

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: The 1993 general elections 82
Table 2: The 1998 general elections 84
Table 3: The 2002 general elections 88
Table 4: The 2007 general elections 90
Table 5: The 2012 general elections 91
Table 6: The 2015 general elections 95
Table 7: The 2017 general elections 98
Table 8: Lesotho local authority types and numbers 100
Table 9: Lesotho local authority types and numbers 103
Table 10: The 2017 local government elections 103
Table 11: Women councillors following the 2005, 2011 and 2017 local government elections 104
table 12: The MMP system formula (FPTP and PR) 121
Table 13: 2006 The parliament representation after the LCD MP's crossed to the ABC 123

Chapter 1

Introduction to research

1.1 Motivation

The main purpose of this research is to explore the role of political parties and party systems on democracy in Lesotho. The first principle of democracy institutes Lesotho as a “sovereign democratic state” in section 1(1). Section 2 stipulates that the constitution is the supreme law of the country, which simply means that Lesotho is a constitutional and democratic state (Lesotho Government, 1993:6). The most indispensable institutions of democracy are political parties because they offer citizens the choice to elect the government of their choice during elections. Lesotho is a member of the United Nations (UN) and the African Union (AU), and has therefore made binding international commitments to adhere to the standards of universal human rights. However, Lesotho has witnessed a number of human rights violations due to the political instability in the country.

Lesotho has witnessed a number of emerging political parties because the constitution guarantees freedom of association (Lesotho Government, 1993:17). The party systems affect the way representation should be demonstrated in the different choices available to voters for them to express their preference. It is likely that the more political parties a country has, the more the citizens or voters will be authentically represented by one or more of them. Schumpeter (1947:269) attributes democracy as a system “for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of competitive struggle for the peoples vote”. However, citizens – through elections – have the opportunity to participate and exercise their right by electing their representative in a democratic country. Additionally, for democracy to be impartial and sustained, the citizens should be represented and be allowed to participate in governance during and between the elections (Matlosa, 2008).

The National Assembly Electoral Act (2011) stipulates that citizens have the right to vote and stand for elections during periodic elections under a Mixed Member Proportional (MMP) system. It also allows the Independent Electoral Commission (IEC) to register political parties. The IEC may recommend on electoral reforms and make amendments to relevant laws and acts. The institutional restructuring of the IEC in 2001 was a strategy to improve its functional and operational independence from the government. In 2002, an Act of Parliament was publicised, giving the IEC legal self-management status. The IEC's efforts to exercise its independence and prove its commitment to stakeholders, accountability and transparency are crucial for public trust in the electoral process. The registration of voters on the voters' roll is compulsory for citizens aged 18 years and above and is a continuous process (National Assembly Electoral Act, 2011).

Jackson and Jackson (1997:366 in Matlosa, 2004:22) articulate that an election is a periodic procedure by which citizens elect their leaders to represent their views in parliament for a period of five years. Elections are held for the following purposes:

- To give citizens an opportunity to choose and employ certain people to have a representative seat in an institution. The person elected has the mandate from citizens to represent their different views;
- To give periodic chances to determine how the government is operating by evaluating its obligations and, where possible, providing alternative methods to be used;
- To ensure that the designated government's domestic and international legitimacy is permitted. This can be done by giving the power to govern to the party or parties that have the number of seats needed;
- To be an instrument of political socialism and political integration by paying mutual attention to the country (Matlosa, 2004:22).

The Lesotho government created a Lesotho Vision 2020 policy in 2004 with seven pillars to be achieved by the year 2020. The first pillar states, "By 2020, Lesotho shall be a stable democracy". It adds that a stable democracy is characterised by principles of good governance, respect for human rights, the rule of law, political openness, political participation, and tolerance. Men, women, and people with

disabilities will be equal before the law; they will be accorded equal opportunities in all aspects of life (Lesotho Government, 2014:4). Since Lesotho gained independence, it has comprehensively planned policies, such as the National Development Plans (NDPs), the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS), and the National Vision 2020. The government has tried many plans and strategies to address the country's structural challenges and has implemented public sector reform programmes to improve efficiency.

In 2005, local government was executed as one of the strategy to address Lesotho Vision 2020, which concentrated mainly on the decentralisation of services with a political structure that appoints leaders through a democratic process of local government elections. Local government is regarded as the closest sphere of government to the citizens (Lesotho Government, 2011). The components of Lesotho Vision 2020 are based on the aspirations of the Basotho people. Lesotho does not have a suitable political and constitutional arrangement that can support a democracy, which will improve the welfare of its citizens. So, how will Lesotho achieve a stable democracy?

According to Gill (2010 in Ngozwana, 2014:9-10) Lesotho was founded by Chief Moshoeshoe 1 in 1822. He allowed missionaries into Lesotho in 1833. They converted the Basotho into Christians. This was done to secure peace among his (Moshoeshoe's) people and to institute schools that would teach the Basotho how to read, write, and do arithmetic. The country has a bicameral parliament consisting of two houses. The first is the National Assembly with 120 members who are elected by a mixed member proportional (MMP) system, and the second is a senate with 33 members (22 of whom are hereditary principal chiefs, while 11 are appointed by the king on the advice of the prime minister).

Lesotho is a constitutional monarchy with a democratic parliamentary government. Thus, the king is the head of state but does not actively participate in political activities (only ceremonial duties). The monarchy has been functional since 1822 where the prime minister is the head of government and has executive authority (Ngozwana, 2014:59).

Lesotho is a Sesotho- and English-speaking country. It is 30 355 square kilometres in size and is surrounded by the Republic of South Africa (Khaketla, 1971:1). It is topographically divided into four zones, based on altitude: the Lowlands, Foothills, Mountains, and the Senqu River Valley within the mountains, which is demarcated by the line above which no winter wheat grows. The country lies between 1500 and 3500 metres above sea level. Lesotho is divided into ten administrative districts (Moteetee, 2005:23). In 1993, Lesotho transitioned from military rule to a democratic multi-party dispensation and it was anticipated that there would be a viable democracy. In democracy, the political parties give the voters the opportunity to express themselves by offering them diverse opportunities to participate in and be engaged with their government. Political parties must deliver and provide the connection between society and politics in democracy.

Heywood (2007:72) states that Abraham Lincoln in 1864 was attributed with inventing the definition of democracy: "The government of the people by the people for the people". This means that the government must serve all the citizens, irrespective of their political affiliation. The Lesotho government must serve all its citizens – whether the congresses or nationalists. The role of political parties is to create policies and programmes so that if/when they are in government they can implement their ideologies. Political parties first have to consider the needs and demands of society and make a priority list because some demands may be more important and necessary than others. Political parties should guarantee two-way communication between the citizens and the government. Political parties have to carefully select and train those people who will be in the legislative office because they must be able to implement the political party's ideologies effectively and efficiently. In short, the political party should deploy the people they are sure will deliver (Caton, 2007). Moreover, it can be said that political parties are the monitoring instrument of a government.

Lesotho has witnessed repeated political and security problems, and even coups and assassinations by the Lesotho military. These are violations of the democratic rights of the people. The African Union (AU) voiced its outrage at the violence, labelling it "a deterioration of Lesotho's rule of law" (Mohloboli, 2016). Political parties in a democratic country should guarantee and safeguard the promises the

government made to its citizens. Only political parties can only do this because they assess the government's performance frequently as they represent the citizens in parliament. Political parties must embrace and sustain a culture of political tolerance, and constructive and practical management of political conflicts.

Lesotho has undergone substantial democratic reforms, especially since 2002. For the democratic state to build longer-term legitimacy, these reforms need to advance from policy intentions to successful implementations. The democratic institutions, including the legislature, executive and judiciary, remain unable to tackle the challenges facing Lesotho due to the collapse of the coalition governments. The judiciary needs to regain its independence from political influence because politicians have continued to show an interest in influencing the justice system. The former Prime Minister Thomas Thabane, has shown his dissatisfaction with the operation of the offices of the Attorney-General and the Director of Public Prosecution. The two offices were suspected of obstructing Thabane's efforts to fight corruption. The heads of each office were loyal to the current Prime Minister, Pakalitha Mosisili, who had appointed them (Lesotho Government, 2016).

This research aims to determine the role of political parties – the ruling parties and the opposition parties. Lesotho's greatest developmental difficulties are unemployment, poverty and inequality, which include the issue of HIV/AIDS, and inadequate governance capability to reverse the current situation. The National Strategic Development Plan and Vision 2020, which are aligned with the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), are the Lesotho government's long-term vision and strategies to overcome these challenges. The government has unsuccessfully tried to set priorities that will guarantee that the challenges that have to be addressed are achieved through broad consultation. However, the country does not seem to have learnt anything from its failure to accomplish its policy objectives (French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2013:2-11). The fact that the prime minister and the deputy prime minister also held portfolios affected the execution and coordination of government business. The coalition government has exposed the flaws and weaknesses within the current state operations. The future of Lesotho depends on the ability of the new government to be able to introduce reforms. Failure to do so could result in a complete collapse of the state. Political stability is

possible through progressive general elections and a peaceful political handover of power from one party to another (Walton, 2012:24).

1.2 Problem statement

Lesotho adopted the Westminster System from its former colonial master; therefore, it is regarded as a parliamentary democracy. The prime minister is the head of government, while the king is the head of state. In a democratic country, there must be parties that are exclusive by taking diverse immersions on concerns that are significant by providing the voters with the authority over what the government does. Lesotho had continuously witnessed the dramatic and a fragile democracy since gaining independence in 1966.

This study will examine the reasons why Lesotho has witnessed the continuous emergence of new political parties since 1966 (Matlosa, 1999:172). According to Matlosa (1999:172), the first democratic government was sworn into office after the 1965 elections. It lasted until 1970 when the ruling party, the Basotho National Party (BNP) under Chief Leabua Jonathan, lost the election.

The 1970 elections contributed to Lesotho's political instability. It was a clear violation of democratic culture and practice; laying the foundation for authoritarian rule. This rule proceeded through both the repression and accommodation of opposition elements aimed at keeping the BNP's political elite in power and keeping the Basotho Congress Party (BCP) from gaining power. The constitution had been suspended; thus, the BNP remained in power. In 1985, general elections were held and the BNP's candidates were voted in unopposed because the opposition boycotted the electoral contest. The elections were called because of pressure from internal and external forces, which were eager to see the reinstatement of the legitimacy and credibility of state managers, and the institutional stability of the state.

In 1986, South Africa encouraged the staging of a military coup, led by Major General Metsing Lekhanya, to remove Chief Leabua from power. The military coup ousted the BNP, which had oppressed the Basotho for 16 years. In 1991, Major General Phisoane Ramaema was the most senior officer within the military council.

This following an earlier exit from power by two close relatives of the king, Colonel Sekhobe Letsie and Colonel Thaabe Letsie, who forced Major General Metsing Lekhanya out of office (Mahao, 1997:2).

In 1993, Lesotho held its first democratic elections and the BCP, led by Ntsu Mokhehle, took office. Since then, the country has sustained its democracy by holding general elections every five years. The conflict inside the BCP led to the first major party spilt in Lesotho in 1997. This led to the formation of the Lesotho Congress for Democracy (LCD) (Mahao, 1997:3). The 1998 elections resulted in the LCD winning 79 of the 80 First-Past-The-Post (FPTP) parliamentary seats despite the opposition winning a significant percentage of the popular vote. During this period, the then Prime Minister, Pakalitha Mosisili, succeeded Mokhehle. The opposition parties were not satisfied with the outcome of the elections. They asked the king to call another election, this time using the Proportional Representation (PR) electoral system (Kapa, 2013:25).

In 1998, Mosisili invited the Southern African Development Community (SADC), of which Lesotho is a member, to intervene and restore law and order in the country because of protests. The FPTP electoral system was blamed for the protests because it prohibited most of the losing political parties from gaining representation in parliament. Electoral and constitutional reforms were made and a comprehensive voting system was introduced – the Mixed Member Proportional (MMP) system (Kapa, 2013:26). SADC and local civil society organisations stepped in to calm the situation, which was approaching the levels of conflict as seen after the 1998 elections.

This study will assess and compare the FPTP electoral system and the MMP electoral system, which is currently in use in Lesotho. Mothibe (1999:490-491) states that the conflict among the political parties was mainly due to the FPTP electoral system as opposition parties felt cheated from being represented in government. An example of this is when, in the 1998 elections, the LCD won 78 of the 79 seats in the National Assembly and the BNP won only one seat (Matlosa, 2004:44).

The electoral system used in Lesotho remains problematic and there is a need to examine and evaluate the current system. The researcher aims to determine whether this electoral system is favourable to all concerned. The MMP electoral system was used for the first time in 2002. Since then, Lesotho has continued to improve its political culture by tolerating the emergence of new parties and alliances.

In 2002, the LCD, led by Mosisili, won elections but could not attain any PR seats because it had won 79 out of 80 constituency-based seats. The LCD was not pleased because it did not have full control in parliament. Fighting among party members escalated and eventually led to a split and the formation of the All Basotho Convention (ABC), led by Thomas Motsoahae Thabane. There were now 11 political parties in Lesotho (Kapa, 2009:4).

In 2007, snap elections were called and the LCD won again. However, the LCD still did not have full control of the parliament as the ABC won 17 of 80 constituency seats. During this time, the MMP system was reformed into a parallel model. This changed its original purpose; thus, political battles erupted again. The LCD experienced a third split when the Democratic Alliance (DC) was formed.

In 2012, Lesotho witnessed the formation of a coalition government between the ABC, the LCD, and the BNP, which was led by former Prime Minister Tom Thabane (the leader of the ABC). This was the first time in Lesotho's history that political parties had merged powers to form a government (Makoa, 2014:101). According to Makoa (2014:101), the primary motivation of these three parties to form a coalition was to have state power, and share cabinet positions and government ministries, so as to meet the parties' individual demands. Now, the question remains: Do the political parties meet the demands of grassroots citizens who elected them, or are they there to pursue their own interests?

Lesotho's politics has divided the Basotho into two groups – congress supporters and nationalists. This situation fuels the fires of hatred. Moreover, it is evident that if either of these parties gain power, they would ensure that the only citizens who benefit from government would be their own and those closest to the people in leadership positions.

In 2014, the LCD withdrew from the coalition government and a vote of no confidence was tabled by the opposition in the National Assembly. King Letsie III dissolved parliament on 10 June 2014. He was advised to do so by the former Prime Minister Tom Thabane and this worsened the political climate. The LCD, led by Mothejoa Metsing, decided to pass the motion of no confidence against Thabane. The reason behind this was that there no longer was mutual trust between the coalition government members and the LCD. Former Prime Minister Thabane's anti-corruption campaign worsened the situation as it was digging up corruption and expelling people from office because they misused public funds (Electoral Institute for Sustainable Democracy in Africa, 2014:25). Coalition arrangements are problematic, especially when political parties do not share the same ideologies and have different political interests.

Thabane filed corruption charges against the then deputy leader of the DC, Monyane Moleleki (who is now the leader of the Alliance of Democrats) and LCD officials because of the alleged misuse of state funds (Makoa, 2014:102). The situation worsened when the then Deputy Prime Minister, Metsing, was also charged with corruption. Moreover, the nation's security was threatened as the Lesotho Defence Force (LDF) and the Lesotho Mounted Police Service (LMPS) chose different political sides. The LDF was thought to be backing the LCD, the DC and their associates, while the LMPS sided with the ABC and the BNP. On 29 August 2014, Thabane, advised by King Letsie III, released the LDF commander, Tlali Kamoli, and replaced him with Maaparankoe Mahao. The feud between the LDF and the LMPS escalated because the LDF was no longer taking instructions from Thabane. They captured the LMPS headquarters, killing one police officer.

The radio stations in the country were off air throughout the attacks. The then deputy president of South Africa, Cyril Ramaphosa, was chosen by SADC to mediate between the political parties. On 5 December 2014, parliament was dissolved (EISA, 2014:10-26). SADC had to intervene and sent the security chiefs on a leave of absence until after the elections in February 2015. In 2015, snap elections were held, which led to a coalition of seven political parties. Pakalitha Mosisili was appointed prime minister in terms of section 87(2) of the constitution. In May and June of 2016, the LDF arrested more than 50 soldiers in connection with an alleged

mutiny. Twenty-three of them faced charges of mutiny or failure to suppress a mutiny. There were reports that the detainees were tortured. On 25 June 2016, members of the LDF shot and killed a former commander of the LDF, Maaparankoe Mahao, in what the LDF said was an attempt to arrest him in connection with the alleged mutiny.

The cruel, inhumane and degrading treatment, punishment, and torture by LDF members and the police and the societal abuse of women and children were the most substantial human rights problems in the country. This all happened under the administration of the Prime Minister, Pakalitha Mosisili, who was popularly known as *Tau ea thaba*, which means “Lion of the mountain”. The government did not take steps to accuse the officials who committed these abuses (whether in the security services or elsewhere in the government) and therefore impunity remained a major problem (Lesotho Government, 2015).

In March 2017, the members of parliament voted in favour of replacing Mosisili with the former deputy president of the DC, Monyane Moleleki, who had formed a new party called the Alliance of Democrats (AD). Mosisili told Lesotho’s citizens that he would continue to be the prime minister after the elections that would be held on 3 June 2017. These were snap elections announced by King Letsie III. The last two elections had not produced a winner, so the political parties were forced to form a coalition government. The LCD saw yet another split when Selibe Mochoboroane formed a new party – the Movement for Economic Change (MEC) (*Lesotho Times*, 2017).

Lesotho needs political reform because new political parties emerge whenever politicians disagree with each other (Mokhethi, 2017). At the time of conducting this study, Lesotho had yet to witness the new political parties that would stand for election in 2017. This study will evaluate whether the ever-multiplying political parties are formed to accumulate power and create jobs for friends, or to represent the citizens and serve the nation. Lesotho uses the Westminster System as it parliamentary system of government. This System was designed to bolster confidence in the National Assembly. According to the System, general elections should be held every five years to elect the members of parliament.

The party that has the majority of seats in the National Assembly should become the government – as mandated by section 87(2) of the constitution. No political party had a majority of votes in the Lesotho National Assembly in either 2012 or 2015. Electoral systems are very vital because they influence the performance of the party on winning power after the elections. The Independent Electoral Commission (IEC) of Lesotho was established in 1997. It conducted national elections in 1993, 1998, 2002, 2007, 2012 and 2015, and local elections in 2005 and 2011. The IEC is a constitutional election management body that was established by the Second Amendment of the Constitution of Lesotho. It is the institution mandated by Lesotho's Constitution to hold national and local government elections and referenda. The IEC receives funding from the government budget through the Consolidated Fund, upon the approval of parliament.

In 2007, the Electoral Act (2011) instructed that all the political parties that form alliances must register with the IEC if they intend to contest elections under such an alliance (Beale, 2013:18). According to Lodge, Kadima and Pottie (2002:108), public funding of political parties for election campaigning has applied since 1993. Half of the funds are distributed to registered parties and shared equally among them, while the other half is distributed to each party in proportion to the number of candidates fielded. There are no laws and regulations governing the public funding of political parties. It has been said that parties do not use the funds for the purpose of elections and no action is taken because no law regulates the misuse of funds by political parties (Olaleye, 2003:14).

A country's type of government determines how that country's executive, legislative, and judicial organs are organised. Democratic governments are those that allow citizens to manage their government – either directly or through elected representatives. Lesotho uses the parliamentary system. Therefore, the head of state's roles are mainly ceremonial, while the chief executive is the head of the nation's legislature (Matlosa & Shale, 2006:3). Parliamentary systems generally make a distinction between the head of government and the head of state. The head of government, in Lesotho's case, is the prime minister and the head of state is the figurehead king.

The parliamentary system does not state that different political parties in coalition with each other rule the country. Such multi-party arrangements are usually the product of an electoral system known as proportional representation (PR). Parliamentary democracies are divided into two systems – Westminster and Consensus. The Westminster System is commonly found in Commonwealth countries, but it is not exclusive to Commonwealth countries. This model permits a more superior separation of powers than the Western European model because the governing party will often not have a majority in the upper house (Szilágyi, 2009:312).

The parliamentary and presidential systems differ concerning the election of the chief executive and debating styles. In a parliamentary system, the chief executive is not elected by the people but by the legislature. Therefore, the majority party in parliament elects the chief executive, known as the prime minister. The party members in parliament vote rigorously along party lines. The presidential system, on the other hand, is less well-organised and legislators are free to vote according to their conscience (Szilágyi, 2009:312).

Debating styles also vary between the two systems. Legislators in a presidential system make use of a filibuster, or the right to prolong speeches to delay legislative action, while a parliamentary system will call for an end to a debate so that voting can begin (Szilágyi, 2009:313). In both systems, the chief executive can be removed from office by the legislature. Parliamentary systems use a vote of no confidence where the majority of parliamentary members vote to remove the prime minister from office. This was seen in Lesotho where prime ministers were removed from office in 2014 and 2017. Afterwards, an election was called. In a presidential system, a similar process is used where legislators vote to impeach the president from office.

As nations battle to discover themselves, they are also assessing and evaluating which form of democracy is the best for them (Szilágyi, 2009:311). This study will investigate the main reasons why new political parties continuously emerge in Lesotho. It aims to determine whether the leaders of political parties have the desire to serve the nation, or whether they just want to line their pockets and pursue their own personal interests.

Lesotho uses the multi-party system, which is categorised by competition between more than two parties, increasing the probability of coalitions. Most citizens of Lesotho are disappointed with the fact that the government has failed to meet its objective of a stable democracy due to the failed coalition governments in 2012 and 2015.

This research intends to address the following main research problem: **To what extent do political parties and party systems influence democracy in Lesotho?**

The following **sub-questions** will be addressed:

1. What leads to the emergence of new political parties in Lesotho prior to elections?
2. What leads to the formation of coalition governments in Lesotho?
3. Is the parliamentary model beneficial in Lesotho to implement multi-party politics?
4. Is the party system that is used conducive to Lesotho politics?
5. Is the political transformation of Lesotho democratic?

1.3 Aims and objectives of the study

The overall goal of the research is to investigate exploring role of political parties and party systems on democracy in Lesotho. This study will use applied research because it will investigate whether solutions to social problems can be found; describe and assess social needs; assess and evaluate existing policies and practices; recommend and implement change; and identify new areas of research (Du Plooy-Cilliers, Davis & Bezuidenhout, 2014:75). The objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To examine the theory relating to the parliamentary system as a theoretical departure point.
2. To explore the current state of political transformation in Lesotho in relation to political parties.
3. To propose recommendations relating to exploring the role of political parties and party systems on democracy in Lesotho.

1.4 Research methodology

The research will be conducted using primary and secondary sources. Moreover, it will adopt the qualitative approach. According to Du Plooy-Cilliers *et al.* (2014:173), when the researcher uses qualitative data collection methods, he/she attains the fullness and deepness of data assembled in a specific social context. The qualitative approach is more subjective in nature than the quantitative approach, and involves examining and reflecting on the less tangible aspects of a research subject, for example values, attitudes, and perceptions. However, the findings of qualitative research can be challenged more easily (Branford University School of Management, 2007:3). De Vos, Strydom, Fouché and Delport (2011 in Du Plooy-Cilliers *et al.,* 2014:232-249) define qualitative data analysis as "the procedure of conveying order, structure and the meaning of data".

The research will be conducted deductively. Therefore, the researcher will use a theoretical framework taken from the theory applicable to classifying precise codes. Qualitative research is basically informative. Therefore, the way the researcher interprets it signifies his/her personal and theoretical understanding of the phenomenon under study. A political party is defined as an organised group of people who have common political aims, views and ideas that will influence public policy by getting their candidates elected into public office. By winning political office, the political party hopes to exercise government authority. Usually, political parties share political preferences, policy procedures, and a common conceptual uniqueness.

This is evident in Lesotho where the Basotho are divided into the nationalists and the Basotho Congress Party (BCP) supporters. Section 16 of the constitution clearly stipulates that every person is free to associate with other persons in religious, political, economic, labour, cultural and recreational commitments. In 2012, Lesotho witnessed the formation of its first coalition government – not because of shared ideologies between the political parties but because they wanted to establish an alternative government (Molapo, 2015). In 2015, congress parties that shared the same ideologies and preferences formed the second coalition government. They all

originated from the BCP, but stood separately for the elections (Mohloboli, 2015). In 2017, the third coalition government was formed.

1.5 Research design

This section will provide an explanation of the chapters as they serve to present the objectives and findings of the study:

Chapter one presents the introduction, providing an overview and orientation of the research. The reasons that motivated the study are emphasised, and the aims and objectives of the study are identified. Hence, Chapter one consists of the motivation for the study, the problem statement, the aims and objectives, the methodology and the research design.

Chapter two will focus on theory in terms of the separation of powers. The principle of *trias politica* will be discussed in depth. This chapter will also compare the tripartite and bipartite national systems. In addition, the origin and design of parliamentary, presidential and semi-presidential systems will be discussed.

Chapter three will explore democratic elections and the different types of party systems used in a democratic country. In addition, it will discuss the core political party systems and their features, and the electoral systems. The chapter will also deal with the types of political parties and political power.

Chapter four will discuss Lesotho's political background and development since it gained its independence. This chapter will also discuss the democratic development – from military rule to democratic rule. Furthermore, it will examine the reason why Lesotho witnessed coalition governments from 2012 to 2017. The Lesotho government structure will also be discussed.

Chapter five will provide the findings, recommendations and conclusion of the study. The guidelines provided could assist political parties in Lesotho to function more effectively in the future.

Chapter 2

Theoretical framework

2.1 Introduction

Chapter two will focus on theory in terms of the separation of powers. The principle of *trias politica* will be discussed in depth. This chapter will also compare the tripartite and bipartite national systems. The origin and design of the parliamentary, presidential and semi-parliamentary systems will be explained in detail.

Military intervention in politics is a common feature in developing countries, caused by weak political institutions. The idea of the doctrine of separation of powers is a valued concept, and was developed over centuries. For this dissertation, the theory of separation of powers will focus on the literature of Locke and Montesquieu. Locke's idea of separation of powers influenced the separation of the legislative and executive powers in order to limit the complete powers of the monarch (1690). Montesquieu's idea of separation of powers influenced the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Constitution of the United States of America.

For Montesquieu, separation of powers was seen as an institutional arrangement that would sustain and maintain the rule of law in order for citizens to gain security and liberty. Montesquieu (1748) gave the principle of separation of powers absolute political importance. He emphasised judicial function and stated that the judiciary should be equal to the other branches of government. Montesquieu also made his views clear in terms of legislative and executive authority. The concept of separation of powers means the separation of the legislative, executive and judiciary authority in a country (Waliggo, 1991:1).

The separation of powers was created to ensure that the rule of law is respected, and to ensure that there is a clear separation of functions among the legislative, executive and judiciary authority. The three branches of government must be completely isolated. This chapter will discuss the significance of parliamentary and

presidential systems as types of democratic government. Both systems are governed by the constitution in order to exercise the political authority in a democratic country.

Moreover, the chapter will discuss the significance of political parties as essential prerequisites in a democratic political system. According to Schattschneider (1942:1), in the modern era, political parties contribute to the success of a democracy. Political parties are the vehicles of communication between the citizens and the government.

2.2 The doctrine of separation of powers

The principle of separation of powers is a political doctrine, which refers to *trias politica.* Hence, it restricts the powers and functions of the three branches of government – the legislature, executive and judiciary. The separation of powers doctrine is designated as a constitutional tool, which is in line with setting goals for a country (Barber, 2001:71). According to Du Plessis (1999:171), the separation of powers doctrine is used interchangeably with the idea of *trias politica*. Masterman (2011:13) states that the legislature makes laws, the executive implements them, and the judiciary interprets the laws. Similarly, Lumb (1983:24) asserts that in the separation of powers doctrine, the legislative branch is vested with the power to make laws, the executive branch with the power to execute laws, and the judiciary with the power to settle disputes. Usually, governments use the separation of powers doctrine to assign different legal and political powers to the three branches of government.

Rabkin (1987:1007) states that without these three branches of government, there would be no separation of powers. Separation of power ensures that power and control are concentrated in one organ of government. Therefore, the doctrine is regarded as the mechanism for promoting democratic and good governance in a state. Gwyn (1965:5) states that the separation of powers outlines the functions and powers of government and it is normative. The concentration of power will be excessive if held by one of the three branches (Strauss & Cropsey, 1981:472).

According to Fisher (1990:217), Montesquieu believed in a tripartite system of government, which comprised of the legislative, executive and judicial branches in order to protect the liberty of citizens. The tripartite system of government is thus the doctrine of the separation of powers, and the countries that practice it should adhere to its guiding principles.

Locke (1690), on the other hand, believed in the bipartite system. His doctrine distinguished between legislative and executive power. According to Strauss and Cropsey (1981:472), Locke was in favour of government with a division between the legislative and executive. Suanzes (1999:9) states that Locke stated that the "legislative authority has to bestow justice and have a say on the enshrined standing laws of the country". Secondly, "the power of legislative authority cannot be transferred to any other organ of government" (Ratnapala, 1990:376-380).

Locke realised that it is easy for officials to be tempted to be corrupt if he/she has the authority to make laws and the authority to execute them. Hence, the abuse of power by government is minimised because each branch or organ of state holds the others accountable. Separation of powers entails a sense of autonomy among the three branches of government.

The following framework guides the legislative, executive and judicial authority:

- The legislative authority is characterised by the following generic functions: "law-making, control, financial, reconciliation and representation functions" (Thornhill, 2012:39). The legislative authority is mandated with the power to make, amend and revoke the rules that govern (Rautenbach & Malherbe, 1996:68);
- The executive authority implements the decisions made by the legislature (Thornhill & Van Dijk, 2015:63); and
- The judiciary authority has the responsibility to comprehend the rules and regulations made by the legislature, and to safeguard and ensure that they are respected, and applied accordingly (Thornhill, 2012:18).

According to Mojapelo (2013:37), the separation of powers doctrine implies that the legislature, which is responsible for the enactment of the rules of law, is responsible for the execution and judicial decisions on them. However, the principle of the separation of powers may not be entrusted to individuals or a single institution in a state and that is why it should be approved by a political authority (Landsberg & Graham, 2017:62). In separation of powers, there are clear duties and responsibilities among the three branches of government and a well-defined clarification of capabilities and authority (Mojapelo, 2013:37). Griffin and Newman (2005:1206) emphasise that the legislatures effectively and efficiently act as administrators of the executive authority and as guardians of morality on behalf of the citizens. According to Sunstein (2001:98-99), the separation of powers helps a government to create a productive and strong hierarchy of labour division.

The employees of the three branches of government should not perform any function in more than one sphere. That means that a person employed by the legislature must only work in the legislature, and not in the executive or judicial offices. Therefore, there is a need to for these three branches to be independent. The purpose of the separation of powers is to prevent power being concentrated in one organ of government (Alder, 2009:143). According to Fombad (2005:25), the doctrine of separation of powers is universal, as most democratic countries have included it in their constitution. The constitution provides for the separation of powers by assigning functions to the governmental branches.

According to Vile (1967:13), the doctrine of separation of powers is characterised by the following principles:

- The principle of *trias politica* emphasises the formal and clear distinction between the legislative, executive and judiciary authority;
- The principle of separate personnel must be administered whereby one person must work only in one branch of government to avoid any abuse of state power;
- The principle of separation of functions emphasises that the legislative, executive and judiciary should be mandated and capacitated only with suitable and required functions; and

- The principle of checks and balances guarantees that the three branches of government monitor each other to ensure that they stick to their roles (Vile, 1967:13).

Wade and Phillips (1960:22-24) are of the opinion that the separation of powers means the following:

- One person should not be a member of more than one of the three branches of government. For example, ministers may not be members of parliament;
- None of the branches of government may interfere and control the functions of any of the other branches. For example, each branch of the government must be autonomous; that is, the judiciary must not be dependent on executive authority; and
- None of the branches of government may perform the duties of the others. Legislative powers should not be given to cabinet ministers.

The separation of powers doctrine places fundamental constitutional value on checks and balances to ensure that the state does not abuse its power (Labuschagne, 2004: 85). The principle of separation of powers is associated with the checks and balances system, which ensures that the government is accountable and transparent with regards to performing its duties and functions. This means that each government branch can exercise control over the other branches of government. According to Currie and De Waal (2002:112), checks and balances are used as the capability of the executive to execute court orders. Checks and balances allow the judiciary to provide control measures over public administration and the executive by means of judicial review (Currie & De Waal, 2002:113). Judicial review helps in enforcing and maintaining the doctrine to ensure that power is balanced among the three branches of government (Feliciano, 1992:19-24).

In order for the doctrine of separation of powers to function effectively and efficiently, the three branches of government need to function autonomously to allow checks and balances of power. The theory of checks and balances ensures that each government organ knows its responsibilities, and no one organ is supreme. Locke stressed the importance of separation of powers as the mechanism to ensure that

the executive power is not abused and that the government is accountable (Locke, 1690).

2.3 Separation of powers in branches of government

The doctrine of separation of powers clearly highlights the necessity to categorise government into three branches – the legislature, the executive and the judiciary authority. The three branches of government will be discussed below in terms of the separation of powers among them.

2.3.1 Legislative authority

The legislative authority is capacitated with the authority to make the laws of the country. In a democratic country, the legislature must be sovereign and, most importantly, it must consist of elected representatives. Sovereign legislatures are known as bicameral parliaments. The legislature usually consists of the Senate as the upper house and the National Assembly as the lower chamber (Cloete, 1993:49). Legislation is associated with law making in which the rights of the people must be adjudicated by the law (Locke, 1690:15). Montesquieu stated that legislative authority "makes temporary laws or amends laws or revokes them" (1748:150).

The legislature has the following functions:

Representing the people: The legislature must represent all people, for example, children, voters from different political parties, the disabled, and the elderly. By using consultation as one of the service delivery principles, the legislature must consult citizens to determine their views. It must be well informed about the actual needs and expectations of citizens. Being in touch with the people in the constituency is important for members of the legislature as this will keep them up-to-date with everything that is happening at grassroots level (Cloete, 1993:54);

Investigative and deliberate functions: The legislature must have the power to appoint committees that will investigate urgent matters; these committee reports should be submitted to them (Cloete, 1993:55);

Policy-making by making laws: In the parliamentary system, the cabinet debates a policy decision and, if the legislature approves it, the cabinet will formulate the policy (Cloete, 1993:55);

Financial functions: The legislature must approve every source of income of the country. Spending of government money and estimates of expenditure are also controlled by the legislature. It makes laws regarding the banking of monies, the accounts of executive institutions, the officials accountable for spending of the funds voted for, and the executive accounts for the auditing and provides revenue and expenditure reports to the legislature (Cloete, 1993:56-57);

Control of the executive institutions: In a country where the parliament consists of a cabinet, the legislature must delegate powers to executive institutions. This will help the legislature to control the executive institution effectively and efficiently. The executive institutions will therefore need to submit all reports and, if needed, give full explanations regarding certain matters on the submitted reports (Cloete, 1993:57);

Opposition role: Strong opposition parties can and should criticise the legislature if certain matters are not executed in accordance with the legislation governing the parliament. They can reveal any deficiency of the political executive office bearers by studying the reports (Cloete, 1993:58).

The legislature also oversees the work of the executive authority to ensure checks and balances. This helps the legislature to protect the morality of citizens (Griffin & Newman, 2005:1206). It is important to note that political parties play a vital role in the law-making process of the state by initiating bills.

2.3.2 Executive authority

The executive authority, in most cases, comprises of the cabinet ministers and is led by the prime minister or president (Jowell, 2014:3). The executive branch executes the law and must maintain the smooth running of the country. The president or prime minister is responsible for choosing his/her own cabinet members. Montesquieu (1748:150) was of the opinion that the executive power was responsible for making

peace or war. It is a duty of the executive authority to protect and preserve the integrity and unity of the state; this can be observed when there is war or violence (Ghai, 2016).

The executive authority is responsible for governing the country and running the day-to-day activities of the country (Daintith & Page, 1999:2). Furthermore, it has the mandate to implement laws and policies that are made by the legislature. According to Hussein (2013:13), the executive authority is the branch of government that is responsible for ruling the state. Gildenhuys (1997:53) states that the executive authority must implement the policies and legislature decisions enshrined in the laws and regulations of the country.

Moreover, the executive authority has to maintain the laws in the country. For instance, each government department has the responsibility to implement the laws and policies according to the department, and run the day-to-day errands of the department. Moreover, the executive branch of government is responsible for making administrative decisions of government affairs (Gildenhuys, 2004:145). Gildenhuys (2004:145) further outlines the characteristics of cabinet, which is part of the executive authority, as follows:

- Cabinet is accountable to the legislature; thus, its members should also be members of the legislature;
- Cabinet members should always have shared political views and must enjoy the legislative support of majority representatives;
- Cabinet members enjoy ministerial duties because they head their ministries or departments; and
- Cabinet is the executive committee that must formulate government policies and control the agenda of the legislature.

2.3.3 Judiciary authority

Judiciary independence is important for the doctrine of the separation of powers because without it there would be no separation of powers (Montesquieu, 1748). Judiciary independence should be guided by the rule of law framework governing the

country. The judiciary is a branch of government that has the authority to interpret the law through the courts of law. The judiciary also ensures that human rights violations are prohibited in a democratic country. It must ensure that people who violate the law are brought to the courts of laws and remedies are provided to people whose rights have been violated.

The judiciary is capacitated with authority by the constitutions of different countries. The constitutions declare the autonomy of the judiciary, which is one of the three branches of government. In essence, the judiciary is capacitated and mandated to resolve disputes; thus, the government has the role to act as a mediator in disputes or disagreements that society might have in a political system (Rautenbach & Malherbe, 1996:215).

According to Fombad (2007:223-239), the independence of the judiciary is important in a country that is governed by the rule of law. The judiciary acts as a mediator in matters between the legislature and the executive, and the executive and the judiciary. The courts have the capacity to enforce the law by applying the facts impartially and independently; it should be noted that judges cannot work as they please in terms of solving disputes. This means that there should be legal values to adhere to and they should respect the rule of law. De Waal and Schoeman-Malan (2015:70) articulate that the courts of law are responsible for determining the exact meaning of the words the legislature may use. The constitution states the right of individuals, specifically the right to fair trial by the courts of laws and tribunals established by law (Hussein, 2013:13). The judiciary is responsible for justice for all citizens, as stipulated in the constitution, and it must perform its duties and functions without bias or fear. Judicial independence is recognised by the UN's basic principles on the independence of the judiciary of 1985, the European Charter on Statute for Judges of 1998, and the Commonwealth principles on the accountability of and relationship between the three branches of government of 2009.

According to Dung (2003:11-29), the following elements of judicial independence are internationally recognised:

Provisions for judicial autonomy

The judicial autonomy principle is regarded as the cornerstone of judicial independence. This implies that judges must be independent and impartial, and operate without any influence from any source (Dung, 2003:15-18). Judicial autonomy is enshrined in principle 1 of the UN's Basic Principles, which clearly outlines judicial independence;

Provision of financial arrangements for judicial autonomy

Judicial tasks cannot be performed without adequate resources. This implies that without sufficient resources, it is impossible for the judiciary to function independently. When the judiciary has a guaranteed budget, it can secure its autonomy (Dung, 2003:11-15). The judiciary receives its resources from the national budget (International Commission of Jurists, 2007:33). The UN's Basic Principle 7 clearly outlines, "Every member state should provide sufficient resources that will ensure that the judiciary perform its duties and obligations properly". A component of the independence of the judiciary is sufficient funding, as outlined by Principle 1 of the UN's Basic Principles;

Provision of security of tenure of the judicial office

Judges must be appointed for a fixed term in order to maintain their independence in the judiciary. They can be removed from office because of clear incapacity and misbehaviour (Dung, 2003:15-18). The judiciary should have sufficient funds in order to carry out its day-to-day activities, as conferred on it by the constitution (America Bar Association). Principle 11 of the UN's Basic Principles therefore states, "The law will secure the term of office of judges, their independence, security, adequate remuneration, and conditions of service, pensions and the age of retirement". Principle 12 further says, "Judges, whether appointed or elected, shall have guaranteed tenure until retirement age or the expiry of their term of office, where such exists";

Provision of adequate remuneration of judicial officers

Judges must receive an adequate salary so that they are not tempted to surrender to bribery or be biased. Moreover, adequate remuneration will attract more qualified persons to work for the judiciary and the country will benefit (Dung, 2003:21-23);

Provision for judicial appointments

The judiciary must be appointed in a transparent manner. It must appoint a person with integrity and who is qualified for the job to give value to the judiciary (Dung, 2003:23). Article 9 of the Universal Charter of the Judge stipulates, “The selection and appointment of a judge must be based on professional qualification and it must be transparent”;

Judicial accountability

Independence of the judiciary must have the responsibility of being accountable. Accountability and independence go hand-in-hand and therefore must be balanced. A judicial code of conduct must be in place to maintain the ethical behaviour of judges (Dung, 2003:27-29). Principle 20 of the UN’s Basic Principles stipulates, “Disciplinary decisions, suspension or removal proceedings of judges should be subject to an independent review”. The matter of discipline and accountability, and the suspension and removal of judges is dealt with in Principles 17 to 19 of the UN’s Basic Principles: “…the judge shall have the right to a fair hearing; …judges shall be suspended or removed from office for incapacity or any behaviour that make them unfit to perform their duties; …all disciplinary, suspension or removal proceedings shall be determined by judicial conduct standards”.

2.4 Parliamentary, presidential and semi-presidential systems

There is a significant distinction between the parliamentary, presidential, semi-parliamentary and semi-presidential systems. These systems will be discussed below.

2.4.1 Parliamentary system

Gamble (1990:407-408) states that the parliamentary system was developed in Britain, and is either unicameral or bicameral. The parliamentary system regulates the separation of powers between the legislative and the executive. Among its members, the parliamentary majority party or coalition determines the chief executive and names the cabinet members in the parliamentary system (Johnson,

2005:7). In the parliamentary system of government, members of parliament have the authority to determine how the cabinet is formed and a majority of similar members may cast their votes to remove ministers from office. The head of state is usually the king or queen who is advised by the prime minister. In most cases they act as ceremonial kings or queens.

Majority parties are mandated to dissolve the parliament if the prime minister sees fit to do so. In the parliamentary system, the prime minister is usually the leader of the leading majority party, or a group of parties who formed a coalition, and who was appointed by parliament. The parliamentary system also uses a voting system called Proportional Representation (PR) in multi-party provisions. In this system, the government must be “appointed and supported”, but in some instances, it may be dismissed by a parliamentary vote, normally referred to as a “vote of no confidence” (Sartori, 1997:101).

The prime minister, who is the head of government, is also head of the cabinet. In the parliamentary system, the parliamentary government must have the ability to impose its will on parliament and govern the agenda of the legislature by means of strict rules in the process of voting in parliament, and the resignation and dissolution of parliament (Tsebelis, 2002:93).

Parliamentary systems are different in terms of their agenda power. Additionally, agenda-setting rules and regulation, and the structuring of the process of amendment are diverse. Therefore, it is vital that the legislative agenda is consecutively controlled by the government (Powell, 2000:31-42). According to Verney (1959:83), parliamentary system activities are more focused on parliament; therefore, everyone respects its supremacy. In a parliamentary system, the prime minister is the head of government and the head of state is a constitutional monarch.

According to Salia (2005:13-14), the parliamentary system uses political parties as one of its components to ensure that it represents the nation at large. The formation of a coalition among parties increases shared political ideologies. The parliamentary system should respond to the challenges of the contemporary world. It should take

into consideration that each parliament has its own national, traditional, distinct, and unique character.

Beetham (2006:13) highlights that a democratic parliament is characterised by people who are represented in terms of gender, language, religion, ethnicity, or other politically significant characteristics. Parliament functions as the main source of legislation in the society (Garner, Ferdinand & Lawson, 2009:217). The characteristics of the parliamentary system are as follows:

Dual executive arrangement

The head of state is a monarch, who in most cases is the ceremonial king or queen or emperor or empress. His/her powers are limited by the constitution. Head of state powers only apply if an official seeks advice (Cheibub, 2007:34). According to Stephan and Skach (1993:3), the legislature can be dissolved by the executive power, and elections are called.

Fusion of power

Cabinet ministers and the prime minister are chosen from the legislature and they have to answer to it. This means they are both members of cabinet and members of parliament. This in conflict with the doctrine of separation of powers because it clearly states that one may only work in one branch of government to avoid abuse of state power (Cheibub, 2007:36). Heywood (2007:338) asserts that the parliamentary system is characterised by a fusion of power between the legislative and the executive branches. This is because the executive members have to maintain their political seats in parliament.

Party system

In the parliamentary system, political parties are highly structured and have fused actions, which allow them to block voting in order to protect their ruling party or parties (Wade & Bradley, 1991:3). If the members of parliament are no longer in favour of the prime minister, they can cast a motion of no confidence (Cheibub, 2007:40).

2.4.1.1 Advantages of the parliamentary system

It must be accountable to the government and to the people, or else face a motion of no confidence. For example, the prime minister must ensure that the delivery of services, as promised by party manifestos and ideologies during elections, is achieved;

Parliament can be dissolved by the executive if the majority of members are unhappy with the way government is performing its duties;

Better coordination between the legislative and the executive because legislators are given the opportunity to participate in the formulation of national policies;

Strengthening of the multi-party system because small parties have an opportunity to take part in the formation of a coalition government (Parreno, 2003:5).

2.4.1.2 Disadvantages of the parliamentary system

Executive dominance, meaning that the legislative and executive members have to reach an agreement to avoid the government being dissolved (Heywood, 2007:338);
Most parliamentary laws can be rejected if the opposition manages to win an election (Moe & Caldwell, 1994:179);
The legislative/executive split obstructs the law-making process; thus, there is no stability due to debates that are constantly held (Linz, 1990b:89-90).

2.4.2 The presidential system

The presidential system varies from country to country, depending on the environment and political conditions. In most cases, the presidential system is one whereby the president is elected by the voters. The president has a fixed obligation to give direction to the government. The policy-making authority is divided between the legislature and the president (Gerring, Thacker & Moreno, 2009:15).

According to Shugart and Carey (1992:15), the regime type is determined by the constitutional powers of the president. The presidential regime is focused on the model of separation of powers, and the duties and obligations of the president and the cabinet.

Bogdanor (1987:493) coined the term “presidential system” in 1967. In this system, the president is usually the head of state and he/she is expected to serve for a fixed term by direct or indirect method (Riggs, 1994:72-152). This is seen in African countries whereby the president serves for a period of five years, and for at least two terms.

Sartori (1997:112) states that the presidential system is a political system whereby the president is elected directly by the people and serves as the head of the executive branch, with separation of powers that are rigid, for a period of time. According to Kasapovi (1996:122), the presidential system safeguards the executive government’s stability, especially in a situation where democracy is not consolidated. He (1996) further states that in a presidential system, the government has direct responsibility to the voters in terms of the choices they have regarding policies. This enhances a good and transparent political relationship between the government and the citizens.

According to Heywood (2000:179), the characteristics of the presidential system are constitutionalism and the separation of powers among the legislative and executive authority. The president is both the head of state and the head of government. The Unites States of America (USA) practices the presidential system model. Article I of its constitution clearly vests all legislative powers in congress, which consists of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Article II vests executive powers in the president. Article III vests judicial powers in the Supreme Court and lower courts, which congress may establish from time to time (USA, 1787).

The presidential system differs from country to country, depending on the authority mandated to the president in terms of the kind of party politics used and the electoral systems used (Mainwaring & Shugart, 1997b:435). In the presidential system,

constituencies elect the president and legislature, while the president selects the members of cabinet from outside parliament. The president is elected by every citizen who votes during the national elections (Johnson, 2005:7). There is full presidential dominance and the legislative and executive authority share mutual preferences and are controlled by the party or coalition parties.

In the presidential system, the president appoints members of cabinet, who are ministers, and the president can reshuffle the cabinet whenever he/she feels it is necessary. The doctrine of separation of powers is respected (Parreno, 2003:3). The presidential system is usually resistant to change (Tsebelis, 2000:443). Shugart and Carey (1992:28-30) articulate that the presidential system is rigid because if the president is not charged with or prosecuted for any offence, it is difficult to remove him/her before his/her term ends. This system places much emphasis on the separation of powers between the legislative and the executive authority (Lijphart, 2008:141). According to Anyebe (2016:1-2), the presidential system is characterised by: the political executive authority that has one chief executive responsible for exercising nominal and real authority; there is a distinct separation of powers among the legislative, executive and judiciary authority; and it has the ability to apply checks and balances on the three branches of government.

2.4.2.1 Advantages of the presidential system

The legislative, executive, and judiciary authority in the separation of powers is a constitutionally given authority and it is impossible to override the other two and transform one into a dictatorship;

It operates through a system of checks and balances. The power of the executive is, therefore, limited – it cannot exercise control over the legislature and judiciary;

The fixed terms of the president and legislatures ensures that the implementation of the policies of government is stable and continues effectively and efficiently;

Because of fixed dates and the regular intervals of elections, the possibility of toppling an administration is minimised. Elections are usually held every five years;

Under the presidential system, the president is elected for a fixed term of office directly by the people; this can enhance the stability of a government. In some instances, the president can be removed by impeachment or be recalled (Parreno, 2003:4).

2.4.2.2 Disadvantages of the presidential system

The legislative and executive authorities have to compete for legitimacy (Linz, 1990a:52);

The presidential system has a fixed term of office, which does not provide for modifications when needed (Linz, 1990a:52). In most cases there is no constitutional provision for an election before the term of office has passed (Gildenhuys, 2004:153);

The politics of the presidential system empowers the president to not tolerate opposition parties; it also encourages populist candidates (Linz, 1990a:52).

2.4.3 Comparison between the presidential and parliamentary systems

The presidential and parliamentary systems differ in terms of their decision-making process. There is a “highly decentralized decision-making process” in the presidential system because the president cannot depend on the majority of seats in parliament, while in a parliamentary system; there is “a highly centralized decision-making process” because it depends on the majority of parliament (Cheibub & Limongi, 2002:152). A presidential system has more stability than a parliamentary system in terms of controlling its economic and political conditions (Przeworski, Alvarez, Cheibub & Limongi, 2000:136). When dealing with the consequences of economic growth, a parliamentary system is more successful, while a presidential system has resistance to failures of the economy (Bernhard, Nordstrom & Reenock,

2001:777). Moreover, “Parliamentary systems are associated with superior governance” in economic and human development areas (Gerring *et al*. 2009:28).

A presidential system, unlike a parliamentary system, has a “divided government”, which allows for the possibility of continuous control of the legislative and executive branches of government by different parties. This means that both the legislative and executive authority will account for similar things (Samuels & Shugart, 2003:44). In a presidential system, even in times of legislative opposition, the executive remains in office as the legislative and executive branches enjoy the legitimacy of democracy from the citizens. In a parliamentary system, the executive must have the support of the legislative majority in order to survive their term of office; thus, making the legislative and executive branches mutually involved (Sartori, 1994:106-108).

According to Lijphart (1992:2-3), in a parliamentary system, the head of government depends on the confidence of the legislature to stay in power; whereas in a presidential system, the president has a fixed period to stay in power, which is normally five years. Moreover, in a presidential system, the voters directly elect the president, while in a parliamentary system, the head of government is designated by the political party or parties. Furthermore, the head of government and cabinet form the executive authority in a parliamentary system, and in a presidential system, the president is both a member of the legislature and the executive.

2.4.4 Semi-presidential system

The semi-presidential system is used by many countries and it is regarded as a mix of parliamentarism and presidentialism. It is often referred to as the French system (Verga, 2016). The semi-presidential system incorporates the parliamentary and presidential systems’ strong political system, while eliminating their flaws (Boban, 2011:13). Duverger (1980:166) states that in a semi-presidential system, “The president is elected for a fixed term by the majority and has significant authority. The prime minister and ministers that have the executive and governmental authority are opposite the president.” In this system, the prime minister and ministers will only stay in office if the parliament does not oppose it. The prime minister is capacitated with

the executive power and thus is responsible to the parliamentary majority (Lin, 2000).

In the semi-presidential system, “a popularly-elected, fixed-term president exists alongside a Prime Minister and cabinet who are responsible to parliament” (Elgie, 1999:13; Elgie, 2001:29). Sartori (1997:131-132) further outlines the criteria for a semi-presidential system as follows:

The president, who is the head of state, is directly or indirectly elected by popular vote for a fixed office term;

The president and the prime minister share the executive authority. This is referred to as a structure of dual authority whereby:

a) The president is independent from parliament but cannot govern directly or alone because the his/her wishes should be executed via his/her government;

b) The prime minister and the cabinet ministers are in need of parliamentary majority support; and

c) Dual authority allows for power shifting within the executive whereby the potential autonomy subsists in each executive unit.

Shugart and Carey (1992:24) articulate that in the semi-presidential system, the appointment and dismissal of ministers is in the authority of the president who, with his legislative powers, also dissolves the parliament. According to Canas (2004:96), the emergence of the semi-presidential system was to overcome the insufficiencies of the parliamentary and presidential systems. Chang (2014:4) states that the semi-presidential system’s consensus is based on the fixed term of the elected president as the constitutional authority and the prime minister who depends on the parliamentary majority vote of confidence.

In the semi-presidential system, the constitution safeguards the balance between the head of state, the government and parliament by ensuring mutual interaction between the three bodies of government (Canas, 2004:98-99). In the semi-presidential system, the elected president shares power with the government and the government should be responsible to the parliament. According to Shugart and Carey (1992:49-53), the semi-presidential system has the advantage that some of

the perils of presidentialism can be mitigated, which can lead to the enjoyment of some of parliamentarism's virtues.

In the semi-presidential system, the prime minister's survival in office depends on the confidence of the assembly and he/she can be dismissed in a no-confidence vote (Sartori, 1994:110; Linz, 1994:48-9; Duverger, 1997:137). Cohabitation is a feature of the semi-presidential system whereby the president may be from a party that has no representation in parliament, while the prime minister is from an opposition party (Elgie & McMenamin, 2010:1). According to Shyu (2000:1), cohabitation exists when one political party holds parliamentary majority seats and the executive power is given to the prime minister by the president with an agreement made by the majority party. Cohabitation is clearly outlined as a situation whereby:
The president and the prime minister are from different political parties (Samuels & Shugart, 2009:14; Elgie, 2010:45);
The political party of the president has no representation in cabinet (Samuels & Shugart, 2009:14; Elgie, 2010:45).

According to Elgie and McMenamin (2010:15), in the process of cohabitation, there is a tendency for the main political actors to work within the constitutional framework. Furthermore, there is a tendency of peaceful co-existence between the president and the prime minister (Chang, 2014:32). According to Elgie (2011:14), cohabitation is a power-sharing instrument that supports democracy in a semi-presidential system that gives both representatives an opportunity to share power. Cohabitation is associated with certain electoral interactions and a degree of power for the president in a country (Elgie & McMenamin, 2010:2).

The variables that differentiate between the types of cohabitation in a semi-presidential system are discussed below (Tsai, 2012:5-6):
Unilateral authority of the president, which constitutes the levers of the president that confront the prime minister who has control of the majority. The following forms of unilateral authority ensure that the president has a voice in policy-making:

a) decree power: assembly law establishment in lieu of action;
b) dissolution power: used as a weapon for the president and prime minister to turn down;

c) veto power: power that affects the legislation outcome. If the president does not have unilateral authority in a semi-presidential system, he is bound to be the prime minister's "second fiddle".

Cabinet composition as the prime minister's power operates as such:

a) if the cabinet is formed with only one party, the prime minister becomes the leader of the party;
b) if the coalition cabinet and the party of the prime minister obtained the dominant position; for example, in cabinet with the largest party, then the prime minister may be given more power if the coalition parties agree;
c) if the cabinet is made up of the coalition, each party shares parliamentary seats equally and the prime minister should share the executive powers proportionally with the parties that are in the coalition.

2.4.4.1 Advantages of the semi-presidential system

Division of labour because the head of state is the president, while the prime minister leads the government (Elgie & McMenamin, 2010);

The prime minister also acts as the checks and balances in government because some of the president's bureaucracy segments are taken away (Barrington, 2013:6);

There is no constitutional crisis when the prime minister is removed from office. Stability is maintained because of the fixed term of the president (Barrington, 2013:6).

2.4.4.2 Disadvantages of the semi-presidential system

Gridlock caused by dual leadership and cohabitation risk as there is accountability confusion (Elgie, 2007:57);

The possibility of a rift between the president and the prime minister could force paralysis of the executive (Fabbrini, 1995:133);

Dual legitimacy often results in policy conflicts between two democracy branches (Linz & Stepan, 1996:286).

2.5 Military intervention in a state

Military intervention is the unilateral or multilateral deployment of military troops in a state; usually the military uses its powers to influence the future of politics in a country (MacFarlane, 1983:53). A country can request military intervention to preserve its status. Fawole (1994) defines military intervention as follows: “A conscious act of removing government by soldiers with the aim of governing or influencing the country’s political affairs”. In theory, it can be argued that a country’s independence should bring stability, peace, and no military involvement in politics, but many African states have witnessed the military as an active dominant participant in politics. According to Ugwueze and Edeh (2014:2018), military intervention occurs when there is a state of emergency in a country and the military troops are deployed to maintain peace.

According to Mahmood (2016:91), the military’s role in a country is to ensure that there is protection of territorial boundaries and the country’s integrity, and that there is no foreign threat. Additionally, the military has the mandate to defend the state against political and public unrest and to render services when the country faces a crisis. Edmond (1998:200) states that the role of the internal security of the military deals with a post-colonial situation relating to political ambitions and struggles of power that lead to the breakdown of national unity and homogeneity.

Edmond (1998) further says that the military has less to do with maintaining law and order, and more to do with authority and influence. The military has the potential to further its own needs and not those of society at large (Edmond, 1998:62). Huntington (1956: 383) is of the opinion that the military is an instrument of the government to govern the country and therefore it should stay in its barracks unless there is permission to intervene. Huntington (1995:15) further attests to the fact that military intervention is a barrier in a stable democracy. When the military ensures the

safety of a state, it gains political and economic authority, which leads to political instability and social disorder of the state (Beeson & Bellamy, 2008:7).

Finer (1962:86-87) classifies military intervention using four levels:

Influence: In this case the military works behind closed doors and works with the authority of the civilians by deciding on policies that can endanger the state's interests;

Blackmail: The military works with the civilians' authority behind closed doors and if the military is strong enough the exploitation of the military increases;

Displacement: The removal of a particular setup of the civilians without removing the regime of the civilians because the military cannot defend the setup of the civilians against instability; and

Supplantment: Removes the civilian regime and replaces it with a military regime. This takeover can be with or without violence. It is called a "coup". A military coup is defined as the irregular transfer of the government authority by armed forces using force or threats (Deng, Deng, Deng & Jiménez, 2008:119).

2.5.1 Theories of military intervention

The three theoretical clusters of military intervention are the developmental, military-centric and synthetic approach:

Development approach

The developmental approach deals with the economic and socio-political conditions in a military intervention. Finer (1962:87) is of the opinion that the propensity for military intervention decreases when there is high public participation or social mobility, more especially when there is industrialisation. This approach deals with weak and ill-functioning political institutions, faced by high political participation demands from the public at large; this leads to military intervention.

Huntington (1968:195-196) states that military intervention in politics cannot be decreased by social mobility, but by civilian institutions' incompetence to meet rapid social mobility expectations. Huntington (1968:17-20) adds that in a complex political system, military intervention through coups is more difficult. Leaders' performance failure, which leads to the loss of legitimacy, causes the military to intervene in politics in order to restore peace and order (Nordlinger, 1977:86).

According to Putnam (1967:96), the characteristics of social mobilisation pertaining to the influence of the military are urbanisation, literacy rate, newspaper circulation, higher education, and the distribution of radio sets. In developing countries with a lower income, there is high chance of military intervention (Hopkins, 1966:175). Political development is a politicisation process whereby there are increased citizen participation activities of the state, calculations of power, and consequences (Riggs, 1963:139). Moreover, If the legitimacy of the state is more fragile, chances of military intervention are high (Kennedy, 1974:25). The military's political dominance can be overcome by a strong and stable civilian leadership.

Military-centric approach

In this approach, the military forces are characterised by organisation superiority, symbolic status that is highly emotionalised, and the army's monopoly (Finer, 1962:6). According to Kposowa and Jenkins (1993), divided militaries are likely to plot a coup d'état. Nordlinger (1977:64) states that military doctrine is domestically orientated, and when the army shows an interest in corporate investment, this may lead to a military coup d'état. The military's professionalism teaches them to not intervene in the political arena. Professional military usually have the lowest political power and professional army officers are always alert to assist civilians and ensure the state's legitimate authority (Huntington, 1957:84).

Synthetic approach

Military intervention occurs in divided and weak societies. The society's cultural diversity, ethnic supremacy and competition are regarded as problems that cause military intervention in a society (Jenkins & Kposowa, 1992:271-272). Morrison and Stevenson (1972:82-86) are of the opinion that if there is large cultural diversity, then there will be instability and a high chance of military intervention. Finer (1962:87)

articulates that in a society with a low political culture, the probability of military intervention is higher. A society that has a high political culture reduces the risks of military dominance when the moral right of the leader to govern and be obeyed and accepted by citizens; when a political system is recognised as authoritative; and, when public involvement in the civil institution is extensive and strong.

2.6 Summary

In conclusion it can be said that democratic governments are characterised by the separation of powers of the three organs of government as an essential prerequisite for democracy. It is important that these three abide and adhere to constitutional guidance in terms of their roles and responsibilities in a country. The legislative, executive and judiciary organs of state should maintain their autonomy, while not encroaching on one another to ensure proper checks and balances, and prevent the abuse of power. The doctrine of separation of powers protects citizens from the abuse of power by government. Strong accountability mechanisms and proper checks and balances ensure that the decision-making process is improved.

It is important for a democratic government to know and utilise the doctrine of separation of powers to ensure that all three branches of government are autonomous. In a parliamentary system, the legislative authority seems to contradict the principle of separation of powers because the members of cabinet are also members of parliament. Duverger (1980) initiated “semi-presidentialism” as a new system of democracy. A semi-presidential system is a mix of the presidential and parliamentary systems, and was introduced to correct their flaws. Finally, military intervention as a significant ideology in politics was also discussed.

Chapter 3

Theoretical framework of political parties and party system on democracy

3.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to discuss the literature that is applicable in exploring the role of political parties and party systems on democracy in Lesotho. Moreover, it will describe representative democracy, which is regarded as a mechanism that allows citizens to choose people who will represent them in parliament. In addition, political parties and party systems will be discussed. Political parties decide on a suitable candidate, who will be the legislator and executive official if elected. The democratic election, which provides citizens with an opportunity to elect their representatives who will have authority and be responsible to them, will be outlined. The electoral system, which promotes democratic governance and political stability, will also be examined. Lastly, the researcher will look at coalition governments, which give even small parties an opportunity to form a government.

3.2 Representative democracy

Harrison (1993:3) states that the word “democracy” originates from the Greek word *democratia,* which means “a political system whereby people with majority govern – not aristocrats”. Moreover, democracy comes from the words *demos* (meaning “the common people”) and *kratia* (meaning “power” or “rule”) (O’Neil, 1995:135).

According to Reitzes, Larsen and Fakir (2011:5), democracy is the governance system whereby there are fair and competitive elections, freedom of speech and association, freedom of expression, and representation that is effective and responsive to the citizens. Schumpeter (1943:269) defines democracy as a mechanism in which the opportunity is given to citizens to accept or refuse people who are to rule them. Hague and Harrop (2004:39) state that democracy is a political competition between political parties.

Moreover, Raadschelders (2003:98) says that democracy is the sovereignty of the state that is vested in the citizens; therefore, democracy is citizens' engagement in governance matters within a country. Dahl (1971:3) outlines the following conditions of democracy: elected officials; free, fair and frequent elections; freedom of expression; alternative sources of information; association autonomy; inclusive citizenship; political competition; and institutions that ensure a horizontal division of powers to hold government accountable.

Democracy designates citizens' ability to choose their representatives or leaders effectively. These leaders will make decisions that will affect the citizens that chose them (Bujra & Buthelezi, 2002:1). Democracy is a mechanism that is believed to give citizens an opportunity to choose their political, economic, social, and cultural systems (Makinda, 1996:557). Democracy is also known as "government of the people, by the people and for the people" (Patrick, 2006:6), which gives citizens direct power to participate in decision-making (Tshishonga & Mbambo, 2008:768).

According to Lindberg (2006:3), elections are the primary source of representative democracy. Representative democracy is seen in many democratic countries whereby elite group elections are capacitated with the authority to make decisions on behalf of the people who elected them (Catt, 1999:13). Additionally, the political regime is established in a representative democracy whereby elected elites, who make decisions on behalf of citizens, are subject to the citizens' verdict (Manin, 1997:175).

According to Verba (1999:238), the interests of people within a constituency are represented in a representative democracy. Representative democracy is mostly used in modern democratic governments whereby political leaders are mandated on behalf of citizens to make decisions and formulate laws (Klein, Kiranda & Bafaki, 2011:4). In non-democratic states, representative democracy is impossible without political parties that contest for state power (Matlosa, 2007:2). In terms of representative democracy, the elected representatives should signify the needs and views of citizens and should remain accountable to the electorate (Calland, 1999:62; Briand, 2007:5). Representative democracy is regarded as essential – and not as an

accessory – because it gives preference to the sovereignty of citizens. There are four components of representative democracy, namely:

- Citizens' expression of sovereignty in representative electoral appointments;
- Free representation;
- Ensuring representatives' responsiveness to citizens; and
- Political equality grounded by representation (Urbinati & Warren, 2008:389).

In a representative democracy, certain individuals are elected to represent the will of the citizens and this is done through public participation in the electoral process (Besley & Coate, 1997:106). Under representative democracy, public participation is assured because of the mandate representatives have in the constituency and citizens are the ones who elect representatives who are regarded as a source of power (Patrick, 2006:32).

3.3 Political parties and party systems

Michels (962:78) states that a political party is an organisation that fights in the world of politics. Maliyamkono and Kanyangolo (2003: 41) define a political party as an "association of people working together in an organised manner that compete for political office and have policies that guide them". Kuenzi and Lambright (2005: 423) are of the opinion that political parties are essential prerequisites for a democratic political system.

According to Robbins and Hunter (2011:12), political parties in a modern democracy are important because they allow citizens to be represented in public office. Political parties in a democratic government compete with each other through elections to gain power to rule the country. Sartori (1976: 63) defines a political party as "a group of people who are registered to stand for elections and produce candidates who can stand for public office". Weber (1947: 407), in turn, states that a political party's social relationship is whereby people obtain recruitment free. Sartori (1976:28) asserts that political parties serve as a communication mechanism between government and active civil societies. A political party is characterised by shared common "functions, structures and ideologies" (Salih, 2003: 68-69).

Moreover, a political party is a group of people who are organised and have the same opinions and aims that can influence public policy. They also elect a candidate to stand for public office (Likoti, 2005:1).Political parties are created by individuals who have mutual sets of beliefs and public policy mutual agreement in a self-conscious manner in determination to govern alone or with other political parties in coalition (Budge & Keman, 1990:10; Shively, 1999:224). Each political party has distinct features that make it different from other political parties (Ball, 1981:3). Orji (2013:1) is of the opinion that political parties play a vital role in examining a democracy's health in a democratic country; therefore, it is possible for a country to have a stable democracy (Kura, 2011:270).

Basedau (2007) asserts that political parties form a government or serve as the opposition in a political process. Political parties exist to assist politicians to win elections. According to Schattsneider (1942:1), there is no democracy without political parties in a country.

Political parties are very important because there was no party representation in the past and therefore there was no democratic government establishment (Linz and Stephan, 1996:4). Makara (2009:44) says that democracy cannot function without political parties because of the centrality of parties in the state's democratisation. According to Reitzes *et al*. (2011:11-19), the foundation of democracy is based on political parties because parties are major electoral participants. The political party is involved in a candidate's nomination, organises elections campaigns, and builds support among citizens while integrating different citizens' demands into policy (Norris, 2005:3).

Political parties are expected to form a government or be the opposition in a political process. The government makes policies in a country, sustains government electoral support, and ensures that government and political positions are filled. Opposition parties develop policy alternatives, ensure that they obtain electoral support when government changes, and ensure that competent candidates are trained (Matlosa, 2008:5). Political parties must aggregate the demands of citizens into comprehensive and clear political programmes (Sachikonye, 2005:2).

According to Sadie (2006:204), political parties educate people with vital political information regarding how to play the game of politics in a democracy, which includes the process of elections, participation of voters, and campaigning. Parties that control government (whether one party or a coalition of two or more) have the mandate to ensure political accountability and responsibility that enables citizens to know who to blame or who to give credit to in terms of the choices and outcomes of the government (Weissenbach, 2010:14). Opposition parties are capacitated with the authority to ensure that political accountability and responsibility from government is maintained in a democratic country. Political parties (whether in government or opposition) can foster democratic governance, but if they fail to perform their roles adequately, there will be little chance of democratic survival (Schrire, 2001:11). Ball (1981:4) opines that electorate guidance is given by political parties to ensure that the policies promised by candidates are pursued.

3.4 Functions of political parties

Political parties have the following functions:

- To make provision for choices to determine a suitable candidate who will be a legislator and executive official (Andrain & Apter, 1996:145).
- To encourage citizens to campaign and vote for their parties (Shively, 1999:227).
- To make provision for guiding the electorate regarding public policies that must be pursued by the candidate (Ball, 1981:4).
- To make provision for the recruitment and training of young leaders and entrust them with huge responsibility (Shively, 1999:227-229).
- To formulate and execute public policies in different branches of government (Andrain & Apter, 1996:145).

According to Joannou and Coetzee (2010:141), the numbers of functioning political parties within a country are referred to as party systems. Satori (1964:23) articulates that political parties, based on party systems, must meet the following criteria:

Government that is responsible, meaning that government must answer to parliament;

Election reality, as through elections the ruling government is placed in power by citizens through elections;
Political parties are established as a “system”, which allow for the different party systems that exist.

In different political parties, there are procedures and rules in place to execute a political party’s functions and activities, and to differentiate the roles of the political leaders and the followers (Boucek, 2013:3). Huntington (1968:426) argues that a party system’s historical background regarding power struggles determines its strength; therefore, a party system refers to a system “of interactions as a result of inter-party competition” (Sartori, 1976: 44). Another definition for party system is as follows: “The set of interactions that follow the same pattern and compete among different parties (Mainwaring & Scully, 1995: 4). Heywood (2002: 258) defines a party system as a “network of relationships” that compete for government power. The competition is electoral and political because different parties stand in elections to compete with each other (Lipson, 1953:358). Burchard (2004:6) states that a party system usually refers to many political parties, which take part in elections regularly.

The party system designates the interaction between many political parties, which compete among each other. Salih (2003:7) notes that in competitive political systems, political parties are the link between the government and the party system, and between society and the government. In order to fully understand party systems, Sartori (1976:43) and Pennings and Lane (1998:8) point out that the party system should have the following:
There must be more than one party in a party system in order to ensure competition between the different parties;
Party systems involve the political parties within the state; and
There must be inter-play continuity of interactions between elections.

According to Urbinati and Warren (2008:389), representative democracies are characterised by four features, namely:
Demarcated constituencies on a territorial basis elected the representatives who act on their interests in the legislature by separating the legitimate power sources from those who have authority to exercise power;

Electoral representation establishes people's sovereignty in state power;

Some measure of people's responsiveness by representatives and political parties who speak and act in their name is enforced by the electoral mechanisms, thereby holding their representatives accountable for their actions;

Electoral representation and political equality are endowed by the universal franchise, which demonstrates the citizens are political equals.

3.5 Party systems types

Roberts (2005:23) articulates that voters are important in a party system because political parties are able to achieve their stability by creating long-term relationships with voters. A party system is a mechanism to ensure that political parties are responsive to the needs of voters. In modern politics, the major party systems found are one-party, dominant party, two-party, and multi-party systems (Heywood, 1997:241).

3.5.1 One-party system

According to Nacif (2006:92), the one-party system is one political party ruling, which maintains its power monopoly among competitors. In a one-party system, there is only one political party that is legal and can stand for election. Heywood (2007:283) states that the one-party system is characterised by a monopoly of power, while other political parties are excluded. Thus, one party stays in power permanently as it is legally authorised and there is no political competition. The party can be regarded as democratic only when members can compete freely when offering the political party ideas and policies. A one-party system is usually regarded as a dictatorship system. The evolution of the one-party system was due to the legacy of colonial rule and African leaders' political culture (Okoth, 2006:239).

In a one-party system, the role of parliament is limited in terms of approving executive proposals, instead of monitoring executive performance (Brady & Bullock, 1983:8). The electoral results in a one-party system are constant and competition-free (Arian & Barnes, 1974:613). According to Salih and Nordlund (2007:44-45), the one-party system has two categories, namely: “de jure” and “de facto”. A “de jure” single-party state is where there is only one political party in the country that is legally allowed by the constitution. A “de-facto” single party state is one where “ruling parties gained and kept monopoly of power and dominated all branches of government but the constitution promulgated and mandated the political parties”.

3.5.1.1 Advantages of the one-party system

Mungazi and Walker (1997:85) are of the opinion that some Southern African leaders favour the one-party system because of the following reasons:
There is national unity in the one-party system;

The one-party system is in line with African culture and social practices;

Using the multi-party system is seen as adopting Western ways and it is expensive;

The multi-party system makes it impossible to provide solutions for the development of the nation because the opposition opposes everything and conflict erupts often.

Duverger (1967:257-262) outlines the characteristics and benefits of the one-party system as follows:
Bond and elite, which unite and shape the political leader for the whole country; and
Contact between government and citizens are direct and permanent.

3.5.1.2 Disadvantages of the one-party system

The link between the state and civil societies is reduced in the one-party state. This is because civil societies are silenced by the ruling party (Thomson, 2004:112);

There are no peaceful mechanisms to solve conflict as one party controls the state (Thomson, 2004:112); and

The one-party system leads to authoritarian governments; and
No democracy consisting of only one party is legal.

3.5.2 One party dominance

Duverger (1959:308-309) defines the dominant party as the party that has "superior influence". Sartori (1976:30), in turn, defines the one-party-dominant system as a system whereby one party wins elections for three consecutive terms and gains a comprehensive majority of seats. Moreover, in this system, the opposition exists and free and fair elections are held periodically, but a rotation of party in government does not occur (Sartori, 1976:205). Thus, uncompetitive elections, which are fair and which are held, but only one party wins elections continuously (Langeran, 2010:1). Pempel (1990:3-4) regards dominant party as a party that has to the significant dimensions that are operating in competitive environment. Matlosa and Karume (2004:10) state that the dominant party system is a system whereby, despite the existence of multiple parties, only one party is in control of the state for a long period. The dominant party is characterised as dominant when it has the following characteristics:

- It has the dominant number of votes and seats electorally;
- It stays in power for a long period and has bargaining position;
- It is governmentally dominant to determine the public policy agenda (Dunleavy, 2010:4).

Thus, one-party dominance is a competitive multi-party system whereby one party and political competition dominate government. It determines the opinion of the public without the use of repression by the government. Cox (1997:238) defines dominant parties as parties that stay in government repeatedly after free and fair elections are held. This is normally one party or a coalition senior party. Friedman (1999:99) defines the one-party dominant system as a "democracy whereby elections take place regularly and parties of opposition have freedom to express their interests and their civil liberties". Joannou (2008:23) is of the opinion that the dominant party is in control of the political game in that it has the ability to define the permissible and impermissible.

3.5.2.1 Advantages of the party dominant system

Enhancement of legitimacy and stability in a democratic government to secure the environment of politics (Spies, 2009:152); and

Political institutions and systems can be damaged because the dominant party system usually uses the state resources to ensure that they have maximum support of the people, thereby reducing competition among other parties (Simkins, 1990:50).

3.5.2.2 Disadvantages of the party dominant system

Opposition members usually have a limited number of seats in parliament. This hinders their negotiation capacity;

Opposition parties are usually unproductive and fragile because the government institutions are tools that are used by the ruling party (Assefa, 2010:165);

This system promotes and develops power arrogance; therefore, it is impossible to respond to citizens' demands (IDEA, 2007:51); and

Dominant parties dominate the legislature and this could lead to a monopoly of the law-making process, which only promotes the dominant party's interests (Salih & Nordlund, 2007:51)

3.5.3 The two-party system

According to Duverger (1959:215), the two-party system allows a choice of two different political parties. This system is characterised by two competing parties in parliament and they have an equal chance to win a majority to form a government and to dominate the legislature (Mair, 1990:420). Two-party systems are regarded as a kind of winner-takes-all system because the party that comes second receives no rewards. According to IDEA (2007:46), the two-party system has the following characteristics:

- Legislative and electoral strength to win government power are enjoyed by only two parties, although there may be other minority parties;
- The major party rules alone while the minority parties become the opposition; and
- There is an alternative between parties, as both can be elected.

Duverger (1959:217) opines that the two-party system is usually used by the simple majority, which utilises the single ballot system. Sartori (1976:185-192) says that under the two-party system, the voters have an alternative to choose one party as their government and the other as the opposition party. According to Yadav (2014:19), majority voting, known as the first-past-the-post (FPTP) system, supports two-party system processes. It should be noted that in the two-party system, there may be other small political parties that also contest for elections but they usually do not have the capacity to govern on their own. In this system, the stable macro-economy is maintained and it has a good long-term record (Haggard & Kaufman, 1995:356).

3.5.3.1 Advantages of the two-party system

A direct benefit is that the voters have two alternative sets of public policies;

An indirect benefit is that the two parties compete for voters in the spectrum of politics and, therefore, have to advocate for centric policies;

It can form a stable single party cabinet and have effective policy-makers; and

It can have a stable government and strong political power (Lijphart, 2012:61-62).

3.5.3.2 Disadvantages of the two-party system

There are limited choices for citizens. Therefore, it is unlikely to have a stable government, especially regarding decision-making when the parties cannot find common ground on different issues (Spagnoli, 2003:383).

The effective representation of citizens is compromised (Schraufnagel, 2011:229).

3.5.4 The multi-party system

In a multi-party system, there are a number of political parties that manage to obtain representation in the legislature. This usually results in the formation of a coalition government (Hague & Harrop, 2007:248). Winter and Bellows (1992:160) state that in a multi-party system, there are three or more political parties that enjoy electoral support from the voters. Moreover, several political parties that contest for elections usually divide the popular support for power (Sadie, 2006:216). According to Powell (1982:108), a multi-party system is usually characterised by less stable governments. In this system, the political parties share power among the many political parties that are in government (Brady & Bullock, 1983:607). The political parties are encouraged to participate in parliament. According to Yadav (2014:19), proportional voting, known as the proportional representation (PR) system, supports the multi-party system. Basedau (2007:116) states that a multi-party system is "fragmented to ensure the stability of government and opposition".

According to Ranney and Willmoore (1954:482), a multi-party system emerges when political parties have the following criteria:

- Three or more parties share the majority of votes and public office.
- No one party has won an absolute majority.

In the multi-party system, the government usually forms a coalition because the political parties cannot win elections on their own. Multi-party elections in Africa hardly have a high fragmentation of parties, but rather have one dominant party emergence (Erdmann & Basedau, 2007: 8). According to Doorenspleet (2003:185), democracy functions well if there is election competition between two or more parties; therefore, a multi-party system is necessary for democracy.

3.5.4.1 Advantages of the multi-party system

Better representation as many political parties take part in the elections and thus citizens have different political choices. This allows citizens to choose a leader that will possibly represent them in parliament and minority parties have a chance to gain seats in parliament (Doorenspleet, 2003:185).

Multiple political parties get an opportunity to stand for elections and differing opinions are represented (Doorenspleet, 2003:185).

3.5.4.2 Disadvantages of the multi-party system

Political instability, due to fragile coalitions, which leads to the possibility of early elections; and

A large party may need to form a coalition government with a small party; therefore, the small party gains concession on important matters (Barrington, 2013:264).

3.6 Democratic elections

Democracy provides citizens with the opportunity to elect their representatives who will have authority and responsibility (Aubynn, 2007:77). Elections are defined by Pitkin (1967:234) as a mechanism to put individuals in office and as a democratic mechanism that allows citizens to participate in political decision-making through their representatives. An election is the process of electing the leaders in the

country. Elections thus allow candidates to participate in the contest for a leader's recruitment (Aubynn, 2007:77).

Matlosa (2004:20) states that elections are vital elements in the transformation of a democracy and a democratic election's value can be enriched or condensed by the electoral system type used. Moreover, elections are a mechanism that allows citizens to decide how state resources will be allocated in the future (Hoglund, 2009:419). Democratic elections should have the following prerequisites: firstly, the involvement of people in having a choice of electing the candidate they prefer; secondly, conditions of political surroundings; and lastly, the election results in terms of power structure should be accepted by the participants at large (Nohlen, 2010:2).

The transition to democracy is characterised by electoral competition that occurs in a manner that is free and fair and acceptable to all (Bratton & Van De Walle, 1997:194). The African Union (AU) (2002) clearly stipulates that democratic elections should be conducted in the following manner:

- They should be free and fair.
- Under a democratic constitution and at regular intervals that comply with the country's legal instruments.
- Under the separation of powers system that allows for the independence of the judiciary.
- By an impartial and accountable electoral institution that has well-trained personnel.

According to Powel (2000:4), elections are instruments that are crucial in encouraging policy makers to give attention to citizens. Additionally, elections are the mechanism citizens use to participate in the political process in a low-cost manner (Axter & Rosamond, 1997:132). According to Ball (1993:122), elections allow the citizens to choose their representatives using their intelligence and discretion.

Democratic elections should deepen and consolidate political stability and democratic governance (Matlosa, 2003:98). For representative democracy, the votes of the citizens must be equal and elections must be held periodically (Kapa,

2003:70). The election legal framework should not be discriminatory; thus, societal groups should not be marginalised and it must include minorities, vulnerable groups, people with disabilities, people displaced internally, and women (IDEA, 2002:6).

Secret ballot voting is necessary in democratic elections for the voters to anonymously elect the candidate of their choice and to avoid manipulation. Moreover, ballot papers in democratic elections are designed in such a way that the voters do not show their handwriting, thereby ensuring that it is not traceable. The marking and casting of ballot papers should be done in voting booths so that voting is done in secret. There are, however, exceptions, for example illiterate voters, people with disabilities and the elderly (ODIHR, 2010:23).

In essence, elections are a mechanism that ensures political conflicts are resolved and a hierarchy of political priorities is formed in search of solutions (Bernard, 1991:180).

3.6.1 Functions of elections

The functions of elections are as follows:

- They provide a systematic mechanism that recruits and selects individuals who will represent citizens in parliament (Matlosa, 2002:5). The political representative delegation gives permission to voters to elect their own representative who will secure their needs and demands (Zukowski, 2004:16);
- They review government records periodically to assess their mandate and replace them with an alternative, if one is needed (Matlosa, 2002:5);
- They mandate and accord the legitimacy of the elected government with the title to rule (Matlosa, 2002:5);
- They are instruments of political socialisation and integration; thus, giving the country a unifying focus (Matlosa, 2002:5);
- They change governments, or renew or extend the ruling government (Kapa, 2003).

3.6.2 Elements of elections

There are three elements in the election process that will be discussed below:

Participation

According to Linberg (2004:65), the key aspect that empowers citizens is participation – whether direct or through voting. Lijphart (1997:111) states that voter registration is used to measure citizen participation in the election process. Additionally, citizens can participate in politics through their political parties. In addition, opposition party participation assists in measuring participation and equality in legislative elections (Linberg, 2006:108).

Legitimacy

Legitimacy is regarded as the behaviour of different political contestants and voters within the state in accepting the outcome of elections. Denial of outcomes results in electoral conflicts (Linberg, 2006:34). Therefore, if the outcomes of elections are accepted in a peaceful manner by all participants (even those that lost the elections), then they are regarded as legitimate (Linberg, 2006:44).

Competition

Electoral competition offers the voters a choice of representatives, which results in vote sharing and the allocation of parliamentary seats between political parties (Linberg, 2004:101). According to Norris (2012:2), there is a global diffusion of electoral competition.

3.6.3 Election violence

Election violence is defined as “organised and random behaviour that can harm physically, blackmail, threaten or abuse political stakeholders to influence the process of elections” (Fischer, 2002:4). If the violence takes place between the official announcement of election results and the inauguration of the new government, it is called “post-election violence”. Violence can be perpetrated by the

military or police, political parties, rebel groups, and parliamentary groups (Hoglund, 2010:416). According to Hoglund (2010:418), violence usually occurs when the party that lost the election is not satisfied with the election results. Hoglund (2009:2) outlines the conditions that trigger electoral violence as:

- The political nature within the society;
- The nature of the election competition; and
- Electoral institution incentives.

Khadiagala (2010:17) postulates that a country could face electoral violence because of electoral rules that are not perfect, and/or election manipulation due to rigging and buying of votes by parties. Electoral violence thus contributes to the future stability of the creation and evolution of constitutional rules. Dunning (2011:330) states that election violence is characterised by street protests and riots when there is insufficiency to maintain power after elections. Political parties commit violence when they fear exclusion from the future government. If the opposition parties believe that the election was rigged, violent action usually occurs (Ellman & Wantchekon, 2000:499-511). This leads to opposition parties violently protesting against the election winners to remove them from power and, in most cases, they are killed, which leads to fear of the opposition (Hafner-Burton, Hyde & Jablonski, 2010:29). Moreover, the state departments and forces that are controlled by the ruling party react to the protests by punishing members of the opposition.

According to Sobek (2010:265), weak states have no means of preventing violence from happening and those who commit violence often go unpunished. Hoglund (2009:413) states that if violent actions cost less than the cost of losing an election, violent action will occur. Losing elections is regarded as losing access to state power and benefits as a political party or parties form the government after winning elections and followers are rewarded for their votes (Durant & Weintraub, 2013:4). Sisk (2008:16) is of the opinion that the people who lose state power are often tempted to commit fraud to secure state access. Ellman and Wantchekon (2000:511) further assert that a violent government silences the opposition to ensure that it will function as usual. Fox and Hoeschler (2010:5) opine that poverty forces individuals to resort to violence in order to secure state resources.

3.7 Electoral system

The electoral system expresses the citizens' choice of leaders, which translates into parliamentary seats (De Ville & Steytler, 1999:1). Nohlen (1996:20) postulates that the rules are determined by the electoral system, according to the voters' expression of political preferences, which converts votes into parliamentary seats or government posts. Morgenstern and Vázquez-D'Elía (2007:145) define the electoral system as follows: "A set of rules that regulate the electoral competition and outline the guidelines on how candidates can compete in elections and translates votes into positions of government".

The electoral system is vital in governance because it outlines the manner in which citizens cast their votes in elections, which are translated into seats in parliament. Electoral systems are multifaceted and different countries use identical systems. Reynolds, Reilly and Ellis (2008: 5) assert that the electoral system is regarded as a political institution that can manipulate government systems in a positive or negative way. Electoral systems determine the number of political parties and citizens' interests in politics. According to Menocal (2011:3), the electoral system is important because of the following reasons:

- It has a positive impact on the degree of coherence with regards to government effectiveness and the party system;
- It assists in easing conflict; and
- It assists in shaping the outcomes of public policy outcomes and political actors' structural behaviour.

The electoral system is the aggregation of the voters' preferences, converting them into election results (Horowitz, 2003:2). Reynolds (2007:42) defines the electoral system as the tools used by people to make decisions regarding selection in large societies. This selection is done because not every citizen can be involved in the decision-making process that affects the community. The electoral system is regarded as a set of rules that determine how the elections in a country should be conducted and the combinations of rules and regulations that govern the electoral choices of the voters (De Ville & Steytler, 1999:1). Moreover, it regulates and

outlines who can vote, who has the right to be elected, the date of the election, and how campaigning for the election should be financed and conducted.

Matlosa (2004:21) states that the choice of electoral system is important for the credibility of the electoral process, election outcome acceptance, and the legitimacy of law. Electoral systems construct political game rules by outlining the candidates to be elected and who will govern (IDEA, 2015). Blanc, Hylland and Vollan (2006) state the following criteria an electoral system should meet:

It supports accountability of the elected members: Representatives are monitored continuously by the citizens until the next election to ensure that the promises made during the election campaign are met.

It supports stable governments: Voters should be given an opportunity to say how the government should govern;

It gives equal weight to each voter: Voters should not feel discriminated against so as to avoid tension in society, thereby causing conflict in the future.

It creates representative assemblies: The citizens' interests should be represented and the elected body should ensure that it responds to citizens' needs.

It should be simple for the voters: The voters should understand how the system works in order for them to cast their votes with ease.

It should be simple for the election administration: The system should reflect the available election administration capacity, especially regarding limited financial and human resources.

It should be generally accepted by the parties and the public: The rules should be simple and understood by the electorate. The necessary resources for the election administration should be reasonable (Procházková, 2016:48-49).

It should promote conciliation among different groups: In the electoral rules, which are highly complex, a good electoral system acts as a conflict management tool (Taagepera, 2002:257). Parties can contribute to inclusiveness if they are given an opportunity for the broad support of political values and programmes (Reynolds *et al.,* 2005).

The electoral system ensures that the government is continuously responsive and accountable to the citizens, as this is regarded as vital to democratic rule (Bormann & Golder, 2013). Reynolds (1999:5) asserts that the electoral system adds value to democracy by exchanging views between the government and citizens by allowing the expression of voters' opinions in order for members of parliament to be accountable. An electoral system shapes a government's nature, the voters' choices during elections, holds representatives accountable, and addresses the parliament's composition (Gallagher & Mitchell, 2005:2).

The goals of alternative electoral systems can be evaluated using the following criteria (Horowitz, 2003:3):

Easy to understand and administer

It is vital that citizens understand the electoral system because it is used to elect their representatives (Benoit, 2004:371). It must be easy to administer and understand because if it is difficult to vote, then the elections will be pointless. Benoit (2004) asserts that in order to ensure that voting is easy, the ballot paper must be user-friendly and designed in such a way that a voter can easily cast his/her vote. Moreover, the resources of the country are taken into consideration in order to employ an alternative electoral system, such as the finances and skills to administer elections;

Accountability to constituents

According to Hix, Johnston and McLean (2010:108), members of parliament should represent citizens' views as well as promote their interests concerning their issues and concerns. This will help the voters to hold the members of parliament accountable and ensure that they do not vote for them in future elections if they fail to deliver on the promised services;

Proportionality of seats to votes

The election results' proportionality votes ensure that the share of votes will correspond to the share of seats for a party. The society's representation must be reflected in the parliament through different political parties or independent candidates with representation (Reynolds *et al.,* 2005:5). If the majoritarian electoral

system is used, then the minorities in society will be underrepresented. If proportional representation is used, minority parties gain representation in parliament (Norris, 2003:6);

Interethnic or intercultural conciliation

According to Alonso and Ruiz (2005:1), an electoral system is a mechanism for conflict management that establishes society's governing bodies. Interethnic conciliation cannot be fostered by electoral systems that create accountability and proportional results. Instead, conciliatory behaviour can be fostered by a system that allows for the achievement of regional distribution of candidates, in addition to plurality. Furthermore, post-electoral conciliation will be difficult to achieve if politicians can be elected without behaving moderately (Horowitz, 2003:5-6);

Effective parliament or opposition oversight

For the government to be effective, it should rely on those in power and those in opposition (Newman, 2006:6). The electoral system helps opposition parties to assess legislation and ensures that minority rights in the constituency are represented. Thus, the opposition's strength is derived from the electoral system;

Stable and efficient government

A stable and effective government is determined by many factors, such as the fairness of the system for citizens, effective legislation enactment by government, and ensuring that the system does not discriminate against certain parties or interest groups (Newman, 2006:6). This implies that the system should maintain its neutrality towards candidates and parties;

Minimise wastage of votes

Newman (2006:6) states that votes are disregarded or wasted in a situation where the losing candidate received cast votes. This is because some voters prefer not to participate in the elections because they know their candidate will not win, which leads to a reduction in voter turnout (Milner, 1997).

3.7.1 Types of electoral systems

There are many electoral systems used worldwide, with little agreement on which system promotes democratic governance and political stability (Reynolds, 1999:91). Most countries are governed by representatives who are chosen by citizens through elections and an electoral system guarantees the conversion of votes into representative seats in parliament.

For this research, the electoral systems are categorised into plurality/majority systems, proportional representation systems, and mixed systems. First-Past-the-Post (FPTP) will be discussed under plurality/majority systems, Proportional Representation will be discussed under Proportional Representation (PR) systems, and lastly, the Mixed Member Proportional (MMP) which uses mixed electoral system (Reynolds, Reilly & Ellis, 2005:30).

3.7.1.1 The First-Past-the-Post (FPTP) System

The Westminster-style First-Past-the-Post (FPTP) is an electoral system used all over the world and it was introduced to Lesotho by Britain (Molomo, 2004:118). In this electoral system, each candidate competes in single-member districts (SMDs) and the candidate with more votes wins. Each electoral constituency won by the party returns to parliament. Blais (2008:7) says FPTP is used worldwide (by at least 43% of the world's countries). Usually there must be equal constituencies divided among the country and each constituency must elect one representative to parliament who should be held accountable by the constituency. Moreover, the political party elects a candidate to stand for the constituency, but once the candidate is elected, he/she stands as an individual with his/her own rights; this could lead to disputes and infighting in a political party. This, in turn, could lead to division in the political party and the formation of a new political party. Additionally, the candidate contesting in any constituency has the capacity to safeguard the simple plurality votes and not the majority of votes, and this leads to winners by minority (Matlosa, 2000:6).

According to Kadima (2000), this was seen in Botswana's 1999 and Lesotho's 1998 elections where the outcome of 46% and 40% respectively were ignored. The FPTP system permits a dominant party to win all the votes cast, thereby creating a minority government. However, in reality, there may be people who did not vote for the winning party and therefore, the fraction of the people who did not vote for the winning party will not be represented in parliament.

This was seen in the elections in Lesotho when the LCD won 78 of the 79 constituencies (Southall, 2003:288). According to Reynolds *et al.* (2005:28), in FPTP, each constituency has a winner in the candidate who wins the majority of the votes and the party that wins the majority of the seats governs the country until the next elections.

According to Molokomme (2000), the FPTP system does not advocate for increased gender equality and the participation of women in politics. The FPTP system, however, does provide power to the coherent opposition legislature, allowing it to act as a system of checks and balances to the government (Reynolds, *et al.*, 2008:28). Blanc, Hylland and Vollan (2006:48) assert that the winners in the FPTP system are representatives who have strong regional ties and represent the citizens' interests at national level, which leads to high accountability in their performance.

According to Nohlen (2010:39), FPTP does not give the small parties an opportunity to have parliamentary seats as they have few voters. The proportional electoral system is associated with minority and women representation due to the choice of electoral system (Bowler, Donovan & Brockington, 2003:7).

3.7.1.1.1 Advantages of the FPTP system

Election results and the winner are acknowledged and the party with more seats forms the government.

The power is vested in the largest minority (Britain, 2008:18).

It uses easy to use ballot papers, which makes counting of ballot papers easy.

The winner-takes-all principle encourages other parties to gain more mobility and work hard in the next elections (Britain, 2008:27).

3.7.1.1.2 Disadvantages of the FPTP system

It encourages many wasted votes because the votes cast for the candidates who lost the elections are not considered. This may lead to political parties forming based on religion or ethnic group (Reynolds & Reilly, 1997:29).

The system can be manipulated by the electoral boundaries (Reynold & Reilly, 1997:31).

Without the majority of the popular vote, the government can be elected into power and obtain majority seats.

Small parties with insufficient representation are excluded from parliament (Britain, 2008:28).

3.7.1.2 The Proportional Representation (PR) system

The Proportional Representation (PR) system is another electoral system that allocates representative bodies seats in terms of the votes received by the political parties and individual candidates. This is done to avoid inequality, thereby sharing the parliamentary seats and national votes (Reilly & Reynolds, 1999:21). The importance of the PR system is the translation of a party's share regarding the votes obtained into a consistent and reliable proportion of parliamentary seats. This system uses the closed party list system (Lijphart, 1994:10). In proportional representation, the voters cast only one vote. The seats are then allocated proportionally between the parties according to their total votes. Hendricks (2005: 67) states that the PR system is good for facilitating the proliferation of parties and allowing candidate diversity to ensure electoral competition. Mattes and Southall (2003:52) view the PR

system as a mechanism that allows competing political parties to cooperate and reconcile in order to work together. Moreover, in the PR system, parties that have insufficient votes manage to gain representation in parliament (Moses, 2012:1).

According to Britain (2008:17), the PR system implies that due to proportionality, a representation of small parties is seen in parliament and multi-member constituencies whereby there is one or more representative in office. The PR system promotes the representation of women and minority parties. In single member districts, the "lowest-common-denominator candidates," which are males, are nominated (Reynolds, 1999). According to Sobolewska (2013:622), the anti-minority voting behaviour discourages the nomination of minorities by leaders of parties, which leads to women being excluded from party lists (Matland, 1993:738). Thus, parties usually only do minority nominations if they will make them win seats (Soininen, 2011:161).

3.7.1.2.1 Advantages of the PR system

Few votes are wasted as the votes cast are accurately translated into seats and all votes elect the candidates chosen by the voters (Reynolds & Reilly, 1997:62).

People's election choices are increased because of the parliamentary proportional allocation of seats as minority parties can be represented in parliament (Britain, 2008:18).

Increased chances of a coalition government whereby any political party, regardless of its share of votes or size, can be part of the government (Britain, 2008: 18).

Better election chances for minority groups and more women are elected (Reynolds & Reilly, 2002).

3.7.1.2.2 Disadvantages of the PR system

The system often results in the formation of coalition governments.

It is difficult to make urgent decisions when the coalition government partners do not work together (Reynolds & Reilly, 1997:65).

The position of the candidate depends entirely on the leader of the political party. The system vests greater authority and decision-making in the leader of the party (Gallagher & Mitchell, 2005:420).

There is little room for independent candidates because the parties have too much power (Reynolds & Reilly, 2002).

3.7.1.3 The Mixed Member Proportional (MMP) system

The mixed member electoral system is defined as "system in which voters elect a candidate in a single-member district and party in a proportional representation contest" (Moser & Scheiner, 2012:xvi-xvii). In this system, members of parliament are chosen using the FPTP system and the party in the proportionality of seats allocated to parties. According to Shugart and Wattenberg (2001:9), the MMP system guarantees that half of legislative seats are elected in single-seat districts and the other half of the seats are elected from party lists allocated by proportional representation (PR).

The mixed electoral system is a combination of plurality/majority and PR (Gallagher & Mitchell, 2005:591; Reynolds, 2006:1; Likoti, 2009:58). PR seats are dependent on the result of the plurality/majority and each country utilises its own proportional seats. For example, in Lesotho, the candidates compete for 80 constituency seats using the FPTP, while the remaining 40 are for PR compensatory seats. The constitution of Lesotho was amended in 2001 to include the MMP system, with a ratio of 80:40 (thus, FPTP:PR respectively).

The MMP system allows for two-party competition in Single Member Districts (SMDs) and multi-party competition under PR (Duverger, 1954). Shugart (2001:26) is of the opinion that the candidates in SMDs have the mandate to ensure that politicians and voters have good relationships, as well as to ensure that vote cohesion remains high. According to Molomo (1999), Lesotho uses the MMP system, which was enacted because there was one-party dominance in the SMDs.

It is vital that election contestants have an equal opportunity in the electoral system. Lesotho uses only one ballot paper for its elections. The district candidate is elected and then there is aggregation of district votes to allocate the PR seats. The voters indirectly vote for PR seats and, therefore, there cannot be a split between SMDs and PR tiers in terms of votes. Likoti (2007:3) states that the adoption of the MMP system was done to ensure that the country entered an era of democratic consolidation whereby all parties would have representation in parliament.

According to Moser and Scheiner (2004: 578), the MMP system has the following features: two tiers linkage; each tier ratio seats; rules of SMDs' seat allocation; and PR tier district magnitude. The PR tier determines each party's allocation of seats, while the SMDs select the candidates to fill the seats. Thus, proportional seats depend on the FPTP results, as they are compensatory seat disproportionalities (Blanc, *et al.,* 2006: 59). For example, the party that gets 20% of the votes at national level, without district majoritarian seats, is given up to 20% of the PR seats in the legislature.

3.7.1.3.1 Advantages of the MMP system

It creates parliamentary representatives because of the proportionality allocation of seats, even to minority parties (Reynolds *et al.,* 2005:95).

Only a few votes are wasted as votes are accurately translated into seats and all votes elect the candidate chosen by the voters (Reynolds & Reilly, 1997:62).

A better election chance for minority groups and more women are elected (Reynolds & Reilly, 2002).

The people's election choices are increased because of the parliamentary proportional allocation of seats so that minority parties can be represented in parliament (Britain, 2008:18).

3.7.1.3.2 Disadvantages of the MMP system

The delimitation of a boundary is required, which makes room for gerrymandering and the system is complicated to understand.

Voting strategies are used because voters may ignore small parties they fear will obtain threshold seats under the PR allocation.

The position of the candidate depends entirely on the leader of the political party. The system vests great authority and decision-making in the leader of the party (Gallagher & Mitchell, 2005:420).

There is little room for independent candidates because the parties have too much power (Reynolds & Reilly, 2002).

3.8 Coalition governments

According to Karume (2003), a coalition government is the process whereby different political parties form a government because they have mutual goals. A coalition government is defined as a "set of legislators from different political parties that vote together and hold one cabinet" (Cheibub, Przeworski & Saiegh, 2004). A grand coalition is whereby political party leaders work together to govern the country and minority parties can also take part in the government (Lijphart, 1977: 25-30).

Lijphart (2008:20-81) asserts that a coalition government works best in the parliamentary system because cabinet ministers have equal executive power. Usually, a coalition government is formed due to the absence of a dominant party that can obtain majority seats in the legislature (Oyugi, 2006:54).

It should be noted that coalitions could be formed before or after the elections with the aim of forming a government. The classical coalition is formed to achieve a parliamentary majority, and a consociational coalition is implemented to prevent political crises in divided societies. Both classical and consociational coalitions are formed to consolidate diverse socio-political conditions within the state (Majeed, 2000:3).

3.8.1 Classical coalition governments

Political parties resort to forming a coalition government because they want to attain a parliamentary majority. Thus, a classical coalition government is suitable for political parties and elite leaders in order to obtain a parliamentary majority (Oyugi, 2006:53). According to Golder (2006:195), a pre-electoral coalition may exist whereby two or more political parties form an alliance before the elections. In most cases, they will decide which party will stand for the election in a certain constituency to avoid competing against each other. The voters are informed beforehand. A coalition government is used as a tool that can re-establish democratic governance in countries due to conflicts that occur in plural societies. This cooperation of political parties to win elections also helps them to win a parliamentary majority (Oyugi, 2006:53).

3.8.2 Consociational coalition governments

The coalition government theory is derived from divided societies in a consociational democracy. Therefore, consociational coalition governments usually safeguard the stability of groups in a society that is deeply divided (Lijphart, 2005:31). In this type of coalition government, the interests and demands of diverse groups in society can be met by means of a power-sharing framework and provide the formation of a grand coalition government, group autonomy, and proportional representation. According to

Norris (2008:23), power sharing ensures sustainable democracy and peace settlements that last, as well as state power that is shared by all groups within the society. Lijphart (2008:29) is of the opinion that joint efforts by the elites to stabilise the system is vital in a consociational coalition.

3.9 Summary

The political party's growth and the party system acquisition mark the political arena. Political parties are crucial for a democratic country because citizens are mandated with the opportunity to choose their government through these parties during elections. This chapter reviewed political parties and party systems theories. The distinction was made between the one-party system, the two-party system, the multi-party system, and the dominant party system.

Elections allow citizens to participate in decision-making and give legitimacy to leaders. The MMP system is recommended in certain countries, as it is believed to minimise wasted votes, as small parties are given the opportunity to be represented in parliament. The voters are given an opportunity to vote for the candidate and party of their choice, and therefore party dominance of large parties is minimised. This leads to a minority government whereby a coalition government will have to be formed as coalition usually occurs in PR electoral systems, which sometimes lead to unstable government (Miljan & Alchin, 2018:23).

Elections ensure political competition between different political parties and individual candidates; thus they have to communicate effectively with the citizens. Elections also ensure the stability of a democratic system when they are conducted in a free and fair manner. A coalition government formation, which arises because of the absence of a dominant party so as to obtain the majority of the seats in the legislature, was also discussed.

Chapter 4

Political background of Lesotho

4. 1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to outline and present the political background of Lesotho. Democracy in Lesotho has been characterised by major problems since it gained dependence from Britain in 1966. According to Shale and Kapa (2011:1), Lesotho has experienced a culture of political parties splitting since 1950 due to the political disputes that arise within them.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the origins of political parties in Lesotho. Lesotho's first political party, named the Basutoland African Congress (the BAC), was established in 1952 by Ntsu Mokhehle. This party won the elections that were held in 1960 (Leeman, 1984:173). The BAC split and this resulted in the formation of three political parties. They were the Marema-Tlou Party (the MTP), which was founded in 1957 by Chief Seephephe Matete; the Basotho National Party (the BNP), founded in 1958 by Chief Jonathan Leabua, Chief Patrick Mota and Anthony Manyeli; and the Basutoland Freedom Party (the BFP), founded in 1961 by Makalo Khaketla and Dr Seth Makotoko (Khaketla, 1971:20; Gill, 1997:211; Moleleki, 1994:93).

The MTP and the BFP formed an alliance, which became the Marema-Tlou Freedom Party (the MFP) in 1963 (Moleleki, 1994:94; Weisfelder, 1999:44). According to Moleleki (1994:94), the Lesotho Communist Party (the LCP, later the CPL) was also founded in 1961. In 1967, the United Democratic Party (the UDP) was founded (Mphanya, 2004:52). In 1965, just a year before Lesotho gained its independence, elections took place and the BNP, led by Chief Leabua Jonathan, won (Kapa, 2013; Weisfelder, 1999). In 1970, the governing BNP lost the elections to a congress party named the Basutoland Congress Party (the BCP) led by Ntsu Mokhehle.

This win led to problems, as the Prime Minister, Chief Leabua Jonathan, refused to hand over power to the BCP. Jonathan declared himself the leader of the country, despite losing the elections. Some BCP members were imprisoned, while others went into exile (Kapa, 2013; Khaketla, 1971). According to Machobane (2001:13), the BNP government governed from 1970 to 1985. In 1986, a military coup, led by Major General Metsing Lekhanya, forced Leabua out of office and the military council returned executive powers to King Moshoeshoe II.

Lekhanya was forced out of office in 1991 by the lower military ranks led by Major General Phisoane Ramaema. Ramaema claimed that the government was dysfunctional. Lesotho experienced socio-economic and political crises while the military governed the country until the first democratic elections were called in 1993 (Lesotho, 1986:10). In order for Lesotho to gain access to international aid and trade, and foreign direct investment, Ramaema adopted the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank's proposal of poverty reduction, as well as the UN's sustainable human development policy (Matlosa, 2008).

This chapter will examine Lesotho as a democratic country. According to the Independent Electoral Commission (IEC) of Lesotho, democracy is a political system controlled and run by citizens, and made up of representatives who are elected. A democratic government has the following features:

- It is elected in a free and fair election. Political parties are given an opportunity to canvass and citizens are allowed to elect the representatives they want. The elections in a democratic country must be run by an independent Election Management Body.
- It is accountable to the people through its institutions, such as parliament, ministers, and an Auditor-General. To be accountable means explaining in detail and voluntarily how the work was done, as well as to be open to questions that are related to procedures and expectations relating to that particular work.
- It is responsible for people's protection; thus, ensuring the safety of the citizens and delivering basic services.

- It is transparent in conducting business. There must be procedures that are clear, transparent, and are known to be followed. It should not be a problem to divulge information to the public and the media.
- It is guided by a constitution (IEC: 8).

This chapter will also discuss democratic rule in Lesotho and outline the different political parties that stood for national elections from 1993 to 2017. Local government elections will also be discussed. Lastly, the three coalition governments that Lesotho has witnessed will be examined.

4.2 Democratic rule in 1993

Lesotho held its first democratic elections in January 1993. The FPTP system was used and the BCP, under the leadership of Mokhehle, won all 65 constituencies (Matlosa, 1999:97). These elections were held 23 years after dictatorial rule ended and were regarded as free.

Ramaema handed over power to the BCP and Mokhehle became the Prime Minister. According to Matlosa (1997:97), the 1993 election was all about settling the political scores of 1970 when the BNP was punished for its actions, which were regarded as unconstitutional. Southall and Petlane (1995:xiii) state that the 1993 elections were seen as an opportunity to rectify the wrongdoings of the BNP when it unconstitutionally grabbed power in 1970.

The BNP and the BCP had candidates in all 65 constituencies, whereas the MFP only had 51 candidates (Mahao, 1997:1). Southall (1995:32) is of the opinion that the BNP went to elections as 1970's bad loser. Table 1 below indicates the election results:

Table 1: The 1993 general election

Name of party	No. of votes	% of votes	No. of seats	% of seats
BCP	**398,355**	**74.7**	**65**	**100**
BNP	120,686	22,6	0	0
MFP	7,650	1,4	0	0
Other	6,287	1,2	0	0
Total	**532,978**	**100**	**65**	**100**

Sources: Lucas (1993:26) and Southall and Petlane (1995:42).

Table 1 above illustrates that all 65 constituencies were won by the BCP (thus, 74,7%), while the BNP lost with 22,7% of the votes, and the MFP with 1,4% of the votes (Mahao, 1997:9).

The BCP did not attempt to reform the military when it came into power. Therefore, part of the military supported the BCP government while the rest supported the BNP. Nnoli (n.d.) states that since the BCP government took over from the military regime, all military professionalism obstacles were meant to be removed. According to Makoa (1995:9), within a month's time, the salaries of the parliamentarians were increased by 285% by the BCP government. Mokhele declared that the military was controlled by the BNP. Therefore, it was difficult for the BCP to have control over the army, as the army did not trust the BCP government (Mothibe, 1998:49).

In 1994, the army demanded that their salaries also be increased by 100%. This led to tension and a split in military ranks (Pule, 1998:12). This led to violence. Matlosa and Pule (2001:10) state that the governments of Botswana, Zimbabwe, and South Africa as well as the Commonwealth mediated and recommended the depoliticising of the army as the only way to consolidate Lesotho's democracy. The fighting ended in February 1994. During this era, the BCP government amended the constitution. In 1994, the BNP rejected the election results and this led to violent conflict and the death of the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Selometsi Baholo (Mothibe, 1999:55).

The then Royal Lesotho Mounted Police (RLMP), now called the Lesotho Mounted Police Service (LMPS), protested and demanded a 60% salary increase. They captured the then minister of finance, who in turn gave them a 42% salary increase. According to Makoa (2005:188), King Letsie III, backed by the LMPS and the LDF, made the BCP government collapse. The king dissolved the government and the provisional ruling council took control. A petition was handed to the king, requesting him to:

- Mediate between the BCP and the opposition,
- Prepare for new elections and introduce a government of national unity (GNU).
- Introduce the PR electoral system to replace the FPTP system.

King Letsie III responded to the opposition's demands by dissolving the BCP government on August 1994. An interim government was appointed. The Christian Council of Lesotho and the Lesotho Council of Non-governmental Organisations disapproved and ordered the citizens to participate in a stayaway, which was successful. A month later, the BCP government returned to power.

During this period of political uncertainty, Lesotho experienced high inflation, domestic investment and foreign direct investment were negatively affected, and there was slow economic growth and growing trade imbalances that contributed to the unsustainable national debt burden (Makhetha, 2008:162; Matlosa, 2008). South Africa began to mobilise its troops under the umbrella of the peacekeeping force (Matlosa, 1995:136) and, according to Mothibe (1999:21), prepared for military intervention.

4.3 Democratic rule in 1998

The ruling BCP split again just before the 1998 elections – fuelled by disputes in its leadership. In 1997, Mokhehle left the BCP and formed a new political party with the members of the National Assembly and named it the Lesotho Congress for Democracy (LCD) (MoAfrika, 1997: 1). According to Kapa (2013) and Matlosa and Shale (2008), the majority of the 40 members of parliament supported Mokhehle to form a new government, but 25 members remained as the opposition. In May 1998,

elections were held and the LCD won 79 of the 80 constituencies. At this juncture, Pakalitha Mosisili succeeded Mokhehle (Sekatle, 1998:31). Table 2 below illustrates the election results of the 1998 election:

Table 2: The 1998 general election

Name of party	No. of votes	% of votes	No. of seats	% of seats
BCP	61,793	10,4	0	0,00
BNP	143,073	24,5	1	1,27
LCD	**355,049**	**60,7**	**78**	**98,73**
MFP	7,460	1,3	0	0,00
Others	17,365	3,0	0	0,00
Total	**584,740**	**100**	**79**	**100**

Source: Lodge, Kadima and Pottie (2002:100)

The elections were declared free and fair by local and international observers but opposition parties claimed that the elections results were fabricated. According to Lindberg (2006:149-150), the opposition parties rejected the election results, claiming voting fraud, and demanded the elections be held again. The opposition parties claimed that the FPTP electoral system was biased because it did not allow opposition parties to play an active role in parliament when the dominant party won all the constituencies. The BCP, the BNP and the MFP formed an alliance of opposition parties known as “Setlamo sa Baitseki” (Mphaololi, 1998:11). Members of the opposition protested against the elected government outside the royal palace and the army mutinied to show their sympathy with the opposition (Kapa, 2013; Makoa, 2014). The army rebelled and refused to take direct orders from the government. This led to SADC sending troops from Botswana and South Africa to suppress the LDF and stop the riots that were taking place.

The citizens became enraged and burnt down shops in Maseru. SADC and LDF troops clashed and many Basotho were killed. A commission of inquiry, which was led by South African judge Justice Langa, was formed (Sithetho, 2005:12) in August 1998 to investigate if the elections were fair and what happened at the polling stations. It was also tasked with providing recommendations that would solve

Lesotho's political problems (Langa, 1998:2-3; Sithetho, 2005:12). According to Langa (1998:7), the IEC and political parties communicated and wrote submissions from 15 to 22 August 1998. As a result, 200 students from South African universities and 100 members of the South African National Defence Force assisted the commission in recounting the election votes. The commission found slight differences between the election results announced by the IEC and the results of the recount (Leon, Browde & Shearer, 2001:56-57).

The Langa Commission outlined solutions to the problems the IEC was facing as follows: a new registration system; demarcating 80 constituencies; voter education; reducing the voting age from 21 to 18 years, and having the capacity to ensure that all elections activities are dealt with within eight months (Langa, 1998:24). The other recommendations of the Langa Commission were as follows:

- The IEC should be trusted by the community, regardless of the influence of politics;
- Sufficient resources should be allocated to the IEC;
- The IEC and its employees must obey the rules and regulations of the elections;
- Election personnel should be systematically trained to conduct elections. The candidates, party agents and official witnesses must also be offered comprehensive training;
- Sufficient equipment and stationary should be available and disseminated to voting stations on time;
- Election personnel, together with the party agents, should account for the voters' lists, ballot papers cast, ballot paper counterfoils, unused ballot paper books and the attendant completed electoral forms, which should be properly labelled and sealed in secure containers or envelopes. The seals must be signed by party agents; and
- The electoral system must be reviewed (Langa, 1998:28-29).

According to the United States (2001:2), nine days after the Commission had completed its work in Lesotho, dissatisfied citizens burnt down shops in Maseru, Mafeteng and Mohale's Hoek. Nine SADC troops, 50 LDF soldiers and 40 civilians who had aligned themselves with the opposition parties lost their lives. South Africa

advised Lesotho to form the Interim Political Authority (IPA), which was made up of all 12 political parties that stood for the elections in December 1998 (Elklit, 2008). The MMP electoral system was chosen by the IPA, which guarantees that the opposition will have representation in the National Assembly. This system ensured that Lesotho would have 80 constituencies allocated to National Assembly seats and 40 seats that should be filled in a proportional manner (thus, 120 seats in parliament). The 80 seats would be elected through the FPTP system, while the 40 seats would be elected using the PR system (Matlosa, 2008).

The MMP system was introduced as a mechanism to ensure that small parties with satisfactory votes would have representation in the National Assembly (Makoa, 2014; Kapa, 2013; Matlosa, 2008). The IPA was also mandated with ensuring that proper norms and standards of political parties' behaviour are in place (Rosenberg & Weisfelder, 2013:417-420).

According to Leon *et al.* (2001:1-3), the Leon Commission of Inquiry was formed in 2002, led by Justice Leon, to investigate and study the conflict and political instability that occurred in 1998. The Commission had to:

- Explore, examine and analyse the political instability which led to the deaths of many people from July to November 1998. It also had to determine if there was a conspiracy to stage a coup or destabilise the government and, if so, name the people involved in the plot;
- Identify and name the political party or parties and individuals who played a leading role in the political disturbances that occurred on the doorstep of the Royal Palace;
- Study and explore the role of the LDF and LMPS in terms of preserving and maintaining order in the country as well as their confrontation in the Royal Palace;
- Study and explore the role of the National Security Service (NSS) in terms of protecting and preserving the national security in the country;
- Investigate and examine certain police station attacks and name the people or person who commanded the LDF members to stage the mutiny of 11 September 1998;

- Examine and probe the situation that caused looting and arson of commercial establishments in Maseru, Mafeteng and Mohale's Hoek on 22 September 1988; and
- Recommend solutions that would ensure that the events of 1998 would never be repeated in country.

The Leon Commission ruled out the possibility that the prime minister had breached section 92 of the Constitution by requesting the intervention by SADC troops without first asking for the king's advice (Leon *et al.*, 2001:123). The Commission made recommendations on how to deal with those involved in the 1998 massacre and how to ensure that Lesotho never witnessed a genocide again (Leon *et al.,* 2001:124-133). Knight (2001) states that in normal circumstances, the army in a country has the mandate to seize power without any harm or worsening the conflict in that particular country. It is clear that the intervention in Lesotho was not legitimate because the burning of Maseru, Mohale's Hoek and Mafeteng happened just after the military intervention.

4.4 Democratic rule in 2002

In 2001, a year before the general elections, Lesotho witnessed another split in its government. The Deputy Prime Minister, who was also the Minister of Justice, Human Rights and Constitutional Affairs, Advocate Kelebone Maope, split from the LCD and formed a new political party – the Lesotho People's Congress (LPC). It took 27 members from the LCD, and therefore the LPC was now an opposition party (Matlosa & Shale, 2008; Matlosa & Sello, 2006; MoAfrika, 2001:1-3). Qhobela left the BCP and formed the Basutoland African Congress (BAC) in February 2002.

BAC was the led by the late Ntsu Mokhehle in 1952 before Lesotho gained its independence before it was renamed BCP in 1959 (Lesotho, 2002:10). In May 2002, the first snap election was held due to the disputes caused by the 1998 election outcomes. The revised MMP system, which includes the FPTP and PR, was used. Lesotho is the first African country that practices a parliamentary system, which gives it the opportunity to use the MMP electoral model. The LCD won the elections

with 79 of the 80 constituency-based seats and did not obtain PR seats. All nine opposition parties held the 40 proportional seats. The BNP held 21 seats.

For the first time, opposition parties had the opportunity to win a number of proportional seats and Lesotho experienced unitary parliamentary democracy whereby the opposition had representatives in parliament. Arhin (2002:6) states that the voters were educated extensively and this resulted in the high turnout on election day. The results of the 2002 election and the PR seats allocated were as follows:

Table 3: The 2002 general elections

Name of party	**No. of Votes**	**% of Votes**	**FPTP seats**	**PR Seats**	**Total seats**
BAC	16,095	2,9	-	3	3
BCP	14,584	2,7	-	3	3
BNP	124,234	22,4	-	21	21
LCD	**302,316**	**54,4**	**79**	**-**	**79**
LPC	124,234	5,8	1	4	5
LWP	777,88	1,4	-	1	1
MFP	6,890	1,2	-	1	1
NIP	30,346	5,5	-	5	5
NPP	3,985	0,7	-	1	1
PFD	6,330	1,1	-	1	1
Others	7,772	1,4	-	-	-
Total	**554,386**	**100**	**80**	**40**	**120**

Source: Independent Electoral Commission (2002:4)

The LCD won 79 constituencies, and therefore, it was not allocated any PR seats. However, the BNP protested the victory of the LCD and lodged a complaint in the High Court, declaring that it refused to accept the outcome of the 2002 elections (Matlosa, 2003:8-9). However, before the 2002 elections, the 19 political parties had signed the electoral code of conduct that stated that they would accept the election results. The elections were closely observed by SADC, Japan, the EU and the US – all of whom declared that the elections were held in a transparent manner and were

free and fair (Lesotho Parliamentary Chamber). According to the IEC, the turnout of this election was 70%.

4.5 Democratic rule in 2007

In 2006, there were ten political parties, but prior to the 2007 elections Lesotho witnessed another split. The Minister of Communications, Science and Technology, Thomas Motsoahae Thabane, resigned from his position and left the LCD. He formed the All Basotho Convention (ABC) and had the support of 17 members of parliament. In November 2006, the BNP split and the Basotho Democratic National Party (BDNP), led by Thabang Nyeoe, was formed (Rosenberg & Weisfelder, 2013:56). In 2006, the Basotho Batho Democratic Party (BBDP) was formed by retrenched miners from South Africa in order to fight for their retrenchment benefits. It was led by Jeremiah Ramathebane (Monyane, 2009:13).

Elections were due to take place in May 2007, but because the government was uncomfortable with the ABC's growing numbers, King Letsie III advised the prime minister to dissolve parliament and announce elections for February 2007. The LCD won and Mosisili became prime minister. Prior to the elections, nine political parties formed alliances as a way to gain PR compensatory seats:

- The ABC / the Lesotho Workers Party (LWP);
- The BNP / the National Progressive Party (NNP);
- The Alliance of Congress Parties (ACP), the BAC, the LPC and the BCP;
- The LCD / the National Independent Party (NIP) (Monyane, 2009:200).

The 2007 election results and the PR seats allocated were as follows:

Table 4: The 2007 general elections

Party name	No. of Votes	% of Votes	FPTP seats	PR Seats	Total seats
ABC	-	0,9	17	0	17
ACP	20,263	4.6	1	1	2
BBDP	8,471	1,9	0	1	1
BCP	9,823	2,2	0	1	1
BDNP	8,783	2,0	0	1	1
BNP	29,965	6,8	0	3	3
LCD	**-**	**0.0**	**61**	**0**	**61**
LWP	107,463	24,3	0	10	10
MFP	9,129	2,1	0	1	1
NIP	229,602	51,8	0	21	21
PFD	15,477	0,9	0	1	1
Others	3,984	0,9	0	0	0
Total	**442,963**	**100**	**79**	**40**	**119**

Source: Independent Electoral Commission (2007)

After the 2007 elections, there were disputes regarding the allocation of parliamentary seats, which led to political unrest. SADC's Sir Ketumile Masire and the Christian Council of Lesotho had to mediate. The new members of parliament were sworn into office on 23 February 2007. The ABC/LWP alliance did not attend claiming that they were not informed formally about the ceremony.

In March 2007, King Letsie III opened the eighth assembly of parliament. The opposition parties protested, claiming that the leader of the NIP was not given a parliamentary seat, but the Speaker of the National Assembly, Ntlhoi Motsamai, dismissed this. He stated that those who obtained parliamentary seats were those whose names were on the PR list or won constituencies. This led to LDF members removing protesting members of parliament by force from the premises (EISA, 2007:4).

From 19 to 21 March, the ABC led the opposition and successfully organised a stayaway in Maseru. Public transport was not available and therefore schools and businesses were closed. The minister of public transport threatened to revoke the licences of taxis if they did not go to work, but this fell on deaf ears. On the second day, the districts of Maputsoe, Mafeteng and Mohale's Hoek also took part in the stayaway. The situation worsened when the Lesotho Chamber of Commerce and Industry issued a statement encouraging their members to close their businesses and join the stayaway. Moreover, the Lesotho Law Society released a statement saying that the courts of law would be closed during the stayaway. The government offered transport to citizens, but they refused to use it. The ABC leader, Thomas Thabane, met with SADC and he agreed to dismiss the stayaway (EISA, 2007:6-7). The LCD government faced serious problems regarding gaining the trust of public servants, especially those in the Maseru district.

4.6 Democratic rule in 2012: the first coalition government

In February 2012 (prior to the May 2012 elections), Lesotho witnessed another spilt and the Democratic Congress (DC) was formed. It consequently had 45 seats in the National Assembly. Elections were held and the DC won 48 out of 120 seats. The DC thus needed only 13 seats to obtain 61 constitutional seats to form a coalition government. The ABC had 30 seats, the LCD 26 seats, and the BNP five seats (Lesotho, 2018:20). Table 5 below outlines the political parties that won the 2012 national elections:

Table 5: The 2012 general elections

Party name	No. of votes	FPTP seats	PR seats	Total seats
ABC	138,917	26	4	30
BBDP	2,440	0	1	1
BCP	2,531	0	1	1
BDNP	3,433	0	1	1
BNP	23,788	0	5	5
DC	218,366	41	7	48

LCD	121,076	12	14	26
LPC	5,021	0	1	1
LWP	2,408	0	1	1
MFP	3,300	0	1	s1
NIP	6,880	0	2	2
PFD	11,166	1	2	3
Others	12,400	0	0	0
Total	**555, 726**	**80**	**40**	**120**

Source: Adapted from IEC Lesotho (2013:58)

Lesotho had a hung parliament, which occurs when no one political party wins the majority of seats. For the first time in the country's history, the Lesotho government formed a coalition government. It comprised of the ABC, the LCD and the BNP. This coalition government was led by Thomas Motsoahae Thabane, the leader of the ABC, while Mothejoa Metsing, the leader of the BNP, was the Deputy Prime Minister. The leader of the BNP was the Minister for Gender, Youth, Sports and Recreation (Letsie, 2015:86-88). The coalition government experienced a lack of trust and political unity, which resulted in a cabinet reshuffle and the appointment of critical government posts without consulting the public and coalition members. It should be noted that consultation is one of the eight principles of service delivery that are imperative in governance (South Africa, 1997:17).

Two years into the coalition government, there were still serious problems and disputes among the three parties that formed the coalition government. This led to the Deputy Prime Minister saying that the Prime Minister was making government unilaterally and without consulting the coalition government's partners. Thomas Thabane was also accused of firing Motlatsi Ramafole, who was the government secretary, and Tlali Kamoli, who was the Commander of the LDF. The latter was alleged to have refused to surrender soldiers who were suspects in cases of murder, attempted murder and robbery. Kamoli refused demotion and carried on as the commander of the LDF. Moreover, Thabane was accused of controlling the management of the Lesotho Highlands Water Project (LHDA) (Letsie, 2015:88).

Thabane fuelled tension in the coalition government when he ordered the LMPS and Directorate on Corruption and Economic Offences (DCEO) to lay criminal charges against high-profile officials, namely:

- Mothejoa Metsing, the Deputy Prime Minister, for breaching the provisions of the Penal Code Act 6 of 2010 (Tefo, 2014b:2). The DCEO demanded that Metsing account for corrupt tenders and deposits made into his bank accounts between April 2013 and January 2014. The deposits made were M328 000, M118 000, and M524 965 (Tefo, 2015b:2);
- Monyane Moleleki, who was the former Minister for Natural Resources and the deputy leader of the DC, was charged with corruption and fraud in 2013 for diverting the Kao, Liqhobong and Lemphane mines and the Kaonyana mining electrification project worth M15-million to his constituency, Machache (Molomo & Tlali, 2013:6);
- Timothy Thahane, the Minister for Natural Resources, was recalled from his position and charged with fraud and bribery amounting to M43-million (Ntaote, 2013:8); and
- Selibe Mochoboroane, the Minister for Communications, Science and Technology was charged with breaching the provisions of the Penal Code Act 6 of 2010 (Tefo, 2014b:2).

According to Mohloboli (2014), General Kamoli accused Thabane of using the LMPS to fight his battles and attack his political opponents. Letsie (2015:92) states that the coalition government faced more problems when two members of the ABC – Thabiso Lits'iba and Mophato Monyake – crossed the floor in parliament. Monyake claimed that Thabane's administration was characterised by autocratic leadership.

In March 2014 a vote of no confidence, led by Lits'iba and Monyake, was supported by the opposition parties in the National Assembly. The leader of the Basotho Batho Democratic Party (BBDP), Geremane Ramathebane, filed the vote of no confidence. He was arrested and charged with fraudulently registering his party in 2006.

In June 2014, the Deputy Prime Minister Metsing announced that he was leaving the coalition government because of Thabane's humiliations to form a new government with the DC under the leadership of the former Prime Minister, Pakalitha Mosisili (Zihlangu & Ntaote, 2014:1).

In August 2014, Thabane, with the approval of King Letsie III, promoted Maaparankoe Mahao to commander of the army and demoted Tlali Kamoli. Thabane advised King Letsie III to recess the parliament for nine months, which can be done under Section 83(1) and (4) of the Constitution. Section 83(1) promulgates, "The king may dissolve or recess the parliament at any time", while Section 83(4) states, "The king acts according to the prime minister's advice as mandated by the constitution". The opposition parties asked SADC to intervene and for the then deputy president of South Africa, Cyril Ramaphosa, to assist in restoring peace and security in Lesotho (SADC, 2014:2). According to Lesotho (2018:69), LDFarmy staged a coup d'état at the end of August, which forced Prime Minister Thabane to flee to South Africa. The country's radio stations were off-air and the prime minister's palace and the Maseru police headquarters was surrounded by the army. Parliament reopened in September 2014 to ensure that the elections were free and fair. A date was set for the snap elections – 28 February 2015.

4.7 Democratic rule in 2015: the second coalition government

Lesotho witnessed its third snap elections in February 2015 due to political instability. Thus, the elections took place two years earlier than scheduled (Letsie, 2015:82). The second coalition government was formed by seven parties: the DC, the LCD, the PFD, the MFP, the LPC, the BCP and the National Independent Party (NIP). Table 6 below outlines the political parties that won the 2015 national elections:

Table 6: The 2015 general elections

Party name	No. of votes	FPTP seats	PR seats	Total seats
ABC	215,022	40	6	46
BCP	2,721	0	1	1
BNP	31,508	1	6	7
DC	218,573	37	10	47
LCD	56,467	2	10	12
LPC	1,951	0	1	1
MFP	3,413	0	1	1
NIP	5,404	0	1	1
PFD	9,829	0	2	2
RCL	6,731	0	2	2
Others	17,999	0	0	0
Total	**569,618**	**80**	**40**	**120**

Source: Adapted from IEC Lesotho (2016)

Pakalitha Mosisili, the leader of the DC, led the new government while the Deputy Prime Minister was Mothejoa Metsing, the leader of the LCD. The DC had 47 seats, the LCD 12 seats, the PFD two seats, and the MFP, the LPC, the BCP and the NIP one seat each. According to Amnesty International (2015/16:230), Lesotho's new government, under Mosisili, had to deal with half of Lesotho's population facing a drought and living below the poverty line. Amnesty International further states that Lesotho faced human rights violations because of the political instability and security crises.

In April 2015, Mosisili withdrew the promotion of General Mahao and reinstated General Kamoli as the army commander. Mahao challenged his demotion in the High Court but was unsuccessful.

In mid-May and June 2015, 23 members of the LDF were detained at the Maseru Maximum Security Prison for a suspected mutiny. In October 2015, the Lesotho High Court ruled that their detention was unlawful and ordered their "open arrest" (Amnesty International, 2017:2). In June 2015, Mahao was shot dead by his LDF

colleagues. Mokema stated that Mahao resisted arrest for allegedly leading a mutiny. Tensions flared when Mahao's family accused the army of killing him in cold blood (Tefo, 2018). After his death, the opposition parties did not attend the National Assembly. The leaders of the ABC, the BNP, and the RCL fled to South Africa out of concern for their safety (Commonwealth, 2017:3).

Mosisili requested that SADC aid Lesotho in investigating Mahao's death. A commission of inquiry was set and led by a judge from Botswana, Mpathi Passevil Phumaphi. This commission was called the Phumaphi Commission of Inquiry, and it was deployed for 60 days, and was extended for another 30 days. According to the Media Institute of Southern Africa (MISA) (2016:40), the report of the Phumaphi Commission of Inquiry was handed to Lesotho's government by the SADC Double Troika Summit, and mandated it to:

- Ensure that the report is published within 14 days (thus, by 1 February 2016); and
- Ensure that feedback is given to the Chair of the Organ on Politics, Defence and Security Cooperation regarding the recommendations of the Phumaphi Commission of Inquiry.

Phumaphi's report was published in 2016 with the following recommendations:

- The immediate removal of General Kamoli as LDF commander;
- The LDF officers associated with cases of murder, attempted murder and treason must be suspended; and
- The 23 LDF officers who were detained for alleged mutiny must be pardoned.

In December 2016, General Kamoli retired and the deputy commander of the LDF, General Khoantle Motšomotšo, became the new commander of the army. In September 2017, Motšomotšo was shot dead during a gun battle with Colonel Tefo Hashatsi and Colonel Bulane Sechele at the Ratjomose barracks. It was evident that the appointments of Mahao and Kamoli threatened the security of the country.

4.8 Democratic rule in 2017: The third coalition government

A fourth snap election was scheduled for 3 June 2017 after Mosisili was removed from office with a vote of no confidence by opposition parties on 1 March 2017. The leader of the ABC, Thomas Thabane, made an agreement with the deputy leader of the DC, Monyane Moleleki that they should remove Mosisili as prime minister and replace him with Moleleki (Ngatane, 2016). This happened while the leaders of the ABC, the BNP and the RCL were still in exile.

Moleleki was suspended from his party because of the alliance he formed with opposition parties. He formed the Alliance for Democrats (AD) in December 2016 (Ngatane, 2017). The AD formed an alliance with the ABC, the BNP and the Reformed Congress of Lesotho (RCL). Together they tabled a motion of no confidence in parliament to oust the government in March 2017. The LCD split again when the LCD's secretary-general, Selibe Mochoboroane, left the party and formed the Movement for Economic Change (MEC). In March 2017, King Letsie III dissolved parliament and set a new date for the snap elections – June 2017 (*Lesotho Times*, 2017).

In 2016, the BNP witnessed a split and a new political party, the Basotho National Party (BNP), was formed under the leadership of Limpho Tau, Mamako Mohale and Malimatle Hlalele (Ntaote, 2016).

The ABC, the AD, the BNP and the RCL planned to form a government after the elections in June 2017. The ABC, the BNP and the RCL opposition leaders, who had been exiled in South Africa, arrived back in Lesotho in February 2017 to be there when the vote of no confidence was tendered to Mosisili in the National Assembly. Table 7 below outlines the political parties that won the 2017 national elections:

Table 7: The 2017 general elections

Party name	No. of votes	FPTP seats	PR seats	Total seats
ABC	235,729	47	1	48
AD	42,686	1	8	9
BCP	3,458	0	1	1
BNP	23,541	0	5	5
DC	150,172	26	4	30
DPL	2,801	0	1	1
LCD	52,052	1	10	11
MEC	29,420	1	5	6
MFP	2,761	0	1	1
NIP	6,375	0	1	1
PFD	13,200	1	2	3
RCL	4,037	0	1	1
Others	15,460	0	0	0
Vacant		3	0	3
Total	**581,692**	**77**	**40**	**117**

Source: Adapted from IEC Lesotho (2018)

After the elections, the ABC, the AD, the BNP and the RCL formed a coalition government led by Prime Minister Thomas Thabane (Akwei, 2017). Just two days before Thabane was sworn in as the Prime Minister of Lesotho on 16 June together with the deputy Prime Minister and members of the cabinet along with Thabane's ex-wife, Lipolelo Thabane, were shot dead on 14 June 2017 (Akwei, 2017).

In October 2017, the former LDF commander, Tlali Kamoli, was arrested. He was denied bail by Justice Teboho Moiloa in the High Court and currently faces 14 counts of attempted murder (Tefo, 2018). The Amnesty Bill to grant immunity to officers of the security forces who committed crimes and offences between 2015 and 2017 was presented in the National Assembly.

4.9 The 2005 local government elections

Lesotho's parliament is mandated by the Constitution to institute local government that is governed by the Local Government Elections Act of 1998. In 1994, the Ministry of Local Government was created and mandated with powers to ensure that Act 6 of 1997 was implemented efficiently and effectively.

Lesotho has ten districts and each is under the administration of a district administrator. In April 2005, Lesotho held its first post-independence local government elections. Section 20 of the Constitution of Lesotho states that every citizen may participate in public affairs so as to freely elect their representative and Section 106 allows for local government establishment.

The local government elections were conducted using the FPTP system, although the MMP system was introduced in the National Assembly elections. When the PR system is used, there is a slim chance that the elections will be contested because every party that stood for election and has a satisfactory number of votes will be represented in parliament (Hartmann, 2004:178). Local governance is governed by the Local Government Act (Act No. 6 of 1997), which states that local authorities should exercise their functions and powers in line with their legal powers.

The amendment of the Local Government Act, 1997 (Act 6 of 1997) was done by the Local Government Amendment Act, 2004 (Act 5 of 2004). Local government in the first and second schedule of Act 6 of 1997 is mandated to govern, regulate and control all matters pertaining to it. It is imperative that the structure of local government enhance the citizens' participation in decision-making in a democratic country.

According to the Lesotho Election Report (2011), Lesotho's local government previously had 128 Community Councils, ten District Councils and one Municipal Council. This changed in 2011 when the Ministry of Local Government and Chieftaincy introduced new demarcations, which incorporated ten District Councils, one Municipal Council and 11 Urban Councils.

The Community Councils were decreased from 128 to 64. They are regarded as the link between citizens at grassroots level and the central government (Morphet, 1993:183). The Municipal Council is known as the Maseru City Council (MCC) and is made up of urban and rural regions. The Urban Councils consist of 11 urban regions, excluding Maseru, while the Community Councils are found in rural regions. The District Councils consist of ten representatives from Lesotho's ten districts (Lesotho Election Report, 2011:7-8). According to Lesotho (2014:3), the council structure is outlined as follows:

- **District Councils**: Instituted by indirectly elected councillors and made up of community and Urban Councils members who live within the district;
- **Municipal Councils**: Instituted by councillors who are representatives in wards that are within the urban region known as municipalities. Only the district of Maseru is regarded as an urban region that has the status of "municipality";
- **Urban Councils**: Urban areas are regarded as district headquarters; and

Community Councils: In the formal hierarchy of government, Community Councils are the lowest in the structure and are instituted by councillors who are representatives of Electoral Divisions (EDs). There are two chiefs who are representatives in the Community or Urban Councils, and two other chiefs who are either nominated or elected in the local government area by other chiefs and who are representatives in the Council. The structure of local government in Lesotho is outlined in Table 8 below:

Table 8: Lesotho local authority types and numbers

Districts	District Councils	Number of Municipal Councils	Urban Councils	Community Councils
Berea	1	0	1	8
Butha-Buthe	1	0	1	4
Leribe	1	0	2	11
Mafeteng	1	0	1	7
Maseru	1	1 (Maseru City Council)	1	10
Mohale's Hoek	1	0	1	7
Mokhotlong	1	0	1	4
Qacha's Nek	1	0	1	3

Quthing	1	0	1	5
Thaba-Tseka	1	0	1	5
Total	**10**	**1**	**11**	**64**

Source: Adapted from Lesotho Local Government Act 1997 (amended)

At present, in local government, only the councillors stand for elections. There are 194 district councillors, 164 urban councillors, and 1256 community councillors in Lesotho. Women make up 49% of the councillors, which means that there is gender balance (Lesotho, 2014:3). Local government elections are governed by the Local Government Elections Act, 1998 (Act 9 of 1998). This was amended to the Local Government Elections Act, 2004 (Act 6 of 2004). The Local Government Election Act mandates the IEC to ensure that elections are conducted in a free and fair manner in Lesotho. The Act also outlines the rules and regulations according to which the local government elections should be conducted.

In 1997, SADC addressed gender inequality among public representatives. This led to the amendment of the Local Government Act, 1997 to ensure that a one-third representation of women will be included in local government structures. Furthermore, Lesotho signed the SADC declaration that removed all laws that can discriminate against women (Letuka, Marite & Mapetla, 2004:21). Kambule (2010:27) states that the representation of women in local government is proposed in the SADC Declaration on Gender and Development (1997).

In line with the amendments in the Local Government Election Act, 1998, a voter votes using two ballot papers. The first ballot paper is for the candidate who is contesting an electoral division and the second ballot paper for the party competing for additional seats for women. Each political party willing to contest for additional seats is mandated to draw up a list of female nominees and the list will be in order of preference. The political parties submit the list to the IEC on nomination day. The IEC has made it clear that once the list has been submitted, it cannot be modified. The first name on the list will join the council if the party has a won seat in the council.

Local government representatives who are democratically elected are referred to as "councillors" (Venter & Landsberg, 1998:207). According to Clause 38(2), on local government election day, the voter is given two ballot papers that are referred to as "Forms 12A and 12B". The first ballot paper is to elect the candidate, while the second ballot paper is to elect the political party. Clause 39(1) stipulates that two ballot boxes will be provided for the two ballot papers (Lesotho, 1998:28). In the local government elections, the ballot paper for the candidate is to elect the person who will be a councillor, while the ballot paper for the party is to elect the women in Proportional Representation (PR). Gildenhuys (1997b:13) states that in order for local government to be representative it must be based on the following:

- There must be a division of labour between the councillor and public;
- Councillors should be approachable and open their offices to citizens; and
- Councillors should be accountable to the public.

Promoting democracy and delivering services are the main reasons for the existence of local government (Ismael, Bayat & Meyer, 1997:3). This is because local government is regarded as the closest branch of government to the citizens. Local government should ensure that the government listens to the people at grassroots level in order to deliver services that the community actually need and therefore ensure the involvement of the community's political process (Reddy, 1996:3).

Lesotho adopted the National Decentralisation Policy in February 2014. It was created to ensure that grassroots democratic governance will be attainable and local government will obtain autonomy. According to the IEC, Lesotho's local government elections are held every five years, but may, under certain circumstances, be scheduled earlier or later.

The second local government elections were held in October 2011. The goal of 50% gender equality was exceeded and 58% of the local government authority was female (Matshalaga, 2014:vi). Table 9 below provides a breakdown of the results of the 2011 local government elections, which was won by the LCD with ten of the 18 local councils:

Table 9: Lesotho local authority types and numbers

Party name	FPTP results	PR results for women	All councillors
ABC	106	76	182
BAC	1	0	1
BNP	15	19	34
LCD	501	190	691
LPC	4	3	7
LWP	2	0	2
NIP	2	2	4
Other	19	8	27
Independent	173	0	173
Elected chiefs		0	153
TOTAL	**823**	**298**	**1274**

Source: Compiled from the IEC database, 2011

The third local government elections were held on 30 September 2017. These elections play a vital role because they are where the local community gives a ward councillor the mandate to represent them in council and so ensures that the community will have developed roads, sanitation, water and lights. Table 10 below illustrates the local government election results of 2017:

Table 10: The 2017 local government elections

		Number of council seats won										
Districts	**Council seats**	ABC	AD	BDNP	BNP	DC	HDP	LCD	MEC	PFD	RCL	INDEPE-NDENT
Butha-Buthe	91	47	11	0	0	12	1	5	2	6	0	7
Leribe	213	112	21	0	2	22	0	22	4	3	2	22
Berea	132	83	10	0	3	20	0	7	1	1	0	7
Maseru	153	84	20	0	4	26	0	8	0	0	0	11

Mafeteng	125	51	1	0	1	34	0	6	22	1	0	8
Mohale's Hoek	141	50	5	1	0	71	0	2	6	0	0	4
Qhuthing	112	16	10	0	16	46	0	14	1	0	0	8
Qacha's Nek	87	5	3	0	6	67	0	2	1	0	0	3
Thaba-Tseka	118	43	8	0	7	33	0	5	6	7	0	3
Mokh-otlong	97	48	5	0	4	27	0	2	1	2	0	8
TOTAL COUNTRY	**1269 100%**	**539**	**94**	**1**	**43**	**358**	**1**	**73**	**44**	**20**	**2**	**87**

Source: IEC (2015:1-6)

According to the Lesotho Government (2011:115), female representation dropped to 49% in 2011 (compared to 58% in the 2005 elections). Table 11 below illustrates female councillors following the 2005, 2011 and 2017 local government elections:

Table 11: Women councillors following the 2005, 2011 and 2017 local government elections

Councillors	**2005 %**	**2011 %**	**2017 %**
Female councillors	58	49.1	49
Male councillors	42	50.9	51
Total councillors	100	100	100

Source: Gender Links (2017)

4.10 Coalition government

A coalition government is defined as the system whereby different political parties hold cabinet posts and have reached a mutual agreement (Cheibu, Przeworski & Saiegh, 2004). The formation of a coalition occurs when political parties agree and have the common goal of forming a government (Karume, 2003). Karume (2003) further articulates that the coalition process entails goal communication, signing the

coalition agreement that stipulates the commitments that are binding, and detailing the role of each party that enters into a coalition.

The formation of coalition governments happens before or after the elections (thus, either pre-electoral or post-electoral coalition governments). In a pre-electoral coalition, the parties plan to join forces before the elections, rather than stand alone in the elections (Golder, 2006:195). Oyugi (2006:53) states that this alliance is made to increase the chances of winning and having a majority in the legislature. According to Golder (2006), the parties that form alliances do not stand for elections as independent entities and the merging should be made known to the electorate and the IEC. A post-electoral coalition is formed just after the elections when the dominant party does not have sufficient numbers to form a government on its own.

4.10.1 Coalition government of 2012: Thabane's administration

Lesotho witnessed a coalition government, which was formed by the ABC, the LCD and the BNP, in 2012 and was led by Tom Thabane as Prime Minister (Nyane, 2017:76). Thabane was sworn into office on 8 June 2012 (Lesotho, 2018:20). According to Nyane (2017), it was the first time Lesotho had witnessed a scenario whereby there was no single party that could form a government alone. None of the parties possessed the National Assembly's prerequisite majority as stipulated by the Constitution. Just before the elections, the commander of the LDF, Lieutenant General Kamoli, was relieved of his duties and Thabane made Brigadier Mahao the commander of the army. According to the UN (2012), in August 2012, Thabane declared a food crisis in Lesotho. Food security had declined due to late rains and a drought in 2011/2012. Thabane asked Lesotho's development partners for assistance. The government filed a grant application to the Central Emergency Relief Fund (CERF). A grant of $6.2-million was granted to be used in the following manner:

- **$5.4-million for food insecurity**
  $1.1-million for vulnerable farmers as agricultural emergency interventions. $2.4-million food parcels. $2-million cash to families who were most vulnerable.
- **$415 000 for health and nutrition**

$227 000 for malnutrition management and $188 000 for constant surveillance of diseases.

- **$190 000 for protection**
  For gender-based violence management and prevention (United Nations, 2012:12).

In 2008, King Letsie, on the advice of the prime minister, appointed Michael Ramodibeli as the president of the Appeal Court of Lesotho. The Appeal Court usually sits in April and October, and the president is mandated to convene special sessions if needed. Tensions flared when Justice Ramodibeli informed the Chief Justice that High Court judges would not be needed in matters of the Appeal Court until further notice (Ngcobo, Nganunu & Ramadhani, 2013:14-22). According to Rickard (2014), Judge Ramodibeli, who was the president of the Appeal Court in Lesotho and the Chief Justice in Swaziland was charged with fraud, mismanagements of funds, and political prejudice by the government of Lesotho. In January 2015, Thabane appointed Dr Kanelo Mosito as the Judge President (Southern Africa Litigation Centre, 2016:4).

4.10.2 Coalition government of 2015: Mosisili's administration

Lesotho's second coalition government was formed in 2015. It was led by Mosili, who was sworn into office in March 2015 (Lesotho, 2018:23). The fighting began in May 2015 when Mosisili removed Mahao as commander of the LDF and reinstated Kamoli. In June 2015, Mahao was shot dead by members of the LDF (Southern Africa Litigation Centre, 2016:2). In December 2015, the autopsy report revealed that Mahao was killed intentionally (Mohloboli, 2015).

In addition, the Auditor-General reported that Mosisili's administration paid M261-million for a vehicle fleet service contract of six months (from October 2015 to March 2016) to Bidvest Bank Limited of South Africa. The Finance Minister, Mamphono Khaketla, announced that the government would buy 600 vehicles and take 600 Basotho vehicles in order to empower the Basotho. The problem arose because the Bidvest contract outlined that the government would gain ownership rights – regardless of whether or not it was registered as the "owner". The Auditor-General

urged the government to terminate the contract with Bidvest because it was 60% higher in costs compared to the former contract holder, Avis Fleet Services. The former Minister of Police, Monyane Moleleki, announced at a rally in Butha-Buthe that the government paid M600-million to Bidvest in the 2016/17 financial year. He added that the government made an agreement to pay M37-million to buy 159 used cars from Bidvest as a termination agreement and M28-million for 124 cars after the contract was ended prematurely. This was one of the reasons why Moleleki formed the AD (Kabi, 2017).

4.10.3 Coalition government of 2017: Thabane's administration

In December 2016, the Mosisili-led government removed Kamoli as the commander of the army (as per the SADC Commission of Inquiry's recommendation). He was succeeded by Major General Khoantle Motšomotšo. In October 2017, a few months after Thabane became Prime Minister, Kamoli was arrested. He is presently in custody at a maximum security prison and has been denied bail (Tefo, 2018). On 5 September 2017, Motšomotšo was shot dead in his office in the barracks. He died alongside two other high-ranking colleagues, Colonel Tefo Hashatsi and Colonel Bulane Sechele. Both were shot by Motšomotšo's bodyguards (Fogelman, 2017:3). General Lineo Poopa was appointed as the acting army commander after the death of Motšomotšo (Molupe, 2017). In August 2017, the former Minister of Defence, Tseliso Mokhosi, who was also the deputy leader of the LCD, was charged with murdering police constable Mokakale Khetheng and other four police officers.

Mokhosi was released on M1000 bail and had to attend his remands in custody until his final trial. He released a statement in which he said he was brutally tortured by the police to confess to killing Khetheng. He then fled for his life, just like Mothejoa Mesting of the LCD and Mathibeli Mokhothu, the deputy leader of the DC (Muzofa, 2017). According to Fengu (2017), Metsing fled the country because of threats to his life and after he received a tip-off about a plan to assassinate him while he was in custody. Thabane reappointed Justice Mosito and replaced Justice Robert Nugent, who was appointed to the court of apex by Mosisili (Tefo, 2018). In August 2017, there was no sitting of the top court lawyers because they were opposed to the appointment of Mosito.

The Constitutional Court bench ruled that the appointment of Mosito was unlawful and breached the Constitution's provisions due to his impeachment over issues of tax evasion. However, in October 2017, the judges of the High Court cleared the criminal charges against him. The majority judgement ruled that Mosito was not fit to be president of court because Justice Nugent, his successor, had been removed unlawfully. The minority judgement ruled that it was unnecessary to declare Nugent's removal in order to conclude that Mosito was unfit for his position (Tefo, 2018). Nugent, who was a retired South African Supreme Court of Appeal judge, tendered his resignation to the government of Lesotho because he did not want to be associated with the case. This caused a delay in the sitting of the Court of Appeal, which affected the administration of Lesotho's justice system.

On 27 February 2018, Justice Yvonne Mokgoro was appointed as the acting president of the Appeal Court. On 20 March 2018, Justice Hlajoane was appointed. In February 2018, General Mojalefa Letsoela was appointed as the new army commander. Letsoela emphasised that the army must respect the citizens and be accountable for its actions (Tefo, 2018). On 1 November 2018, Dr Kananelo Mosito was reappointed and sworn in as the president of the Court of Appeal after winning his impeachment case (Tefo, 2018). According to Pheko (2018), Chief Justice Nthomeng Majara was suspended by the prime minister on 14 September 2018 over financial mismanagement allegations and failing to perform her duties well. Justice 'Maseforo Mahase was appointed as acting chief justice. Lesotho's judiciary has experienced constant interference from prime ministers as they have a tendency to appoint a new president of the Appeal Court and chief justice when they assume their duties. This is a way of removing the judiciary's independence, which is mandated by the Constitution.

4.11 Summary

The 1993 and 1998 elections took place under the FPTP system, whereby the winner takes all. The elections of 2002, 2007, 2012, 2015 and 2017 were based on the MMP system, which was put into effect as a post-election conflict resolution in 2002. The elections and electoral process may advance or contain the conflict.

Lesotho has transitioned from one dominant party to military rule to multi-party governance; thereby promoting democracy. The PR system introduced is conducive to ensuring stability because it ensures broad representation in the process of governance (as opposed to the FPTP system). Political parties splitting just before an election and the formation of new political parties show a lack of tolerance and a hunger for power among members.

The 2012, 2015 and 2017 snap elections led to the formation of coalition governments, which faced numerous problems because Lesotho's Constitution does not include anything on coalitions. Each time the prime ministers failed to amend the Constitution – as recommended by the Phumaphi Commission. It is evident that the political parties that lose elections are always dissatisfied and find a way to protest the election results. Moreover, the opposition parties are in favour of a government of national unity, but when they are in power, they neglect the idea.

This chapter discussed Lesotho's first democratic elections, which were held in 1993. Since then, Lesotho has witnessed various military coups. The 1993 elections were followed by elections in 1998, which led to the political violence because of allegations that the elections were rigged. Between 2002 and 2017, Lesotho has held several snap elections due to political instability. The country held its first local government elections in 2005, followed by two more – in 2011 and 2017. Lesotho witnessed coalition governments from 2011 until the 2017 general elections.

Chapter 5

Research summary, findings and recommendations

5.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to present a summary of the chapters and discuss the research findings. The empirical findings will be presented and discussed in line with the general aim of the study, which is to gain insight into exploring the role of political parties and party systems on democracy in Lesotho. The numerous new political parties that emerge just before an election in Lesotho motivated the researcher to determine why this occurs.

Political parties as a mechanism for the introduction of democratic procedures encourage and mobilise the citizens to participate in an election by voting for the candidate of their choice (Diamond & Gunther, 2001:7-8). Political parties differ in the way they compete with each other and in the way they channel their ambitions in order to solve problems collectively (Aldrich, 1995:22-23). In a democratic country, political parties should exclusively take diverse engagements on concerns that are significant by providing the voters with the authority over what the government does.

Lesotho adopted the Westminster System and therefore the country is regarded as a parliamentary democracy whereby the prime minister is the head of government and the king is the head of state. In this system, the government exercises executive power, while the legislative authority is vested in the government and the National Assembly and Senate chambers. The judiciary is independent from both the executive and legislative authority.

Lesotho has witnessed a number of new political parties because the Constitution guarantees freedom of association. Thus, the citizens enjoy that right by forming political parties (Lesotho Government, 1993:17). Lesotho transitioned from authoritarian rule to democratic rule after a lengthy history of coups, dominant parties and inadequate opposition voices.

5.2 Summary of chapters

Chapter one: Chapter one discussed what motivated the researcher to pursue a study which examines exploring the role of political parties and party systems on democracy in Lesotho. Section 1(1) of the Lesotho Constitution stipulates that it is a "sovereign democratic state". Section 2 stipulates that the Constitution is the supreme law of the country, which simply means that Lesotho is a constitutional and democratic state (Lesotho Government, 1993:6).

In addition, democracy was discussed as an institution where political parties give the citizens the choice of who they want to elect to government by means of voting in elections. The Constitution of Lesotho (1993) guarantees citizens freedom of association; therefore, citizens enjoy that right by forming new political parties. The party systems affect the way representation should occur by demonstrating the different choices available to voters in order for them to express their preferences.

The National Assembly Electoral Act (2011) stipulates that citizens have the right to vote and stand for elections during periodic elections under the MMP system, and the IEC is allowed to register political parties. Lesotho, therefore, operates by means of the Westminster political system in which the king, on advice of state council, appoints the prime minister from the political party with the majority of parliamentary seats. The prime minister of Lesotho is the head of government, while the king is the head of state. Lesotho has adopted a multi-party system whereby many political parties run for an election in order to gain government control – in a coalition or separately. Lesotho has witnessed the formation of many new political parties prior to elections – mainly due to dissatisfaction within parties. The first coalition government was introduced in Lesotho in 2012 and was led by the leader of the ABC, Dr Thomas Motsoahae Thabane.

The citizens of Lesotho are disappointed with the fact that the government is failing to meet its objective of a stable democracy – as seen with the 2012 and 2015 coalition governments. Like other countries, the Lesotho government operates through three main organs of the state, namely the executive, the legislature and the judiciary, which are interrelated and interdependent. The MMP system used in

Lesotho remains a problem and there is a need to examine and evaluate it to assess whether it is beneficial to the current political situation.

The MMP system has been used since the 2002 general elections; therefore, it can be said that Lesotho has tolerated the emergence of new parties and alliances. The study investigated the main reasons why new political parties emerged prior to elections in the country. As mentioned before, Lesotho uses the multi-party system, which is characterised by competition between more than two parties. This increases the probability of a coalition.

The research questions were outlined and that assisted the researcher in understanding why certain circumstances occurred. In addition, the aims and objectives of the research were outlined, which provided the researcher with insight into the research. The research was conducted using primary and secondary sources in a qualitative approach.

Chapter two: This chapter discussed the theory in terms of separation of powers whereby the principle of *trias politica* was outlined. The separation of powers was created to ensure that the rule of law is respected and so that there are clear, separate functions for the legislative, executive and judiciary organs. The three branches of government must be completely isolated in the separation of powers. Masterman (2011:13) states that the legislature makes laws, the executive implements them, and the judiciary interprets them. Usually, governments use the separation of powers doctrine to assign different legal and political powers to the three branches of government.

According to Fisher (1990:217), a tripartite system of government comprises of the legislative, executive and judicial branches in order to protect the liberty of citizens. The tripartite system is thus the doctrine of separation of powers and the countries that practice it should adhere to its guiding principles. The principle of separation of powers is associated with the checks and balances system, which ensures that the government is accountable and transparent concerning the performing of its duties and functions. Checks and balances ensure that each of the government organs

know their responsibilities and that no organ is supreme. The chapter also discussed the parliamentary, presidential and semi-presidential systems.

The parliamentary system regulates the separation of powers between the legislative and executive power. The members of parliament have the authority to determine how the cabinet is formed and the majority of similar members may cast a vote to remove ministers from office. The head of state is usually a king or queen, who is advised by the prime minister. The prime minister is the head of government and the head of the cabinet. In the parliamentary system, the parliamentary government must have the ability to impose its will on parliament and govern the agenda of legislature by strict rules in the process of voting in parliament, as well as the resignation and dissolution of parliament (Tsebelis, 2002:93).

In the presidential system, the president is elected by the voters and has the fixed obligation to give direction to the government. Policymaking authority is divided between the legislature and the president (Gerring *et al.,* 2009:15). Furthermore, Sartori (1997:112) states that the presidential system is a political system whereby the president is directly elected by citizens and serves as the head of the executive branch with separation of powers that are rigid for a period of time. The semi-presidential system is regarded as a mix of parliamentarism and presidentialism. It is also referred to as the French system (Verga, 2016). Military intervention was also discussed. This is the unilateral or multilateral deployment of the military troops in a state. The military usually uses its powers to influence the future of politics (MacFarlane, 1983:53).

Chapter three: This chapter acknowledges the literature regarding exploring the role of political parties and party systems on democracy in Lesotho. It also discusses representative democracy, which is regarded as a mechanism that allows citizens to choose people who will represent them in parliament. According to Lindberg (2006:3), elections are the primary source of representative democracy. Representative democracy is seen in many democratic countries and is whereby elite group elections are capacitated with authority to make decisions on behalf of the people who elected them. In addition, representative democracy is mostly used in modern democratic governments. The political leaders are mandated, on behalf of

the citizens, to make decisions and formulate laws. In a representative democracy, certain individuals are elected to represent the will of the citizens and this is done through public participation in an election (Besley & Coate, 1997:106).

The chapter further discussed political parties and party systems in a democracy. Maliyamkono and Kanyangolo (2003:41) define a political party as an "association of people working together in an organised manner that compete for political office and have policies that guide them". Each political party has distinct features that make it different from other political parties. Political parties play a vital role in examining a democracy's health in a democratic country; therefore, it is possible for a country to have a stable democracy but democracy does not exist without political parties in a country. The foundation of democracy is based on political parties, which are major electoral participants. According to Sadie (2006:204), political parties educate people about how to play the game of politics in a democracy. This includes the process of elections, the participation of voters, and campaigning by parties. Opposition parties are capacitated with the authority to ensure that political accountability and responsibility from government is maintained in a democratic country.

According to Joannou and Coetzee (2010:141), the number of functioning political parties within a country is referred to as party system. Party system is defined as follows: "The set of interactions that follow the same pattern and compete among different parties" (Mainwaring & Scully, 1995:4). Party system usually refers to many political parties, which take part in elections regularly, and designates the interaction between many political parties, which compete among each other. The different party systems are one-party, one-party dominant, two-party and multi-party. Lesotho uses the multi-party system, which allows many political parties to compete in elections for political power. Democracy provides citizens with the opportunity to elect their representatives who will have authority and be responsible for them. Elections are thus citizen's expression that has the constitutionally stipulated period and they allow candidates to participate in the contest of leader's recruitment.

The electoral system is a technique that expresses the citizens' choice of leaders, which translates into parliamentary seats (De Ville & Steytler, 1999:1). The electoral system is vital in governance because it outlines the manner in which citizens cast

their votes in elections, which are translated into seats in parliament. It also ensures that government is continuously responsive and accountable to citizens. The types of electoral systems discussed were the FPTP and MMP. At present, the MMP system is used in Lesotho in elections. The chapter also discussed how a coalition government is a process whereby different political parties form a government based on mutual goals.

Chapter four: The chapter discussed the political background of Lesotho whereby its democracy has been characterised by major problems since it gained dependence from Britain in 1966. Lesotho has experienced a culture of political parties splitting since 1950 due to the political disputes that arise within them. This chapter explained in detail Lesotho's democracy from 1993 to 2017. Lesotho held its first democratic elections in January 1993. The FPTP electoral system was used and the BCP, under leadership of Ntsu Mokhehle, won all 65 constituencies (Matlosa, 1999:97).

In May 1998, elections were held and the LCD won 79 of the 80 constituencies and Pakalitha Mosisili succeeded Ntsu Mokhehle (Sekatle, 1998:31). The opposition parties rejected the election results, claiming voting fraud, and demanded that the election be repeated. The opposition parties also claimed that the FPTP electoral system was biased because opposition parties were not provided with an opportunity to be active in parliament when the dominant party won all the constituencies. MMP was introduced as a way to ensure that small parties with a satisfactory number of votes would have representation in the National Assembly (Makoa, 2014).

In May 2002, the first snap election was held due to the disputes caused by the outcome of the 1998 election. The revised MMP system, which includes FPTP and PR, was used. The LCD won the election with 79 out of 80 constituency based seats. It did not obtain any PR seats. All nine opposition parties held the 40 proportional seats and the BNP had 21 seats.

An election was due to be held in May 2007 but because the government was uncomfortable with the ABC's growing numbers, King Letsie III advised the prime

minister to dissolve parliament and announce an election for February 2007. The LCD won and Mosisili became the prime minister.

An election was next held in 2012 and the DC won 48 out of 120 seats. Therefore, the DC needed only 13 seats to obtain 61 constitutional seats to form a coalition government. Lesotho witnessed its first coalition government, which was formed by the ABC with 30 seats, the LCD with 26, and the BNP with five (Lesotho, 2018:20).

Lesotho's third snap election took place in February 2015 due to political instability; thus, two years earlier than the scheduled five year term (Letsie, 2015:82). The second coalition government was formed by seven parties – the DC, the LCD, the PFD, the MFP, the LPC, the BCP, and the NIP.

Lesotho's fourth snap election was scheduled to take place on 3 June 2017. The then prime minister, Pakalitha Mosisili, who was the leader of the DC, was removed from office with a vote of no confidence by the opposition parties on 1 March 2017. The 2017 coalition government was formed by the ABC, the AD, the BNP and the RCL and led by Prime Minister Thomas Thabane (Akwei, 2017).

The chapter further discussed the local government elections of 2005 and 2017, when the elections were conducted using the FPTP system, although the MMP system was introduced in the National Assembly elections. When the PR system is used, there is a slim chance that the elections will be contested. This is because every party that stood for election and has a satisfactory number of votes (as stipulated by the IEC) will be represented in parliament (Hartmann, 2004:178).

5.3 Data interpretation

The section will interpret the data collected regarding exploring the role of political parties and party systems in Lesotho. The data collected will be assessed and evaluated based on the researcher's intentions for pursuing the research.

5.3.1 Parliamentary system and separation of powers

Lesotho's political system follows the principles of the Westminster System. The country has an executive authority, which is made up ministers who are drawn from the senate and the legislature. Citizens do not elect the prime minister. Instead, members of parliament elect him/her. Article 44 of Lesotho's Constitution stipulates that the king is the constitutional monarch and the head of state that serves a ceremonial function and is regarded as a national unity symbol under the constitutional effect. The prime minister is the head of government and during the course of this study, the leader of the ABC was in a coalition government with the AD, the BNP and the RCL, in the ninth parliament.

The government exercises the executive power, while the legislative power is conferred on the government and parliament. Lesotho has a bicameral parliament, which consists of two chambers, the Upper House (Senate) and Lower House (National Assembly). The parliament consists of the National Assembly, which has 120 members of parliament (80 who are elected in the FPTP system and 40 in the PR system), and the Senate, which consists of 33 members, 22 principal chiefs and 11 nominated senators (Matlosa & Shale, 2006:144). The Constitution stipulates that the majority leader in parliament is regarded as the prime minister.

Separation of powers is a political doctrine, which refers to a way of restricting the powers and functions of the three branches of government, namely the legislature, the executive and the judiciary. The separation of powers doctrine is designated as a constitutional tool, which is in line with setting goals for the country (Barber, 2001:71). It applies to Lesotho, whereby the judiciary is independent from the legislative and executive authority.

The separation of powers ensures that power and control are not concentrated in one organ of government. Therefore, the doctrine is regarded as a mechanism for promoting democratic and good governance in a state. The executive authority is regarded as the lawmaker, whereby the cabinet ministers are derived. Lesotho's legislative or law-making authority is vested in its parliament, according to section 70(1) of the Constitution. The executive power is vested in the prime minister, who is

also the head of government. Section 88 of the Constitution stipulates that the cabinet is responsible to the two houses of parliament – the Senate and the National Assembly. Under Lesotho's parliamentary system, the separation of powers between the executive and legislative authority is not clear because the members of parliament can pass legislation without being opposed by an independent body. The parliamentary system used is not conducive to democracy because there is no clear separation of powers. This may lead to a lack of accountability and transparency, as ministers are part of the legislative authority. This may lead to a conflict of interest concerning policy matters.

5.3.2 Lesotho's political instability

Lesotho's political landscape since independence has been characterised by political instability, which has negatively affected the country's economic and human development. Lesotho experienced undemocratic rule from 1970 to 1986. From 1986 to 1993 it was ruled by the military. The military ensured a return to a multi-party system in the 1993 democratic elections, which were won by the Basotho Congress Party (BCP) (African Development Bank, 2006:2).

The political problems in Lesotho are due to its poor economic performance. It is difficult for the country to accumulate sufficient resources to distribute among its citizens (Sekatle, 1997:84). According to Leftwich (2000:142), poverty is viewed as a democratic consolidation obstacle because of the scarce resources in a country. The ruling elite benefit at the expense of the citizens. They have proper salaries and huge benefits. Members of parliament, cabinet ministers and principal secretaries have access to interest-free loans of between M500,000 and M800,000 (Government Gazette, 2005). According to Ntsukunyane (2016), eight interest-free loans of M500,000 each of members of parliament were written off by the government. This amounted to M32, 229, 284.92 million and took place in April 2015 under Mosisili's administration. According to the Lesotho Council of Non-governmental Organisations (LCN), ministers and senior public servants violated the principles of good governance. The same applies to the scheme where government vehicles were sold to officials (mainly ministers and senior public servants) at drastically undervalued "residual values" (e.g. a three-year old Mercedes-Benz E-

class sold for M4000). These policy decisions and practices are unjust, immoral and violate all the principles of good governance. History repeated itself under Thabane's administration in August 2017 when the government paid a hefty loan, amounting to M43-million, to nine parliament members.

Lesotho transitioned to democratic rule in 1993. That year's general elections were won by the BCP. It won all the constituencies under the FPTP system. Lesotho had used the FPTP electoral system since it gained independence. This system led to political instability and crises because many political parties felt that they were excluded during elections (Weisfelder, 2001:75). The FPTP electoral system allowed members of parliament to "cross the floor" in parliament, that is, migrate from one party to another. In 1997, Lesotho witnessed the first massive floor crossing when the then prime minister, Ntsu Mokhehle, left the BCP and formed the LCD on 9 June 1997. He had the support of 40 members of parliament. The BCP was left with only 25 members of parliament; thus, it had to become an opposition party. The then leader of the BCP became the prime minister, but under the umbrella of the LCD (Sekatle, 1997:68). Usually, floor crossing takes place in parliamentary democracies, such as Lesotho under the FPTP system (Sekatle, 1997:73, Matlosa, 1999:179). These events led the BNP and the LCN to march to the Royal Palace. They submitted a memorandum that asked for the dissolution of the LCD government by the king. They also asked for the formation of an interim government that would administer the next elections because the FPTP electoral system was undemocratic as no opposition was represented in parliament (Sekatle, 1997:70).

The opposition parties and other organisations believed that the LCD government was illegitimate. Hence, they worked hard to ensure that the government was destabilised because they wanted the MMP electoral system, which would allow them to gain representation in parliament. In 1993, opposition parties gained 25% of the votes, while in 1998, opposition parties gained 40% of the votes but had no representation in parliament under the FPTP system (Matlosa, 2003:79). In the same year, Lesotho witnessed a political crisis that was caused by opposition parties rejecting the LCD's victory because of the FPTP system. According to the IEC (1998:42), the 1993 and 1998 elections had no parliamentary opposition and therefore there was a need to review the electoral system. Opposition parties called

for the LCD government to be declared illegitimate and therefore be dissolved. They believed that the election results were rigged. Lesotho witnessed a South African-led military intervention to assist with conflict management.

South Africa led the external mediation and the Langa Commission was established. This was presided over by Justice Pius Langa of the Constitutional Court of South Africa, as well as three representatives from Botswana, four from South Africa, and three from Zimbabwe (Matlosa, 2003; Mothibe, 1999). The dissatisfaction of the parties that felt cheated in the elections led to protests that claimed many lives of citizens and damaged infrastructure. This resulted in intervention from the Langa Commission and the Interim Political Authority (IPA) was formed. The IPA was established with the aim of preparing and reviewing the electoral system that would be used in future elections and ensuring that there would be democratic representation of citizens in parliament. Lesotho adopted the mixed member proportional (MMP) system, which first was used in the 2002 elections to remedy the mistakes of the FPTP system (also referred to the winner-takes-all system) after the 1998 elections. This electoral system is a combination of 80 FPTP seats and 40 PR seats (which are referred to as compensatory seats) – thus, 120 parliamentary seats. Lesotho introduced the MMP to remedy the flaws of the FPTP system and ensure that parties that had support from voters are represented in parliament.

There were numerous problems related to the adoption of the MMP system that the IPA faced. Some parties wanted the National Assembly seats to be split 65/65, while others advocated for 80 FPTP seats and 50 PR seats (Matlosa, 2003). According to Likoti (2007), the LCD government did not favour the proposed MMP. After long consultation, an agreement was reached that the MMP electoral system would be used which would consist of 80 FPTP and 40 PR seats. A bill was drafted by the IPA and parliament and passed in 2001 to accommodate the MMP system. This led to an amendment of the Constitution (Fourth Amendment to the Constitution Act 2001). Many political parties favoured the MMP system because it increased the chances of smaller parties gaining representation in parliament due to the PR system (Southall, 2003:276). The researcher is of the opinion that the MMP system is advantageous for Lesotho because it enables the proportionality of seats in parliament. This allows for the representation of small parties and ensures that there is a stable government.

In 2002, Lesotho used the MMP electoral system for the first time. The LCD won 77 out of the 80 constituency seats, while the LPC won one constituency (Fox & Southall, 2003). The formula that was used in the MMP system in 2002 was outlined by the Independent Electoral Commission and can be seen in Table 12 below:

Table 12: The MMP system formula (FPTP and PR)

If the formula is used (FPTP and PR) after counting, the results are as follows:
Red party – 101,237
Blue party – 132,679
Pink party – 268,103
Total votes – 502,019

502,019 is divided by 120 (number of parliamentary seats (FPTP and PR) to get the quota of votes

$$\frac{502{,}019}{120} = 4{,}183.491$$

4,183.491 is rounded off to the next whole number and we get 4,184. Therefore, the allocation of seats is as follows:

$$\text{Red party } \frac{101{,}237}{4{,}184} = 24.19622$$

$$\text{Blue party } \frac{132{,}679}{4{,}184} = 31.71104$$

$$\text{Pink party } \frac{268{,}103}{4{,}184} = 64.07815$$

Red party has 24 seats
Blue party has 31 seats
Pink party has 64 seats
Total seats are 119. There is still one seat to be allocated. If there are fewer provisionally allocated seats that the expected 120 seats of the National Assembly, then the remaining seat is allocated to the party with a high decimal

fraction. In this case, the Blue party will get an additional seat and have 32 seats.

The provisional allocation of each party for proportional representation is calculated by subtracting the seats won in the constituency elections as follows:
Red party – 15 constituency seats
Blue party – 20 constituency seats
Pink party – 45 constituency seats

Therefore:
Red party – 24 provisional seats minus 15 constituency seats won = 9 compensatory seats
Blue party – 32 provisional seats minus 20 constituency seats won = 12 compensatory seats
Pink party – 64 provisional seats minus 45 constituency seats won = 19 compensatory seats.
Thus, 9 + 12 + 19 = 40 PR seats

Source: IEC (2002:2)

According to Likoti, (2007:3) the MMP adoption was done in an understanding manner. Many political parties were now represented in parliament and for the first time in Lesotho's history, ten political parties were represented in its democratic government. Although the BNP had 21 PR seats in 2002, they accepted the election results but claimed that the election results were rigged. The BNP wrote a Memorandum of Settlement Agreement to the Prime Minister, stating that it would accept the 2002 election results under the following conditions:

Withdrawal of the BNP's legal trials only if the IEC would compensate it with M550,000 to cover its legal costs; King Letsie III would be consulted by the Prime Minister in order to appoint three BNP members to cabinet, and be given the ministry of justice, ministry of natural resources and deputy minister of finance; and the Constitution musts be amended so that the country would have 50 constituencies and 50 PR seats (Lesotho, 2003).

Some other opposition parties were satisfied with the MMP system because their parties were represented in parliament. Matlosa (2003:36) states that the electoral system provided the opposition leaders with work and the election violence was contained. The MMP was the system that managed to solve the political conflict that arose because smaller parties were not allowed representation in parliament. In 2006, prior to the 2007 elections, Thabane left the LCD and formed the ABC. He accused the LCD of not having strategies and being incapable of eradicating the escalating poverty and unemployment. The LCD was left with 61 seats, while the opposition parties had 58 seats. Accordingly, the then Prime Minister, Pakalitha Mosisili, closed parliament and called for early elections. Table 13 below outlines the parliamentary representation after the LCD members of parliament crossed to the ABC in 2006.

Table 13: The 2006 Parliament representation after the LCD MPs crossed to the ABC

Parties	**No. of seats after 2002 elections**	**No. of seats after floor crossing in 2006**	**Gain/loss**
ABC	-	**18**	**+18**
BAC	3	3	0
BCP	3	3	0
BNP	21	21	0
LCD	**79**	**61**	**-17**
LPC	5	5	0
LWP	1	1	0
MFP	1	1	0
NIP	5	5	0
NPP	1	1	0
PFD	1	1	0

Source: Matlosa and Shale (2006:4)

This table shows that the ABC gained 18 parliamentary seats after the floor crossing by the LCD members of parliament. The table further indicates that in 2002 the LCD had 79 parliamentary seats, while in 2006 they only had 61 seats.

The multi-party system used in Lesotho is beneficial for the country because minority parties have gained representation in parliament. The ABC gained massive support in urban areas and this led to the party forming an alliance with the LWP. The LCD, meanwhile, formed an alliance with the NIP. The leader of the NIP, Anthony Manyeli, was left off the PR list. He challenged the legality of the LCD/NIP coalition and obtained an interdict from the High Court of Lesotho that declared the coalition null and void. However, this was reversed by the Appeal Court (Manyeli, 2007).

These coalitions were formed by parties aiming to increase their chances to gain PR seats. The Electoral Institute of South Africa (EISA) (2004:27) states that most of Lesotho's political parties stem from the BCP and the BNP; for example, the LCD split from the BCP, the LPC split from the BCP, and the ABC split from the LCD. The LCD won the 2007 elections with 62 constituencies out of 79. Its coalition partner (the NIP) was allocated 21 PR seats, which resulted in a LCD/NIP coalition dominance of 83 seats. The ABC won 17 seats, while the LWP received ten PR seats, resulting in 27 seats in total (IEC, 2007).

The ABC rejected the election results, claiming that the election was rigged and the allocation of proportional seats was incorrect. It should be noted that each democratic country has an electoral system that is prescribed by the electoral law that outlines the procedures. The LCD/NIP and ABC/LWP alliances were informal because they were not registered by the IEC. Thus, each party was independently allocated its share of seats. Lesotho's political parties that lose in elections have the tendency to reject the election results, claiming that the results were rigged. Opposition parties were unhappy with the allocation of the PR seats. They wanted the coalition of the ABC/LWP and LCD/NIP to be treated as one party in the allocation of the seats. According to Likoti (2007:5-7), in the MMP system, parties that failed to obtain FPTP seats are usually compensated using the PR system.

Moreover, the National Assembly Election Act does not give clarity on the alliances PR list; that is, whether PR candidates can belong to a certain political party. This resulted in the LCD and the ABC submitting their members in the NIP and the LWP respectively; thus, no laws or rules were broken. Lesotho faced the challenge of a

coalition government in 2012, 2015 and 2017, as no political party was able to form a government alone; thus, they had to share power, which led to conflict.

5.4 Research findings

The section will present the findings that are applicable to the research questions. The research's main aim was to explore the role of political parties and party systems on democracy in Lesotho. The research findings were based on the research questions, which were answered by this study, as follows:

The multi-party system that is used in Lesotho is beneficial because the numerous political parties are given an opportunity to stand for elections in order for the electorate to decide who they want to govern them. In **Chapter 3,** the theory of the multi-party system was discussed. **Chapter 4** discussed multi-party systems in the context of Lesotho. The number of political parties that stood for elections in Lesotho increased dramatically from the 1993 general elections to those in 2017. In a multi-party system, there are a number of political parties that manage to gain representation in the legislature; this often results in the formation of a coalition government. According to Yadav (2014:19), proportional voting, known as the proportional representation (PR) system, supports the multi-party system. The formation of new political parties can be ascribed to the poverty in Lesotho, whereby the leaders believed that their parties would obtain compensatory parliamentary seats if they failed to obtain constituency seats. Hence, they would be able to eradicate poverty among the members of their parties. However, the multi-party system is unsystematic because of the multiplying and emerging of weak political parties.

According to Robbins and Hunter (2011:12), political parties in a modern democracy are important because they allow citizens to be represented in public office. In **Chapter 3**, the theory of political parties was discussed. Political parties in a democratic government compete with each other in elections to gain power to rule the country. Lesotho is characterised by the emergence of new political parties prior to elections since it gained independence because of feuds and disagreements

among the members of political parties. This occurred in 1997, when the then Prime Minister the late Ntsu Mokhehle, left the BCP and formed the LCD a year before the 1998 national elections. The LCD won the 1998 elections with 79 out of 80 seats. The LCD's new leader in 1998 was Pakalitha Mosisili, who succeeded Mokhehle. The formation of the LCD marked the end of the BCP, which won 65 constituencies in Lesotho's first democratic elections in 1993. In 2001, Kelebone Maope and Shakhane Mokhele left the LCD and formed the LPC. This new party's symbol was the head of Mokhehle. The reason given for the formation of the LPC was that the LCD had become oppressive.

In 2006, a year before the general elections, Thomas Thabane left the LCD and formed the ABC (see **Chapter 4)**. In 2012, Mosisili left the LCD and formed the DC. In 2014, the LCD split again when Keketso Rants'o, who was the secretary-general, formed the Reformed Congress of Lesotho (the RCL). In 2016, before the general elections, Monyane Moleleki left the DC and formed the AD. In 2017, just before the general elections, Selibe Mochoboroane left the LCD and formed a new party called the MEC. The emergence of these new political parties was due to the dissatisfaction of party members within their respective parties. The researcher is of the opinion that the leaders of new political parties believe that they can do better in new parties - especially in terms of delivering services to the citizens who placed their trust in them when voting in the elections.

The formation of coalition governments in Lesotho can be ascribed to political parties failing to obtain the 61 parliamentary seats, which are required to form a government (see **Chapter 4**). Lesotho witnessed its first coalition government in 2012, which comprised of the ABC, the LCD and the BNP. Thomas Thabane, the leader of the ABC, led this coalition government, while Mothejoa Metsing, the leader of the BNP, was the Deputy Prime Minister. The leader of the BNP was also the minister for Gender, Youth, Sports and Recreation. The ABC had 30 seats, the LCD 26 and the BNP five seats (Lesotho, 2018:20). Seven parties, the DC, the LCD, the PFD, the MFP, the LPC, the BCP and the National Independent Party (NIP), formed the second coalition government in 2015. The DC had 47 seats, the LCD 12, the PFD two, and the MFP, the LPC, the BCP and the NIP one seat each. The third (and

current) coalition government is made up of the ABC, the AD, the BNP and the RCL. The ABC has 48 seats, the AD nine, the BNP five and the RCL one seat.

The research found that the coalition governments in Lesotho were formed because no political party obtained the required 61 seats to form a government. **Chapter 4** discussed the coalition governments in 2012, 2015 and 2017. The coalition governments of 2012 and 2015 experienced instability as there was a lack of trust and political unity. This resulted in a cabinet reshuffle and the appointment of critical governments post without consulting the public and coalition members.

Local government in Lesotho witnessed the remarkable achievement of women political representation. **Chapter 4** also discussed local government elections in Lesotho. In 1997, SADC addressed gender inequality among public representatives. This led to the amendment of the Local Government Act 1997, which ensured one-third female representation in local government structures.

The judiciary in Lesotho is not fully independent. The prime minister, on the king's advice, appoints the Chief Justice and the president of Court of Appeal. **Chapter 4** discussed how the new prime minister usually appoints a new Chief Justice when the government changes. This led to the malfunctioning of the courts of law and political disputes.

The FPTP system was undemocratic because the winner took all; thus, separating the political environment in Lesotho, making it difficult to discuss important matters of government. This was examined in **Chapter 3**. The political parties who practiced FPTP adopted strategies to win the elections at any cost. Often citizens who supported opposition parties were harassed and intimidated. There was also no transparency in the election processes.

Lesotho was found to be a practicing multi-party democracy. Thus, numerous political parties have the opportunity to compete for power in the elections every five years, as stipulated by the Constitution. The theory on the multi-party system, discussed in **Chapter 3,** implied that a number of political parties were represented in parliament. This strengthened and sustained democracy in the country. However,

the number of political parties in Lesotho increased dramatically between 2014 and 2017. Many of the new political parties were formed by splitting from existing political parties. Political parties in Lesotho were unable to obtain the required 61 parliamentary seats in order to form a government, which led to the coalition governments in 2012, 2015 and 2017. It was also established that there was mutual distrust between political parties. This was evident during the 2014 crisis when a fragile post-electoral equilibrium existed partially because political parties accepted the existing electoral rule. Democratic governance in Lesotho is realised through the participation in elections when political parties are given the opportunity to compete fully. However, the electoral process alone is insufficient for democratic governance in Lesotho. There must also be checks and balances, transparency, and accountability in the political system.

Under the one-vote MMP, there is no clear explanation as to how the votes are translated into seats in the case of a coalition. This was evident in **Chapter 4** where the researcher looked at the coalitions of the LCD and the NIP, and the ABC and the LWP.

5.5 Recommendations

This section will present the researcher's recommendations regarding filling the gaps identified in the study.

The introduction of a multi-party system in Lesotho will not sufficient for the country to become democratic. There are criteria that need to be met, such as the promotion of good governance (whereby the government is transparent and accountable), regular, free and fair elections, and healthy competition between the different political parties.

The multi-party system in Lesotho should be reviewed and re-evaluated to ensure that political parties that fail to obtain FPTP or PR seats for three consecutive years be automatically deregistered by the IEC. A multi-party democracy is imperative because it allows all the citizens to be represented. However, there must be a limit to

the numbers for such representation. The multi-party system that is used in Lesotho gives citizens an opportunity to elect the people they want to power. Minority parties are also able to gain parliamentary representation.

There is a need for an Electoral Independent Commission in Lesotho to review its laws concerning political parties. Some political parties do not receive the accepted number of votes in an election; that is, 60 or less. Such political parties must be automatically deregistered. Party systems institutionalisation promotes democracy and increases the legitimacy of these systems, as well as promoting stability and a predictable government.

The MMP system in Lesotho, with 120 seats (FPTP 80 + 40 PR), was adopted after the 1998 political crisis. The MMP assisted in solving the political problems caused by the winner-takes-all system, which excluded the minority political parties from parliament. It is recommended that the MMP system provide guidelines that are clear regarding how the votes are translated into seats. There should be a specific regulatory framework that clearly outlines the registration of ballot papers. Moreover, there should be guidelines that clearly stipulate how the allocation of seats is done when there was a coalition of parties before the elections.

The Constitution of Lesotho is the supreme law of the country; therefore, the coalition agreement must be subject to it. The coalition agreement should have clear legal guidelines that outline the relationships, powers, roles and duties of all the coalition partners to avoid disagreements and dissatisfaction that may lead to the collapse of the coalition government.

Furthermore, the judiciary should be fully independent without interference from the legislative and executive authority. When the judiciary is independent and has enough resources, it will be able to function properly and in a transparent manner. The political parties' main role is to strengthen democracy by executing political recruitment, aggregation, and political participation – especially during the elections. Political parties strengthen democracy by participating in the elections. A political party promotes high levels of participation in the political process, such as in elections.

In addition, it is recommended that to restore trust among political parties, there must be proper communication between party leaders on the electoral rules. A neutral mediator should be involved in this. This will reduce conflict, military intervention, and most importantly, the loss of citizens' lives.

Coalition governments became a reality in Lesotho in 2012, up until 2017. This means there is a need for the government of Lesotho to put in place laws that will assist with the relationships formed to avoid unnecessary conflict between the ruling parties of the coalition government. This will form part of an effective and management mechanism.

Moreover, the adoption of a presidential system will benefit the country because it outlines the clear separation of powers between the legislative and executive authority. The legislative authority can monitor the executive without interference from the cabinet and the prime minister. In addition, the checks and balances are operative because the parliament is consulted when the members of the judiciary and cabinet ministers are appointed. This will lead to leaders who are accountable; therefore, Lesotho will see developments across the board and services will be delivered to the citizens of the country.

5.6 Conclusion

Since Lesotho gained its independence in 1966, it has witnessed significant political instability. Political parties are important in a democratic country as they are designed to contest elections to attain political power. Therefore, political parties are capacitated with the authority to determine the political order by selecting authoritative leaders. Political parties can also resolve disputes to maintain order and promote the interests of society in competing social forces.

A review of Lesotho's electoral system must be done, as the system is regarded as the framework that outlines and sets electoral rules, which determine how elections are governed (Heywood, 2002:232). In 1993, all 65 constituencies were won by the LCD (under the winner-takes-all system) with 74,7% of the votes. The BNP won 22

seats; thus, 7% of votes. In 1998, the LCD won 79 seats with 60,7% of the constituencies, but gained 98,7% of the seats in parliament. The opposition parties, on the other hand, received 40% of the votes, but won only one seat – allocated to the BNP (Kadima, 1999). This indicates that the FPTP system did not favour small parties as it did not provide for their representation in parliament.

This led to massive political violence and the destruction of infrastructure. The MMP system was adopted as a way to remedy the situation. It is evident that the winner-takes-all system (the FPTP system) contributed to election conflict and the problems that arose in the country. Therefore, the solution to the electoral system problems was the adoption of the MMP system.

The citizens of Lesotho believe that elections are a mechanism that leads to the formation of government – this despite the conflict that arose due to election results and parties rejecting the election outcome (Makoa, 2002:3). After the adoption of the MMP system through IPA reforms, Lesotho, in 2002, had ten political parties that were represented in parliament, which made the government inclusive. As a result, the political violence that usually occurred after an election was reduced.

The problems resurfaced after the 2007 elections. The opposition parties, under the MMP system, felt that they were misrepresented in parliament. Lesotho's MMP system was adopted in such a manner that no political party can influence it. The researcher agrees with SADC (2007:4), which stated that any MMP system reforms should have legal status in terms of quota calculations with coalitions and alliances (thus, how the PR seats should be allocated) to avoid misunderstandings.

It can be concluded that proportional representation is functional because small parties that have representation are given an opportunity to have a say in parliament through their members. Democracy in Lesotho should be characterised by a decision-making authority that is real; one whereby citizens have the electoral choice. Democracy in Lesotho should therefore follow the multi-party system path (Ake, 1996:132-185). Elections are a mechanism to promote democracy. Hence, Lesotho's political parties should embrace tolerance in politics and manage the conflicts of politics.

For democracy to flourish in Lesotho, the MMP system was adopted to remedy the weaknesses related to the FPTP model. The major advantage of the MMP system was that it combined the advantages of the FPTP and PR systems. Several multi-party elections were held under the MMP system – in 2002, 2007, 2012, 2015, and 2017.

The study concludes that the MMP system used in Lesotho benefits democracy as minority parties have gained representation in parliament. Moreover, the study concludes that political transformation, from the 2002 elections to the present, was democratic as multiple political parties could stand in elections and obtain representation in parliament because of the MMP system. Finally, the study concludes that Lesotho's political transformation is democratic as the first democratic elections in 1993 used a flawed FPTP system; to remedy this, the MMP system was introduced.

References

Ake, C. (1996). *Democracy and development in Africa.* Washington: The Brookings Institution.

African Development Bank. (2006). African Development Fund Report. Kingdom of Lesotho. Country Governance Profile. Country Department: North, East and South Region.

African Union. (2002). African Union Declaration on the Principles Governing Democratic Elections in Africa. http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/compilation_democracy/ahg.htm. Accessed on 20 October 2018.

Akwei, I. (2017). Devastated Lesotho PM inaugurated after fatal shooting of wife. *Africa news*, 16 June 2017.

Akwei, I. (2017). Lesotho: Incumbent Mosisili loses election to former Prime Minister Thabane. *Afrinews*, 6 June 2017.

Alder, J. (2009). *Constitutional and Administrative Law* (7th ed.). London: Macmillan.

Aldrich, J. H. (1995). *Why Parties? The Origin and Transformation of Party Politics in America.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Alonso, S. and Ruiz, R. (2005). "*Political Representation and Ethnic Conflict in New Democracies"*. *European Journal of Political Science*.

Amnesty International Annual Report 2015/16. (2015/2016). Lesotho. Available at: https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/research/2016/02/annual-report-201516/. Accessed on 20 October 2018.

Amnesty International Public Statement. (2017). A Human Rights Agenda for the New Lesotho Government. AFR 33/6468/2017.

Andrain, C. and Apter, D. (1996). *Political protest and social change: analysing politics*. New York: University Press.

Anyebe, A. (2016). "*An Overview of Presidential System at the Local Government Level in Nigeria Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria-Nigeria*". *International Journal of Political Science,* 2(1), 1-8.

Arhin, A. K. (2002). Lesotho National Assembly Elections. Final Report. Unpublished.

Arian, A. and Barnes, S. H. (1974). "*The Dominant Party System: A neglected model of democratic stability"*. *Journal of Politics*, 36(3), 592-614.

Assefa, G. (2010). Parliamentary oversight and constitutionalism in Ethiopia: An appraisal. *Ethiopian constitutional law series*, 152.

Aubynn, A. (2007). *"Behind the transparent ballot box: The significance of the 1990s elections in Ghana*", in Cowen, M & Laakso, M (eds.) *Multi-party elections in Africa*. Oxford: James Currey.

Axter, B. and Rosamond, B. (1997). *Political Participation*, in Axford *et al. Politics: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.

Ball, A. (1981). *British political parties: the emergence of a modern party system*. London: MacMillan Press.

Ball, A. R. (1993). *Modern Politics and Government*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Barber, N. W. (2001). "*Prelude to the Separation of Powers*". *Cambridge Law Journal,* 59.

Barrington, L. (2013). *Comparative Politics: Structures and Choices*. USA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Basedau, M. (2007). "*Do party systems matter for democracy? A comparative study of 28 Sub-Saharan countries*". Uppsala: Nordic Africa Institute.

Beale, S. (2013). Evaluation of the Lesotho 2012 National Assembly Elections. UNDP.

Beeson, M. and Bellamy, A. J. (2008). *Securing Southeast Asia: The politics of security sector reform*. New York: Routledge.

Beetham, D. (2006). *Parliament and Democracy in the Twenty-First Century: a Guide to Good Practice*. Inter-Parliamentary Union: Switzerland.

Benoit, K. (2004). *Models of Electoral System Change*, University of Dublin. http://www.elsevier.com/locate/electsud. Accessed on 24 October 2018.

Bernard, F. M. (1991). *Pluralism, Socialism and Political Legitimacy: Reflections on Opening up Communism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bernhard, M. Nordstrom, T. and Reenock, C. (2001). *"Economic Performance, Institutional Intermediation, and Democratic Survival". Journal of Politics,* 63(3):775-803.

Besley, T. and Coate, S. (1997). *"An Economic Model of Representative Democracy"*. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112, 85-114.

Blais, A. (2008). *To Keep or To Change First Past The Post? The Politics of Electoral Reform: The Politics of Electoral Reform*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Blanc, J., Hylland, A. and Vollan, A. (2006). *State Structure and Electoral Systems in Post-Conflict Situations.* IFES: Washington, D.C.

Boban, D. (2011). Semi-Presidential Systems of Russia and Poland. Zagreb: Fakultek Politickih Znanosti.

Bogdanor, V. (1987). *Semi-Presidential Systems*, in V. Bogdanor (ed.). *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Political Institutions*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher.

Bormann, N and Golder, M. (2013). Democratic Electoral Systems around the World, 1946–2011. *Electoral Studies,* 32(2), 360-369.

Boucek, F. (2013). The dilemmas of intra-party democracy: Lessons from Italy, Japan and elsewhere. Seventh ECPR General Conference - Bordeaux (France), 4-7 September 2013.

Bowler, S., Donovan, T. and Brockington, D. (2003). Electoral Reform and Minority Representation: Local Experiments with Alternative Elections. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Brady, D. W. and Bullock, C. S. (1983). Party and factional organisation in a legislature. *Legislative Studies Quarterly.*

Branford University School of Management. (2007). *Introduction to Research and Research Methods.* http://www.brad.ac.uk/management/media/management/els/Introduction-to-Research-and-Research-Methods.pdf. Accessed on 8 April 2017.

Bratton, M. and Van De Walle, N. (1997). *Democratic Experiment in Africa: Regime Transition in Comparative Perspectives*. UK; Cambridge University Press.

Briand, M. (2007). "*Democracy at the Core: Recalling Participation's Raison d' etre*". *International Journal of Public Participation*.

Britain. (2008). *Review of Voting Systems: The experience of new voting systems in the United Kingdom since 1997*. Ministry of Justice. Governance of Britain: UK.

Budge, I. and Keman, H. (1990). *Parties and democracy: Coalition formation and government functioning in twenty states*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bujra, A. and Buthelezi, S. (2002*). Leadership, Civil Society and Democratisation in Africa.* (eds.).Case Studies from Southern Africa. Addis Ababa: UNECA.

Burchard, M. (2014). *Democracy Trends in Sub-Saharan Africa, 1990 to 2014*. IDA: Virginia.

Calland, R. (1999). *The First 5 Years: A Review of South Africa's Democratic Parliament*. Cape Town: IDASA.

Canas, V. (2004). "*The Semi-Presidential System. Max-Planck-Institut für ausländisches öffentliches Recht und Völkerrecht".* 64(1), 95-124.

Caton, M. (2007). Political parties: necessary for democracy? The crucial role of party assistance for strengthening democracy. IDEA.

Catt, H. (1996). *Voting Behaviour: A Radical Critique*. London: Leicester University Press.

Chang, C. H. (2014). "*Cohabitation in semi-presidential countries"*. *Social sciences,* 3(2), 31-43.

Cheibu, J. A., Przeworski, A. and Saiegh, S. (2004). *"Government coalitions and legislative success under presidentialism and parliamentarism". British Journal of Political Science*, 565, 569.

Cheibub, J. A., and Limongi, F. (2002). *"Democratic Institutions and Regime Survival: Parliamentary and Presidential Democracies Reconsidered*". *Annual Review of Political Science,* 5, 151-79.

Cheibub, J. A. (2007). *Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, and Democracy*. New York: University Press.

Cloete, J. J .N. (1993). *Democracy Prospects for South Africa*. Van Schaik: Pretoria.

Commonwealth. (2017). Lesotho National Assembly Elections 3 June 2017.

Cox, G. W. (1997). *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral Systems.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Currie, I. and De Waal, J. (2002). *The New Constitutional and Administrative Law: Volume One Constitutional Law* (eds.). Lansdowne: Juta Law.

Dahl, R. (1971). *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Daintith, T. and Page, A. (1999). *The executive in the constitution: Structure, autonomy and internal control*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

De Ville, J. (1999). *The electoral system in terms of the South African interim constitution*, in De Ville, J & Steytler, N (eds.). *Voting in 1999: Choosing an electoral system*. Durban: Butterworth.

De Waal, M. J. and Schoeman-Malan, M. C. (2015). *Law of succession.* (5th ed.). Cape Town: Juta.

Deng, F. M., Deng, D. J., Deng, D. K. and Jiménez, V. (2008*). Identity, Diversity, and Constitutionalism in Africa.* United States Institute of Peace Press: Washington, DC.

Diamond, L. and Gunther, R. (2001). *Political Parties and Democracy*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Doorenspleet, R. (2003). *Political parties, party systems and democracy in Sub-Saharan Africa*, in M. Salih (ed.). *African political parties - evolution, institutionalism and governance*. London: Pluto Press.

Du Plessis, L. (1999). *An Introduction to Law* (eds.). Kenwyn: Juta.

Dung, L. T. (2003). Judicial independence in transitional countries. United Nations Development Programme: Oslo Governance Centre.

Dunleavy, P. (2010). *Rethinking dominant party systems*. London: Routledge.

Dunning, T. (2011). "*Fighting and Voting: Violent Conflict and Electoral Politics*". *Journal of Conflict Resolution,* 55(3), 327-339.

Du Plooy-Cilliers, F., Davis, C. and Bezuidenhout, R. M. (2014). *Research Matters. South Africa*: Juta.

Durant, T. C. and Weintraub, M. (2013). How to make democracy self-enforcing after civil war. Working paper.

Duverger, M. (1997). "*Reflections: The political system of the European Union*". *European Journal of Political Research,* 31, 137-146.

Duverger, M. (1959). *Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State*. (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Edmond, M. (1998). *Armed Services and Society*. Guildford: Leicester University Press.

Electoral institute for sustainable democracy in Africa (EISA). (2007). Election updates 2007 Lesotho. Number 3, 17 August 2007.

Electoral institute for sustainable democracy in Africa (EISA). (2014). Pre-election Assessment Mission. Kingdom of Lesotho.

Elgie, R. (1999). *The politics of semi-presidentialism.* In: Elgie, R. (ed.). *Semi-presidentialism in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Elgie, R. (2007). "*Varieties of semi-presidentialism and their impact on nascent democracies"*. *Taiwan Journal of democracy*, 3(2), 53-71.

Elgie, R. (2010). *"Semi-presidentialism, Cohabitation and the Collapse of Electoral Democracies, 1990-2008*". *Government and Opposition*, 45(1), 29-49.

Elgie, R. (2011). "*The Perils of Semi-Presidentialism?"* in Elgie, R., *Semi-Presidentialism: Sub-Types and Democratic Performance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Elgie, R. and McMenamin, I. (2010). Explaining the Onset of Cohabitation Under Semi-Presidentialism. Working Paper in International Studies, Centre for International Studies: Dublin City University.

Elklit, J. (2008). "*The 2007 General Election in Lesotho: Abuse of the MMP System?" Journal of African Elections. Special Issue: Elections and Democracy in Lesotho*, 7(1), 9-10.

Ellman, M. and Wantchekon, L. (2000). "*Electoral competition under the threat of political unrest"*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115(2), 499-531.

Erdmann, G. and Basedau, M. (2007). Problems of Categorizing and Explaining Party Systems in Africa. GIGA Working Paper No. 40. Hamburg: GIGA.

Fabbrini, S. (1995). "*Presidents, Parliaments, and Good Government*". *Journal of Democracy*, 6.

Fawole, W. A. (1994). *The Military and the future of democracy in Africa, in Democratization in Africa, African Perspective*. Benin City: Hima & Hima.

Feliciano, F. P. (1992). "*The application of law: some recurring aspects of the process of judicial review and decision making". The American Journal of Jurisprudence.*

Fengu, M. (2017). Former Deputy Prime Minister on the run as SADC fails to intervene. *City Press,* 3 September 2017.

Finer, S. E. (1962). *The Man on Horseback: The Role of the Military in Politics*. London: Pall Mall Press.

Fischer, J. (2002). Electoral conflict and violence: A strategy for study and prevention. IFES white paper.

Fisher, L. (1990). American constitutional law. Tokyo: McGraw-Hill.

Fogelman, C. (2017). Lesotho Defence Force Commander Killed. Friends of Lesotho. www.friendsoflesotho.org. Accessed on 20 August 2018.

Fombad, C. (2005). "*The separation of powers and constitutionalism in Africa: The case of Botswana". Boston College Third World Law Journal*, 301.

Fombad, C. (2007). Preliminary Assessment of the Prospects for Judicial Independence in Post-1990 African Constitutions. *Public Law*, 233.

Fox, R. and Southall, R. (2003). "*The General Elections in Lesotho". Journal of Modern African Studies*, 23(3).

Fox, S. and Hoelscher, K. (2010). The political economy of social violence: theory and evidence from a cross-country study. Crises State Research Centre, Working Paper 72. Cities and fragile states. Series 2.

French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (2013). Post-2015 Agenda on Development: French Position Paper Prepared With Civil Society. Directorate-General of Global Affairs, Development and Partnerships. Working Document, September 2013.

Friedman, T. L. (1999). *The Lexus and the olive tree*. New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux.

Gallagher, M. and Mitchell, P. (2005). *Introduction to electoral systems*, in Gallagher, M. & Mitchell, P. (eds.). *The politics of electoral systems*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Garner, R., Ferdinand, P. and Lawson, S. (2009). *Introduction to politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gerring, J., Thacker, S. and Moreno, C. (2009). "*Are Parliamentary Systems Better? Comparative Political Studies",* 42(3), 327-359.

Ghai, K. K. (2016). Executive: Definition, Functions and types of executive. Your Article Library. The next generation library.

Gildenhuys, J. S .H. (1997). *Introduction to the management of public finance: a South African perspective.* Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Gildenhuys, J. S. H. (2004). *The Philosophy of Public Administration - A Holistic Approach: An Introduction for undergraduate students*. South Africa: Sun Press.

Gildenhuys, J. S. H. (1997). *Restructuring Your Local Government*: A Practical Guide. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Giliomee, H. and Simkins, C. (1999). *The Awkward Embrace: One-Part Domination and Democracy*. Netherlands: Harwood.

Gill, J. S. (1997). *A short history of Lesotho: from the late stone age until the 1993 elections.* Lesotho: Morija Printing Press.

Golder, S. (2006). "*Pre-electoral coalition formation in parliamentary democracies*". *British Journal of Political Science*, 195.

Griffin, J. D. and Newman, B. (2005). *"Are voters better represented?" Journal of Politics,* 67(4), 1206-1227.

Gwyn, W. B. (1965). The Meaning of the Separation of Powers: An Analysis of the Doctrine from its Origin to the Adoption of the United States Constitution. New Orleans and The Hague: Tulane University and Martinus Nijhoff.

Habermas, J. (1996). *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Hafner-Burton, E., Hyde, S. and Jablonski, R. (2010). Terrorizing Freedom: When Governments Use Repression to Manipulate Elections. http://irps.ucsd.edu/ehafner/pdfs/Hafner-Burton_Terrorizing%20Freedom_2010.pdf Accessed on 8 October 2018.

Haggard, S. and Kaufman, R. (1995). *The Political Economy of Democratic Transitions.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hague, R. and Harrop, M. (2004). Comparative Government and Politics: An Introduction. (6th ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hague, R. and Harrop, M. (2007). *Political Science. A comparative introduction.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Harrison, R. (1993). *Democracy.* London: Routledge.

Hartmann, C. (2004). *"Local Elections in the SADC Countries: A Comparative Analysis of Local Electoral Institutions*". *Journal of African Elections,* 3(1).

Hendricks, C. (2005). Party strategy not popular prejudice: electoral politics in South Africa, in L. Piper (ed.). South Africa's 2004 election: the quest for democratic consolidation. EISA Research Report, 12.

Herman, V. (1976). *Parliaments of the world: A reference compendium*. London: Macmillan.

Heywood. A. (2000). *Key concepts in politics*. London: Macmillan.

Heywood, A. (2002). *Politics.* Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Foundations.

Heywood, A. (2007). *Politics*. Hampshire and New York: Palgrave.

Hix, S., Johnston, R. and McLean, L. (2010). Choosing an Electoral System. British Academy Report: London.

Hoglund, K. (2009). "*Electoral Violence in Conflict-Ridden Societies: Causes, Concepts and Consequences. Terrorism and Political Violence",* 21(3), 412-427.

Hoglund, K. (2010). Electoral Violence in Conflict-Ridden Societies: Concepts, Cause and Consequences. Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University.

Hopkins, K. (1966). "*Civil-Military Relations in Developing Countries*". *British Journal of Sociology*, XVII(2).

Horowitz, D. L. (2003). Electoral systems and their goals: a premier for decision makers. Duke University: Durham. USA.

Huntington, S. P. (1956). Civilian control of the military: A theoretical statement, in H. Eulau, S. Eldersveld and M. Janowitz (eds.). Political Behaviour: A reader in theory and research. Illinois: Free Press.

Huntington, S. P. (1957). *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-military Relations*. Natraj Publishers.

Huntington, S. P. (1968). *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Huntington, S. P. (1995). "*Reforming civil-military relations". Journal of Democracy*, 6(4), 9-17.

Hussein, T. (2013). The Dimensions of the Doctrine of Separation of Power towards Promotion of Good Governance in Tanzania. Master's thesis. Mzumbe University: Nigeria.

Independent Electoral Commission (IEC). (2002). General Report on the 2002 Lesotho General Election. Maseru: IEC Lesotho.

Independent Electoral Commission (IEC). (2007). Elections Report on Lesotho 2007 General Election, 25 February 2007. Maseru: IEC Lesotho.

Independent Electoral Commission Election (IEC). (2013) Report on Lesotho 2012 General Election, 26 May 2012. Maseru: IEC Lesotho.

Independent Electoral Commission. (IEC) (n.d.). Electoral Education Manual of Local Government Elections.

International Commission of Jurists (ICJ). (2007). International Principles on the Independence and Accountability of Judges, Lawyers and Prosecutors. Geneva: Switzerland.

International IDEA. (2002). International Electoral Standards: Guidelines for Reviewing the Legal Framework of Elections. Stockholm, Sweden: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance.

International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA). (2007). Political Parties in Africa: Challenges for Sustained Multiparty Democracy Africa Regional Report Based on research and dialogue with political parties. Stockholm: Sweden.

Ismael, N., Bayat, S. and Meyer I. (1997). *Local Government Management*. Johannesburg: International Thomson Publishing.

Jenkins, A. and Kposowa, J. C. (1992). "*The Political Origins of African Military Coups: Ethnic Competition, Military Centrality, and the Struggle over the Postcolonial State". International Studies Quarterly,* 36(03), 271-291.

Joannou, N. A. (2008). Dominant party tendencies in the Free State Legislature: A critical analysis. PhD dissertation. University of the Free State.

Joannou, N. A. and Coetzee, T. (2010). *"Tendencies of a Dominant Party System in the Free State Legislature (1994-2008)"*. *Journal,* 35(1).

Johnson, J. K. (2005). The Role of Parliament in Government. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The World Bank: Washington, DC.

Jowell, J. (2014). Bingham Centre Myanmar Project: Executive Power in Myanmar Bingham Centre for the Rule of Law.

Kabi, P. (2017). Bidvest Deal Cost Government Millions*. Lesotho Times*. 2 December 2017.

Kadima, D. (2000). Effects of Electoral Systems on Political Competition, Representation and Accountability. Paper presented at the Southern African Elections Forum, Windhoek, Namibia, 11-14 June 2000.

Kambule, D. (2010). "*Gender dimension of quota system at local level*". *The Journal of Work for Justice*, 27(87), 25-28.

Kapa, M. (2003). Secrecy and Transparency in Lesotho's General Elections. *African Security Review.* Cape Town: Institute for Security Studies.

Kapa, M. (2009). "*The case of Lesotho's Mixed Member system. Africa Insight",* 39(2).

Kapa, M. (2013). Lesotho: Political Participation and Democracy. Johannesburg: Open Society Foundations.

Kapa, M. and Theko, L. (2008). "*The role and Position of Civil Society Organizations in Lesotho's Democratization Process". Journal of African Elections. Special Issue: Elections and Democracy in Lesotho*, 7(1).

Karume, S. (2003). Conceptual understanding of political coalitions in South Africa: an integration of concepts and practices. Paper presented at the EISA Roundtable on Political Party Coalitions, Cape Town, 19 June 2003.

Kasapovi, M. (1996). Parliamentarism and Presidentialism in Eastern Europe. Democratic Transition in Eastern Europe. Faculty of Political Science: University of Zagreb.

Kennedy, G. (1974). The Military in the Third World. London: Gerald Duckworth and Co.

Khadiagala, G. M. (2010). Evolution-Related Disputes and Political Violence. Strengthening the Role of the African Union in Preventing, Managing and Resolving Conflict. Report of the AU panel. International Peace Institute.

Khaketla, B. M. (1971). *An African coup under the microscope"* Lesotho 1970. London: C Hurst and Co.

Kiiza, J. (2005). The role of opposition parties in a democracy. Paper presented at the Regional Conference on Political Parties and Democratisation in East Africa, Tanzania.

Klein, A., Kiranda, Y. and Bafaki, R. (2011). Concepts and principles of democratic governance and accountability: A guide for peer educators. http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas_29779-1522-2-30.pdf?111219190223. Accessed on 22 October 2018.

Knight, C. (2001). What Justifies Foreign Military intervention? A PDA Commentary. http://www.comw.org/pda/0109intervention.html. Accessed on 15 October 2018.

Kposowa, J. and Jenkins, C. (1993). "*The Structural Sources of Military Coups in Postcolonial Africa, 1957-1984"*. *American Journal of Sociology*, 99.

Kuenzi, M. and Lambright, G. (2005). "*Party Systems and Democratic Consolidation in Africa's Electoral Regimes. Party Politics",* 11(4), 423-446.

Kura, S. Y. B. (2011). "*Political Parties and Democracy in Nigeria: Candidate Selection, Campaign and Party Financing in People's Democratic Party*". *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa,* (13)6.

Labuschagne, P. (2004). "*The doctrine of separation of powers and its application in South Africa*". *Politeia,* 23(3).

Landsberg. C. and Graham, S. (2017). *Government and Politics in South Africa – coming of age.* Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Langa, P. (1998). Report of the commission of inquiry into the conduct and results of the Lesotho general election held in May 1998. Johannesburg: SADC.

Langfield, D. (2010). Harbingers of Change? Subnational Politics in Dominant Party Systems. Doctoral thesis. Ohio State University.

Leeman, B. (1985). Lesotho and the struggle for Azania. Volume three, 1966-1984. Azania: University of Azania.

Leftwich, A. (2000). *States of Development.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lenka, M. (2010). "*Local Government: A vehicle for good governance?" The Journal of Work for Justice*, 27(87), 29-33.

Leon, N. R., Browde, J. and Shearer, D. (2001). Report of the commission of inquiry into the events leading to political disturbances, which occurred in Lesotho during the period between 1 July 1998 to 30 November 1998. Maseru: Government Printing.

Lesotho Election Report. (2011). Getting the Balance Right. Gender in the 2011 Lesotho Local Government Election. Women in Politics Workshops, Qomoqomong Lesotho.

Lesotho Government Gazette. (2005). Maseru: Government Printers.

Lesotho Government. (1986). The laws of Lesotho. Volume XXXI Maseru: Government Printers.

Lesotho Government. (1993). The Constitution of Lesotho. Maseru: Government Printers.

Lesotho Government. (1997). Local Government Act 1997. Maseru: Government Printers.

Lesotho Government. (1998). Local Government Election Act 1998. Maseru: Government Printers.

Lesotho Government. (2002). Lesotho Parliamentary Chamber National Assembly Parliamentary election results for Lesotho.

Lesotho Government. (2002). National Assembly Elections Election Observation Mission Report 1.

Lesotho Government. (2011). Gender in the 2011 Lesotho Local Government Elections http://genderlinks.org.za/what-wedo/governance/advocacy/lesothogender-and-elections. Accessed on 18 September 2018.

Lesotho Government. (2011). National Assembly Electoral Act, 2011. Maseru: Government Printers.

Lesotho Government. (2012). Lesotho Vision 2020. Maseru: Government Printers.

Lesotho Government. (2014). National Decentralisation Policy. Ministry of Local Government, Chieftainship and Parliamentary Affairs. Maseru: Government Printers.

Lesotho Government. (2015). Lesotho 2015 Human Rights Report.

Lesotho Government. (2016). Lesotho Country Report. Bertelsmann Stiftung's Transformation Index (BTI) Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license 2016.

Lesotho Government. (2018). Country Review Report. Country Watch. http://www.countrywatch.com. Accessed on 28 October 2018.

Lesotho Times. (2017a). Another Political Party Joins the Fray*.* Press Conference.

Lesotho Times. (2017b). History of elections in Lesotho, 26 May 2017.

Letsie, T. W. (2015). *"Lesotho's February 2015 Snap Elections: A Prescription That Never Cured the Sickness". Journal of African Elections*, 14(2).

Letuka P. K., Matashane-Marite and Mapetla, M. (2004). Gender and Elections in Lesotho: Perspectives on the 2002 Elections. EISA Research Report No. 4. Johannesburg: Electoral Institute of Southern Africa.

Lijphart, A. (1977). *Democracy in Plural Societies: A Comparative Exploration*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lijphart, A. (1992). *Parliamentary Versus Presidential Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lijphart, A. (1994). *Electoral systems and party systems: A study of twenty-seven democracies, 1945-1990.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Lijphart, A. (1997). *Unequal participation: Democracy's unresolved dilemm*a. *American Political Science Review,* 1.

Lijphart, A. (2008). *Thinking about Democracy: Power Sharing and Majority Rule in Theory and Practice.* New York: Routledge.

Lijphart, A. (2012). *Patterns of Democracy Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries.* (2nd ed.). London: Oxford University Press.

Likoti, F. (2007). Democracy and Elections in Lesotho: The Challenges of Lesotho Mixed Member Proportional System (MMP). Occasional Paper. Roma: National University of Lesotho (NUL).

Likoti, F. J. (2005). Investigating Intra-Party Democracy in Lesotho: Focus on Basutoland Congress Party and Basotho National Party. EISA Occasional Paper Series, 39.

Likoti, F. J. (2009). "*The 2007 General Election in Lesotho: The Application and the Challenges of the Electoral System". African Studies Quarterly*, 10(4), 57-69.

Lin, J. W. (2000). Post-positivism and English School. Taipei: Sun Yat-sen Institute for Social Science and Philosophy Academia.

Lindberg, S. (2004). The democratic qualities of competitive elections: Participation, competition and legitimacy in Africa. *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, 61.

Lindberg, S. (2006). *Democracy and elections in Africa*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Linz, J. (1990a). "*The Perils of Presidentialism*". *Journal of Democracy*, 1(1), 51-69.

Linz, J. (1990b). *"The Virtues of Parliamentarism*". *Journal of Democracy,* 1, 85-91.

Linz, J. (1994). *Presidential or Parliamentary Democracy: Does it Make a Difference?* in Linz, J. & Valenzuela, A. (eds.), *The Failure of Presidential Democracy: The Case of Latin America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Linz, J. and Stepan, A. (1996). Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe. US: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Lipson, L. (1953). "*The Two Party System in British Politics*". *American Political Science Review,* XLVII.

Locke, J. (1690). *Second treatise of civil government* Great Books Foundation (ed. 1689-1948).

Lodge, T., Kadima, D. and Pottie, D. (2002). In Compendium of Elections in Southern Africa*.* Johannesburg: Electoral Institute of Southern Africa.

Lucas, J. (1993). Report on the Election of members to the National Assembly of the Kingdom of Lesotho. Maseru: Lesotho.

Lumb, R. D. (1983). *Australian Constitutionalism*. Sydney: Butterworth.

Lumb, R. D. (1995). The Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia Annotated. Sydney: Butterworth.

MacFarlane, N. S. (1983). "*Intervention and security in Africa*". *International Affairs,* 60, 53.

Mahao, N. (1997). "*The 1993 Election and the Challenges for the Development for Constitutionalism in Lesotho". Lesotho Social Science Review*, 3(2).

Mahmood, R. (2016). *"Theoretical Preliminaries of Military Intervention in Politics and its implications on Pakistan". Journal of Indian Studies,* 2(2), 90-105.

Mainwaring, S, and Shugart, M.S. (1997). *Conclusion: Presidentialism and the Party System. In Presidentialism and Democracy in Latin America*, (eds.) Mainwaring, S. and Shugart, M. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mainwaring, S. and Scully, T. R. (1995). *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Mair, P. (1990). *The West European party system*. Oxford: University Press.

Majeed, A. (2000). *Coalition politics and power sharing*. New Delhi: Manak Publishers.

Makara, S. (2009). "*The challenge of building strong political parties for democratic governance in Uganda. Does multiparty politics have a future?" Les Cahiers d'Afrique de I' Est*, 4, 43-80.

Makhetha, M. P. (2008). *"The Socio-Economic Cost of the Post-Election Conflict. Journal of African Elections: Special Issue: Elections and Democracy in Lesotho"*, 7(1).

Makinda, S. (1996). *"Democracy and multiparty politics in Africa". The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 34(4), 555-573.

Makoa, F. (1995). "*Lesotho beyond the Elections"*. *African Studies,* 54(1).

Makoa, F. (2005). "*Conflict resolution and peace building through electoral and parliamentary reform: a note on Lesotho's Mixed Member Parliament (MMP)"*. *Lesotho Law Journal,* 15(1).

Makoa, F. (2014). "*Beyond the electoral triumphalism: Reflections on Lesotho's coalition government and challenges". Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, 36(1), 100-110.

Maliyamkono, T. and Kanyangolo, F. (2003). *When Political Parties Clash*. (eds.). Dar-es-Salaam: Tema Publishers.

Manin, B. (1997). *The Principles of Representative Government.* US: Cambridge University Press.

Manyeli, A. (2003). Office of Prime Minister Pakalitha Mosisili, 18 August 2003. Lesotho Official Reports Unit, Maseru: Information Desk.

Masterman, R. (2011). The Separation of Powers in the Contemporary Constitution: Judicial Competence and Interdependence.

Matland, E. R. (1993). "*Institutional Variables Affecting Female Representation in National Legislatures: The Case of Norway". The Journal of Politics,* 55(3): 737-755.

Matlosa, K. and Karume S. (2004). Ten Years of Democracy and the Dominant Party System in South Africa. EISA Election Update 2004: South Africa, 5, 30 March.

Matlosa, K. and Shale, V. (2006). Impact of Floor Crossing on Party Systems and Representative Democracy: The case of Lesotho. EISA and KAS, Cape Town, South Africa.

Matlosa, K. (1997). "*Political Instability and Elections: A Case of Lesotho". Lesotho Social Science Review,* 3(2), 93-107.

Matlosa, K. (1999a). "*Conflict and Conflict Management in Lesotho*". *Lesotho Social Science Review*, 5(1).

Matlosa, K. (1999b). Aid, Development and Democracy in Lesotho, 1966-1996. Paper presented to a workshop organised by the Centre for Southern African Studies, 21-22 November 1999.

Matlosa, K. (2000). Electoral Systems and Political Stability in Southern Africa. Training Workshop on Election Observation hosted by SADC Parliamentary Forum, Windhoek, Namibia, 18-22 September 2000.

Matlosa, K. (2003a). Electoral System Reform, Democracy and Stability in the SADC Region: A Comparative Analysis. Johannesburg: EISA.

Matlosa, K. (2003b). *"Political Culture and Democratic Governance in Southern Africa"*. *African Journal of Political Science,* 8(1).

Matlosa, K. (2004). "*Electoral Systems, Constitutionalism and Conflict Management in Southern Africa". African Journal on Conflict Resolution*, 4(2), 44.

Matlosa, K. (2007). Are political parties agents of democratization in Southern Africa? Electoral Institute of Southern Africa: International Conference on Sustaining Africa's Democratic Momentum.

Matlosa, K. (2008). Consolidating Democratic Governance in the SADC Regions: Transforming and Prospects for Consolidation. Johannesburg: EISA.

Matlosa, K. (2008). "*The 2007 General Election in Lesotho: Managing the Post-Election Conflict". Journal of African Elections. Special Issue: Elections and Democracy in Lesotho*, 7(1), 20-49.

Matlosa, K. and Pule, N. W. (2001). Civil-Military Relations in Lesotho, 1966-1998: Problems and Prospects.

Matlosa, K. and Sello, C. (2006). Political Parties and Democratization in Lesotho. Johannesburg: EISA.

Matlosa, K. and Shale, V. (2008). "*The Impact of Floor Crossing on Electoral Politics and Representative Democracy in Lesotho". Journal of African Elections: Special Issues: Elections and Democracy in Lesotho,* 7(1), 138-152.

Matshalaga, N. (2014). End of Project Evaluation (EOPE) for the Consolidation of Democracy and Good Governance (CDGG) Project (2009-2014). Lesotho Government.

Mattes, R. and Southall, R. (2003). Popular Attitudes towards the South African Electoral System.

Media Institute of Southern Africa (MISA). (2016). So this is Democracy? *National Overview*, 40-46.

Menocal, A. R. (2011). Why electoral systems matter: an analysis of their incentives and effects on key areas of governance. Overseas Development Institute.
Michels, R. (1962). Political parties: a sociological study of the oligarchical tendencies of modern democracy. New York: Collier Books.

Miljan, L. and Alchin, G. (2018). Proportional Representation in Practice: An International Comparison of Ballots and Voting Rules. Canada: Fraser Institute.

Milner, H. (1997). Electoral Systems, Integrated Institutions and Turnout in Local and National Elections Canada in Comparative Perspective. *Canadian Journal of Political Science,* 30(1), 89-106.

MoAfrika. (1997). Ho thehoa 'Moho Congress Party. Vol. 6, no. 22.

MoAfrika. (2001). Maope o tla fumana litokelo tsa moetapele oa bohanyetsi. Vol. 6, no. 22.

Moe, T. and Caldwell, M. (1994). "*The Institutional Foundations of Democratic Government: A comparison of Presidential and Parliamentary Systems"*. *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics,* 160, 171-195.

Mohloboli, K. (2014). I am still LDF Commander - Kamoli. *Lesotho Times*, 30 August 2014.

Mohloboli, K. (2015a). Mahao Autopsy Revealed. *Lesotho Times*, 17 December 2015.

Mohloboli, K. (2015b). Mosisili Returns to Power. *Lesotho Times*, 5 March 2015.

Mohloboli, K. (2016). African Union blast Lesotho over rule of law. *Lesotho Times,* 20 May 2016.

Mojapelo, P. M. (2013). The doctrine of separation of powers, a South African perspective. http://www.sabar.co.za/law-journals. Accessed on 20 August 2017.

Mokhethi, S. (2017). Lesotho Prime Minister Mosisili Loses Vote of No Confidence. *African Independent News.*

Molapo, P. (2015). Time Lesotho formed a National Unity Government. *Lesotho Times,* 6 March 2015.

Moleleki, M. (1994). *Ntsu.* Morija-Lesotho: Morija Printing Works.

Molokomme, A. (2000). Building Inclusiveness in SADC's Democratic Systems: The Case of Women's Representation in Leadership Positions. Paper presented at the Southern African Elections Forum, Windhoek, Namibia, 11-14 June 2000.

Molomo, M. (1999). "*External Military Intervention in Lesotho's Recent Political Crisis". Lesotho Social Science Review,* 5(1), 133-162.

Molomo, N. and Tlali, T. (2013). Moleleki faces two charges of fraud. *Sunday Express*, 22 June 2103.

Molomo. M. (2004a). "*In search of an alternative electoral system for Botswana Pula. Botswana". Journal of African Studies*, 14(1), 118.

Molomo, M. (2004b). "*The Need for Electoral Reform in Botswana*". *African Journal for Conflict Resolution*, 4(1).

Molupi, M. (2017). Senior Army Officer Arrested. *The Post,* 11 September 2017.

Montesquieu, B. (1748). *The spirit of Laws: The Complete Works of de Montesquieu*. Vol. 1. London.

Monyane, C. (2009). The Kingdom of Lesotho: An Assessment of Problems in Democratic Consolidation. Doctoral thesis. Stellenbosch University.

Morgenstern, S. and Vázquez-D'Elía, J. (2007). "*Electoral Laws, Parties, and Party Systems in Latin America*". *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10, 143-168.

Morphet, J. (1993). *The role of Chief Executives in Local Government*. Essex: Longman.

Morrison, H. and Stevenson, D. G. (1972). "*Cultural Pluralism, Modernization and Conflict: An Empirical Analysis of Sources of Political Instability in African Nations". Canadian Journal of Political Science,* (1), 82-103.

Moser, G. R. and Scheiner, E. (2012). *Electoral Systems and Political Context: How the Effects of Rules Vary Across New and Established Democracies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moses, M. (2012). Opposition parties sustaining democracy? Briefing Paper, 292. Catholic Parliamentary Office, June 2012.

Moteetee, M. M. (2005). Lesotho Report On The Quality And Responsiveness of Health Services to Meet the Needs of Women in Crisis Settings*.* WHO, June 2005.

Mothibe, T. (1999). "*The Military and Democracy*". *Lesotho Social Science Review,* 5(1),1999.

Mphanya, N. (2004). *A brief history of the Basutoland Congress Party.* Morija Lesotho: Morija Printing Works.

Mphaololi, M. (1998). BCP, BNP, MFP. *MoAfrika*, 7(11), 13 March 1998.

Mungazi, D. A. and Walker, L. K. (1997). Educational Reform and the Transformation of Southern Africa. US: Praeger.

Muzofa, N. (2017). Mokhosi Flees to Exile. *Sunday Express,* 10 September 2017.

Nacif, B. (2006). The rise and fall of Mexico's PRI. In A Comparative Assessment: Challenges to democracy by one-party dominance. Seminar Report No. 17. Johannesburg: Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung.

Newman, G. (2006). Electoral Systems. Commonwealth of Australia.

Ngatane, N. (2016). Lesotho parties to form coalition government. SABC News, 24 November 2016.

Ngatane, N. (2017). Thousands attend inaugural rally in Maseru. SABC News, 29 January 2017.

Ngcobo, S., Nganunu, J. M. and Ramadhani, A. S. L. (2013). The Crisis of the Judicial Leadership in the Kingdom of Lesotho. Report of the High-Level Mission of the International Commission of Jurists in the Kingdom of Lesotho. International Commission of Jurists (ICJ).

Ngozwana, N. (2014). Understandings of Democracy and Citizenship in Lesotho: Implications for Civic Education. Doctoral thesis. Faculty of Education: University of KwaZulu-Natal.

Nnoli, O. (n.d.). The Military, Civil Society and Democracy in Africa. DPMF Workshop and Conference Proceedings. Pan African Centre for Research on the Peace and Conflict Resolution (PACREP). http:www.dpfm.org/image/military-okwudiba.htm. Accessed 30 April 2018.

Nohlen, D. (1996). *Elections and electoral systems*. New Delhi: MacMillan Press.

Nordlinger, A. E. (1977). *Soldiers in Politics: Military Coups and Governments*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Norris, P. (2003). Electoral Engineering: Voting Rules and Political Behaviour. UK: Harvard University.

Norris, P. (2005). *Radical Right: Voters and Parties in the Electoral Market*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Norris, P. (2008). *Driving Democracy: Do Power-Sharing Institutions Work?* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Norris, P. (2012). Why electoral malpractices heighten risks of electoral violence. Paper presented at the APSA Annual Meeting, July 13 2012.

Ntaote, B. (2013). Thabane's dismissal hailed. *Lesotho Times*, 7 November 2013.

Ntaote, B. (2016). Former BNP Members launch new party. *Lesotho Times*, 14 May 2016.

Ntsukunyane, L. (2016). Government writes off Members of Parliament loans. *Lesotho Times,* 15 October 2016.

Nyane, H. (2016*).* Formation of a Government in Lesotho in the Case of a Hung Parliament. *Law, Democracy and Development,* 20.

Nyane, H. (2017). The Advent of Coalition Politics and the Crisis of Constitutionalism in Lesotho.

O'Neil, T. (1995). The Origins and Development of Ancient Greek Democracy. London: Boston.

ODIHR. (2010). Election Observation Handbook. Warsaw: OSCE ODIHR.

Okoth, A. (2006). A History of Africa: African nationalism and the de-colonisation process. *East African Educational.*

Olaleye, W. (2003). Democratic Consolidation and Political Parties in Lesotho. EISA Paper no. 15.

Orji, N. (2013). Political Parties, Civil Society and Democracy in Nigeria. A paper presented at the National Conference on Political Parties and the Future of Democracy in Nigeria, organised by the National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS), 26 - 28 June 2013.

Oyugi, W. O. (2006). "*Coalition politics and coalition governments*". *African Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 24(2006), 53-79.

Parreno, E. G. (2003). The Shift to Parliamentary System: Changing the Terrain for PO/NGO Intervention. Philippines: First Quarter Storm Foundation.

Patrick, J. J. (2006). *Understanding Democracy: A Hip Pocket Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Peelish, N. (2016). *"A Theoretical Account of Electoral Reform in the UK". Philosophy, Politics, and Economics Undergraduate Journal,* 11(2016).

Pheko, L. (2018). Chief Justice Suspended. The Post. Telling it like it is. *Lesotho Times,* 4 December 2018.

Pempel, T. J. (1990). *Uncommon Democracies: The One-party Dominant Regimes*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Pennings, P. and Lane, J. (1998). *Introduction*, in P. Pennings and J. Lanes (eds.). *Comparing Party System Change*. London: Routledge.

Pitkin, H. F. (1967). *The Concept of Representation*. California: University of California Press.

Powell, G. B. (1982). *Contemporary Democracies*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Powell, B. G. (2000). *Elections as Instruments of Democracy. Majoritarian and Proportional Visions.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Procházková, K. (2016). Electoral Systems and the Representation of Minorities and Specific Segments of Society. Master's Thesis. Palacký University: Olomouc.

Przeworski, A., Cheibub J. A. and Limongi, F. (2000). *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990.* UK: Cambridge University Press.

Pule, N. (1998). "*Power, Struggle in the Basotholand Congress Party, 1991-1997*". *Lesotho Social Science Review,* 5(1).

Putnam, D. R. (1967). *Toward Explaining Military Intervention in Latin American* Politics. *World Politics, XX*(1).

Raadschelders, J. C. N. (2003). *Government: A public administration perspective,* New York: Routledge.

Rabkin, J. (1987). *The success of the separation of powers and its contemporary failings.* Birmingham Young: University Law Review.

Ranney, A. and Willmoore, K. (1954). "*The American Party System"*. *American Political Science Review*, XLVIII.

Ratnapala, S. (1990). Welfare State or Constitutional State? The Centre for Independent Studies Policy Monographs.

Rautenbach, I. M. and Malherbe, E. (1996). *Staatsreg*. Durban: Lexis Nexis.

Reddy, P. S. (1996). *Readings in Local Government Management and Development: A South African Perspective*. Kenwyn: Juta.

Reilly, B. and Reynolds, A. (1999). *Electoral Systems and Conflict in Divided Societies.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Reitzes, M., Larsen, J. and Fakir, E. (2011). Setting Benchmarks for Enhanced Political Party Performance in Africa. Conference Proceedings Report. EISA Annual Symposium. Johannesburg: EISA.

Reynolds, A. and Reilly, B (1997). The International IDEA Handbook of Electoral System Design. Stockholm: IDEA.

Reynolds, A. (1999). Elections in Southern Africa: The case for proportionality, a rebuttal, in Reynolds, A, & Sisk, T. Elections and conflict management in Africa. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Reynolds, A. (1999). Women in the Legislatures and Executives of the World. *World Politics*, 51, 547-572.

Reynolds, A. (2006). Electoral Systems and the Protection and Participation of Minorities. Report, Minority Rights Group International: London.

Reynolds, A. (2007). Effective Participation through Elections: Creating the Space for Minorities and Majorities in the Political Sphere, in Towards Good Governance and Social Integration, by John Packer (ed.). The Hague: OSCE HCNM.

Reynolds, A., Reilly, B. and Ellis, A. (2005). *Electoral System Design: The New International IDEA Handbook*. Stockholm: IDEA.

Reynolds, A., Reilly, B. and Ellis, A. (2008). Electoral System Design: The New International IDEA Handbook. Stockholm: IDEA.

Rickard, C. (2014). Judicial Protocol Taken For Wild Ride. *Mail and Guardian*.

Riggs, F. W. (1963). Bureaucrats and political development: A Paradoxical view, in Joseph La Palombara (ed.). Bureaucracy and Political Development. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Riggs, F. W. (1994). *Presidentialism in comparative perspective: in Comparing nations: concepts, strategies and substance*, M. Dogan and A. Kazancilgil (eds.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Robbins, J. W. and Hunter, L. Y. (2011). Impact of Electoral Volatility and Party Replacement on Voter turnout levels Party Politics.

Roberts, K. M. (2005). Explaining Party System Stability and Change. A paper presented to the Political Economy Research Colloquium. Cornell University.

Rosenberg, S. and Weisfelder, R. F. (2013). Historical Dictionary of Lesotho. Toronto: Scarecrow Press.

Sachikonye, L. M. (2005). "*Political Parties and the 2005 elections in Zimbabwe". Journal of elections,* 4, 63-73.

SADC. (2015). Electoral Observer Mission (SEOM) to the Kingdom of Lesotho. Statement by Hon. Maite Nkoana-Mashabane (MP) Minister of International Relations and Cooperation of the Republic of South Africa and Head of the SEOM to the 2015 National Assembly Elections in the Kingdom of Lesotho, 2 March 2015.

Sadie, Y. (2006). Political Parties, interest groups and social movements, in A. Venter & C. Landsberg (eds.), Government and Politics in the new South Africa. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Salih, M. and Nordlund, P. (2007). Political Parties in Africa: Challenges for Sustained Multiparty Democracy. IDEA Africa Regional Report: Stockholm.

Salih, M. A. (2003). "*Introduction in African Political Parties: Evolution, Institutionalization and Governance"*. London: Pluto Press.

Salih, M. A. (2005). *African Parliaments between Governance and Government*. US: Palgrave Macmillan.

Samuels, D. J. and Shugart, M. S. (2003). "*Presidential, Elections and Representation"*. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 15(1), 33-60.

Samuels, D. J. and Shugart, M. S. (2009). "*The 'Semi-presidential' model and its subtypes. Party presidentialization and the selection and de-selection of Prime Ministers".* Congrès AFSP 2009, Section thématique 48. www.congresafsp2009.fr/.../st48. Accessed on 18 September 2018.

Sartori, G. (1976). *Parties and party systems: A Framework for Analysis*, Volume 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sartori, G. (1994). *Neither presidentialism nor parliamentarism*, in Linz, J. J. & Valenzuela, A. (eds.), *The Failure of presidential democracy*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Sartori, G. (1997). *Comparative Constitutional Engineering: An Inquiry into Structures, Incentives and Outcomes*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schattsneider, E. E. (1942). Party Government. New York: Holt, Renehart and Winston.

Schraufnagel, S. (2001). *Historical Dictionary of the U.S. Congress*. UK: Scarecrow Press.

Schrire, R. (2001). "*The Realities of Opposition in South Africa: Legitimacy, Strategies and Consequences. Democratization Special Issue: Opposition and Democracy in South Africa",* 8(1), 138-145.

Schumpeter, J. (1947). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Brothers.

Schumpeter, J. (1943). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Sekatle, P. (1997). "*The formation of the Lesotho Congress for Democracy: Implications for the 1998 Election*". *Lesotho Social Science Review,* 5(1).

Sekatle, P. (1998). The Lesotho general elections of 1998. Lesotho Social Science Review. Roma: National University of Lesotho.

Shale, V. and Kapa, M. (2011). *The Impact of Proliferation of Political Parties on Democracy In Lesotho. Study by Transformation Resource Centre and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).* Lesotho: Morija Printing Works.

Shale, V. (2009). Strengthening Political Party Representatives in Namibia. Training Programme for Political Parties in Namibia organised by the Namibia Institute for Democracy. EISA.

Shively, P. (1999). *Power and choice: an introduction to political science*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Shugart, M. and Soberg, D. (2001). *Extreme Electoral Systems, in Mixed-Member Electoral Systems: The Best of Both Worlds?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shugart, M. S. and Carey, J. M. (1992). *Presidential and Assemblies: Constitutional Design and Electoral Dynamics.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shugart, M. S. and Wattenberg, M. P. (2001). *Mixed-Member Electoral Systems: The Best of Both Worlds?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shyu, J. R. (2000). "*An Initial Study of the 'Cohabitation' Constitutional System: Comparing France with Taiwan". National Taiwan University Law Journal*, 30(1), 1-44.

Simkins, C. (1999). Stability and Competitiveness in Political Configuration of Semi-Developed Countries.

Sisk, T. (2008). Elections in Fragile States: Between Voice and Violence. Paper presented at e International Studies Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California, March 24-28.

Sithetho, M. (2005). Coalition of mainstream parties only a fallacy - controversial election past: Every man for himself. *Public Eye*, 8 April 2005.

Sithetho, M. (2005). Political suicide boycotting parties. *Public Eye*, 20-26 May.

Sobek, D. (2010). "*Masters of their domains: The role of state capacity in civil wars*". *Journal of Peace Research*, 47, 267-271.

Sobolewska, M. (2013). "*Party Strategies and the Descriptive Representation of Ethnic Minorities: The 2010 British General Election". West European Politics*, 36(3), 615-633.

Soininen, M. (2011). Ethnic inclusion or exclusion in representation? Local candidate selection in Sweden, in Bird, Saalfeld, and Wüst, 145-163.

South Africa. (1997). White Paper on Transforming Public Service Delivery. Government Gazette No. 18340. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Southall, R. (1995). The Candidates in the 1993 Election, in Southall, R and Petlane, T (eds.).Democratisation and Demilitarisation in Lesotho: The general election of 1993 and its aftermath. Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa.

Southall, R (2003). "*Unlikely Success: South Africa and Lesotho's election of 2002". Journal of Modern African Studies*, 14(2).

Southall, R. and Petlane, T. (1995). Democratisation and Demilitarisation in Lesotho: the general election of 1993 and its aftermath. Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa.

Southern Africa Litigation Centre. (2016). Press Briefing: Lesotho Rule of Law Crisis. Johannesburg, 29 January 2016.

Spagnoli, F. (2003). *Homo Democraticus: On the Universal Desirability and the Not So Universal Possibility of Democracy and Human Rights*. London: Cambridge Scholar Press.

Spies, C. (2009). *Democracy and party systems in developing countries: A comparative study of India and South Africa*. Oxon: Routledge.

Stephan, A. and Skach, C. (1993). *"Constitutional Frameworks and democratic consolidation: Parliametarism versus Presidentialism*". *World politics,* 46, 1-22.

Strauss, L. and Cropsey, J. (1981). *History of Political Philosophy* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Suanzes, J. V. (1999). "*Sovereignty in British Legal Doctrine". Electronic Journal of Law,* 6(3), 1-42.

Sunstein, C .R. (2001). *Designing democracy: What Constitutions do?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Szilágyi, I. M. (2009). *Presidential versus parliamentary systems.* Budapest: Hungary.

Taagepera, R. (2002). *Designing Electoral Rules and Waiting for an Electoral System to Evolve, in The Architecture of Democracy: Constitutional Design, Conflict Management, and Democracy* (ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Tefo, T. (2014). We are ready to die for DPP: Metsing. *Lesotho Times*, 20 November 2014.

Tefo, T. (2018a). Blow for Government and Judge Mosito. *Lesotho Times,* 17 February 2018.

Tefo, T. (2018b). Kamoli trial finally commences. *Lesotho Times,* 9 March 2018.

Tefo, T. (2018c). Mahao Murder Suspects Charged. *Lesotho Times,* 31 March 2018.

Thomson, A. (2004). *An Introduction to African Politics*. New York: Routledge.

Thornhill, C. (2012). *South African Public Administration and Management*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Thornhill, C. and Van Dijk, G. (2015). *Public Administration and Management in South Africa: a developmental perspective*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Tsai, J. (2012). Cohabitation and Political Wrestling between President and Prime Minister in Semi-presidentialism. Reshaping Power, Shifting Boundaries, IPSA World Congress. https://www.researchgate.net. Accessed on 25 June 2018.

Tsebelis, G. (2000). "*Veto Players in Institutional Analysis*". *Governance,* 13(4). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tsebelis, G. (2002). *Veto Players. How Political Institutions Work*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tshishonga, N. and Mbambo, M. (2008). "*Forging democracy from below: The challenges and imperatives for crafting community participation and engagement*". *Journal of Public Administration*, 43(4),767-780.

United States. (2001). Lesotho: Country reports on human rights practices - 2000.

Ugwueze, M. I. and Edeh, H. C. (2014). "*Military and Politics: Understanding the Theoretical Underpinnings of Military Incursion in Third World Politics". Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences,* 5(20).

United Nations. (1985). Basic Principles on Independence of Judiciary.

United Nations. (2012). Food Insecurity Situation Report # 2 August 24, 2012. Resident Coordinator's Office in collaboration with humanitarian partners. Period 1 July 2012 to 20 July 2012.

Urbinati, N. and Warren, M. (2008). "*The Concept of Representation in Contemporary Democratic Theory". Annual Review of Political Science*, 11, 387-412.

Venter, A. and Landsberg, C. (1998). *Government and Politics in South Africa.* Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Verba, S. (1999). Representative Democracy and Democratic Citizens: Philosophical and Empirical Understanding, in The Tanner Lectures on Human Values. US: The University of Utah Press.

Verga, C. M. (2016). "*The Relations between the President and Parliament in Semi-presidential Republics*". J*uridica*, 5(2)

Verney, D. (1959). *The analysis of political systems*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Vile, M. (1967). *Constitutionalism and the Separation of Power*. (2nd ed.). UK: Oxford.

Wade, E. and Bradley, A. (1991). *Constitutional and Administrative Law*. London: Longmans.

Wade, E. and Phillips, G. (1960). *Constitutional Law.* London: Longmans.

Waliggo, J. M. (1991). The Separation of Powers between the Legislature, Executive and the Judiciary in the New Constitution. Federo, 18 May 2002.

Walton, O. (2012). Helpdesk Research Report: Election monitoring, voter education and election-related violence

Weisfelder, R. F. (1999). Political Contention in Lesotho, 1952 - 1965. Maseru: NUL.

Weissenbach, K. (2010). Political parties and party types - Conceptual approaches to the institutionalisation of political parties in transitional states: the case of the Philippines. Makati City: Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung.

Winter H. R. and Bellows J. J. (1992). *Conflict and compromise: an introduction to politics.* New York: Harper Collins.

Yadav, S. (2014). *Political Parties Management*. Satishchander MBA: India

Zihlangu, B. and Ntaote, B. (2014). Coalition pact collapses. *Lesotho Times*, 13 June.

Zukowski, A. (2004). System wyborzy do Sejmu I Senatu RP. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sejmore.