



الحكم الاستعماري البريطاني في بوتسوانا وتأثيراته على اقتصاد ما بعد الاستقلال

British Colonial Rule in Botswana and its Effects on Post-Independence Economy

La Domination Coloniale Britannique au Botswana et ses Effets sur l'Economie Postindépendance

* بن خليفة ايمان¹ . افكير محمد²

BENKHELIFA Imane¹, AFKIR Mohamed²

1- A doctorate student preparing Ph.D. in the field of British Commonwealth Studies at the

University of Laghouat, Algeria, i.benkhelifa@lagh-univ.dz

Laboratoire de Recherche" Science de Langage" N° C100 du 27/04/2010

2 -A professor at the University of Laghouat, Algeria, afkirmed@yahoo.fr

Received: 13/07/2019

Accepted: 26/04/2021

Published:28/12/2021

Abstract:

Although Botswana was the third poorest country at independence in 1966, it experienced an astonishing rapid economic development and is often considered as an exceptional country among the African countries with regard to its economic success. Appropriate policies, effective political institutions, the discovery of diamonds, and good leadership all together contributed to this success. However, the nature of British colonial rule in Botswana and its eventual post-independence consequences is a crucial factor to explain the economic success. Therefore, this article aims to evaluate the British colonial rule and its impact on the future of Botswana's economy. This paper tends to emphasize the importance of being neglected in making minimal impact on Botswana after independence compared to other former colonies. Furthermore, the study examines the conditions that led Botswana to sustain spectacular post-independence development. The historical approach is the determinant method in this paper in which qualitative analytical and descriptive methods are used to examine the historical events of Botswana during the colonial period

* BENKHELIFA Imane, i.benkhelifa@lagh-univ.dz

including applying the limbo approach, taxation system, maintaining pre-colonial institutions, the rise of nationalism and unity, male migration, and work in mining. The article draws the conclusion that British colonial rule had a positive impact on long-term economic development through three important factors. The first factor is the rise of Botswana unity. The second factor is the establishment of effective institutions. The third factor is the impact of taxation (cash-based economy, the modern wage labor sector more effective, and getting a great experience from mining in South Africa). Since much evidence supports that the key reason of Botswana's success is the strong government and the effective institutions, this article results in proving that The nature of British colonial rule in Botswana resulted in a political, economic, and social setting that could prepare a favorable ground for effective institutions to be adapted.

Keywords: British colonialism – benign neglect – Botswana unity – clash of institutions - effective institutions – long-term economic development – taxation.

- Abstract in French:

Bien que le Botswana soit le troisième pays le plus pauvre au moment de l'indépendance en 1966, il a connu un développement économique rapide et étonnant et est souvent considéré comme un pays exceptionnel parmi les pays africains en ce qui concerne sa réussite économique. Des politiques appropriées, des institutions politiques efficaces, la découverte de diamants et un bon leadership ont tous contribué à ce succès. Cependant, la nature de la domination coloniale britannique au Botswana et ses éventuelles conséquences après l'indépendance sont un facteur crucial pour expliquer le succès économique. Par conséquent, cet article vise à évaluer la domination coloniale britannique et son impact sur l'avenir de l'économie du Botswana. Ce document tend à souligner l'importance d'être négligé pour avoir un impact minimal sur le Botswana après l'indépendance par rapport à d'autres anciennes colonies. En outre, l'étude examine les conditions qui ont conduit le Botswana à soutenir un développement spectaculaire après l'indépendance. L'approche historique est la méthode déterminante dans cet article dans laquelle des méthodes qualitatives analytiques et descriptives sont utilisées pour examiner les événements historiques du Botswana pendant la période coloniale, y compris l'application de l'approche

limbo, le système fiscal, le maintien des institutions précoloniales, la montée du nationalisme et l'unité, la migration des hommes et le travail dans les mines. L'article tire la conclusion que la domination coloniale britannique a eu un impact positif sur le développement économique à long terme à travers trois facteurs importants. Le premier facteur est la montée de l'unité du Botswana. Le deuxième facteur est la mise en place d'institutions efficaces. Le troisième facteur est l'impact de la fiscalité (économie basée sur l'argent comptant, le secteur du travail salarié moderne plus efficace et une grande expérience de l'exploitation minière en Afrique du Sud). Étant donné que de nombreuses preuves soutiennent que la principale raison du succès du Botswana est le gouvernement fort et les institutions efficaces, cet article a pour résultat de prouver que la nature de la domination coloniale britannique au Botswana a abouti à un cadre politique, économique et social qui pourrait préparer un terrain favorable. pour des institutions efficaces à adapter.

Mots clés : Colonialisme britannique - négligence bénigne - unité du Botswana - choc des institutions - institutions efficaces - développement économique à long terme - fiscalité.

على الرغم من أن بوتسوانا كانت ثالث أفقر دولة عند الاستقلال في عام 1966 ، فقد شهدت تطورا اقتصاديا سريعا مدهشا وغالبا ما تعتبر دولة استثنائية بين الدول الأفريقية فيما يتعلق بنجاحها الاقتصادي. ساهمت السياسات المناسبة والمؤسسات السياسية الفعالة واكتشاف الماس والقيادة الجيدة في تحقيق هذا النجاح. ومع ذلك ، فإن طبيعة الحكم الاستعماري البريطاني في بوتسوانا وعواقبه النهائية بعد الاستقلال هي عامل حاسم لتفسير النجاح الاقتصادي. لذلك ، تهدف هذه المقالة إلى تقييم الحكم الاستعماري البريطاني وتأثيره على مستقبل اقتصاد بوتسوانا. تميل هذه الورقة إلى التأكيد على أهمية الإهمال في إحداث تأثير ضئيل على بوتسوانا بعد الاستقلال مقارنة بالمستعمرات السابقة الأخرى. علاوة على ذلك ، تبحث الدراسة الظروف التي دفعت بوتسوانا إلى الحفاظ على التطور المذهل بعد الاستقلال. النهج التاريخي هو الأسلوب المحدد في هذه الورقة حيث يتم استخدام الأساليب التحليلية والوصفية النوعية لفحص الأحداث التاريخية لبوتسوانا خلال الفترة الاستعمارية بما في ذلك تطبيق نهج النسيان ، ونظام الضرائب ، والحفاظ على مؤسسات ما قبل الاستعمار ، وصعود القومية و الوحدة ، هجرة الذكور ، والعمل في مجال التعدين. يستخلص المقال الاستنتاج القائل بأن الحكم الاستعماري البريطاني كان له تأثير إيجابي على التنمية الاقتصادية على المدى الطويل من خلال ثلاثة عوامل مهمة. العامل الأول هو صعود وحدة بوتسوانا. العامل الثاني

هو إنشاء مؤسسات فعالة. العامل الثالث هو تأثير الضرائب (الاقتصاد القائم على النقد ، وقطاع العمل بأجر الحديث أكثر فعالية ، والحصول على خبرة كبيرة من التعدين في جنوب أفريقيا). بما أن الكثير من الأدلة تدعم أن السبب الرئيسي لنجاح بوتسوانا هو الحكومة القوية والمؤسسات الفعالة ، فإن هذه المقالة تؤدي إلى إثبات أن طبيعة الحكم الاستعماري البريطاني في بوتسوانا أدت إلى وضع سياسي واقتصادي واجتماعي يمكن أن يعد أرضية مواتية لتكييف المؤسسات الفعالة. الكلمات المفتاحية: الاستعمار البريطاني - الإهمال الحميد - وحدة بوتسوانا - صراع المؤسسات - المؤسسات الفعالة - التنمية الاقتصادية طويلة الأجل - الضرائب

- Introduction:

By the 1960s, newly independent African countries were filled with high expectations of decolonization and aspirations to recover from the colonial legacy. The rich-resource countries, in particular, were left with the imposing tasks of investing the natural riches to start the tiresome journey of economy building. However, economic development in most Sub-Saharan African countries was disappointing since their independence; they experienced several economic problems such as stagnation, destruction, inflation. Only a few African countries could escape the fate of miserable economic suffering like the case of Botswana. The former British protectorate in the southern part of the continent achieved the world's highest rate of economic growth between 1966 and 1999 (Leith, 2005, p.5).

In the wake of independence, Botswana's economy was destroyed due to the taxation system inherited from the times of colonial rule. It was known for its poor situation in economy and dependency as Valentin Seideler (2010) who mentioned that Botswana at independence was one of the poorest countries in the world, that had a poor economy and which was dependent on foreign assistance (p.3-4). Yet after independence, Botswana emerged as one of the most stable countries politically and after decades, it built a successful economy. In the 1960s, it achieved rapid economic development with the fastest growing GDP per capita in the world (Andrew Charles Barclay, 2008, p.5). Botswana was an exceptional former British colony in its type of colonization as a protectorate and being in a limbo situation.

While most African countries went through disastrous economic experiences, economists often depict Botswana as an economic success story in a continent. This exceptional case of

an ex-colonial territory making an unexpected economic success is academically motivating. In fact, historians and economists were interested to decode the key to that success. As will be shown below, several interpretations were advanced standing on political, social, and economic particularities in Botswana. Yet this article is interested in why the legacy of colonial rule did not annihilate Botswana's opportunity of economic growth like it did in the majority of the ex-colonial countries. Hence it is interesting to have an investigation into the possibility that colonialism could have a positive impact, which is contrary to the usual African historical context. Unlike many other African countries, ethnic conflicts were absent in Botswana, its political institutions enjoyed stability and its mineral wealth in diamonds did not lead to civil wars.

The main purpose of this article is to explain Botswana's economic success in the context of the colonial legacy left by the British and its impact on economic development. This study attempts to examine the nature of British colonial rule in this country and its political, social, and cultural effects that could have prepared a favorable ground that avoided ethnic and political conflict.

This article argues that Botswana's economy escaped disaster and enjoyed success thanks to the benign political, economic, and social impact of British colonial policies. Therefore, what was the nature of British colonial rule in this colony? What were its political, economic, and social impacts in the post-independence country? And how did colonial legacy encourage Botswana's economic growth?

Review:

The economic success in Botswana has attracted attention on the part of many economic researchers and historians. This section reviews some of the main explanations of economic success in Botswana. The role of mineral wealth (diamonds) and how these riches did not lead to civil wars like other countries (e.g. Sudan) is important in Botswana's success. According to Charles Andrew Barclay (2008): "Botswana's growth could not have occurred without diamonds. The revenues generated from diamonds created the perfect conditions for economic growth"(p.1). He mentioned the reason behind Botswana's success such as the location as a country blessed with diamonds and how Botswana avoided the resource curse.

Other scholars argued that there would have been no sustained economic growth in Botswana without diamonds (Jerven, 2009, p. 13-14).

Postcolonial policies were also considered as one of the factors of Botswana's success. Scott Beaulier (2003) in his work "Explaining Botswana's Success: The Critical Role of Post-Colonial Policy" argued that postcolonial policy choices were the secret behind Botswana's success. He sees that if the wealth and poverty of the country was the result of colonial and historical factors, so the country might be restricted by their past even though they adopted good policies. However if good policy decisions were made by good leadership after independence, then there would be more hope for struggling (P.22-23). Maipose and Metsheka, in their work "Explaining African Growth Performance, the Botswana Case study"(2002), consider that Botswana achieved rapid economic growth due to the adoption of good policies, good management, and good leadership. (p.1-5) Maipose and Metsheka stated the challenges that Botswana faced such as: fighting corruption, poverty, Dutch disease, and how their people avoided them using the right policies, which contributed together in making her one of the most successful stories in the world.

The role of effective institutions is also important in this success. Robinson, James A, in his work "Botswana as a Role Model for Country Success" (2009), gave the institutions main importance in Botswana's economy as well as the influence of elites because of their interests in developing the country (p.10-12). Furthermore, Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson (2001) together in the work entitled "An African Success Story: Botswana" argued that Botswana's economic success was achieved because of following orthodox economic policies. They argued that these economic policies were chosen due to the good institutions, exactly institutions of private property.

Many scholars emphasized the role of president Khama and Masire as good leaders who contributed to this miracle success. Festus Mogae in his lectures (2005) at the Institute of Development Studies emphasized political leadership at the time of independence. As James Fearon and David Laitin argue, because of good leadership, there were good institutions that resulted in a lack of corruption (2005). The same in the work "A Closer Look at Botswana's Development: The Role of institutions" by Philippe Martin (2008) investigated the factors or

the conditions that led Botswana to growth after independence. Philippe emphasized the importance of institutions like others, which resulted in good policies with a special focus on the role of Khama in strengthening the state and economic success (p.48).

Botswana as a protectorate it seems to have enjoyed a good and stable relationship with colonial Britain. Charles Andrew Barclay particularly insists on the factor of the absence of conflicts both with Britain during the colonial period and after independence, which is of special importance in this article. This factor led to creating a good relationship between the two countries and political stability, which in turn had a visible impact on the success of Botswana's economic experience after independence (P.62-63).

The conclusion that can be drawn from the above discussion is that good leadership, effective institutions, good policies, diamonds, and a good relationship with Britain during and after independence all together contributed to the economic success of Botswana. These factors were the direct elements behind the country's successful economic experience. However, colonial legacy stands behind creating a suitable background that made Botswana's economic growth possible. The nature of British rule in this ex-colony and colonial policies resulted in a political, economic, and social setting that paved the way for economic success.

Colonial Legacy and Botswana's Economic Experience:

This section examines the nature of British colonial rule in Botswana and its legacy after independence. The special type of colonial rule in this country led to the creation of a suitable political, economic, and social setting that could prepare Botswana for the growth of its economy by thanks to strong national unity, strong institutions, and a working tax system.

The Nature of colonial rule in Botswana:

British colonial rule in Botswana was of a special type. Botswana had faced previous invasions before the British. The Zulus from 1818 until 1830 tried to invade Bechuanaland; however, most of these invasions were unsuccessful. Boers attempted to invade the southern and western Tswana tribes and they failed in the battle of Dimawe. In 1853, Sechele the Tswana chief asked the British for protecting Bechuanaland from Boer attacks, but the British refused because they did not want to damage the relationship with the Boers. Furthermore,

British public opinion wanted full colonization for Bechuanaland rather than awarding protectorate status (Scott Beaulier, 2003, p.5-6). When Germany seized South West Africa (present-day Namibia), the British changed their policy concerning Tswana in 1884. The British were afraid that Germany would annex Bechuanaland, and as a result, they would "block one of their main corridors to northern Africa" (Scott Beaulier, 2003, p.6). Cecil Rhodes mentioned that Bechuanaland was "the Suez Canal into Africa's interior" (Gann and Duignan 1967, p.203). Because the Germans presented a threat to British colonialism in South Africa, they decided to grant Bechuanaland protection in 1885. Therefore, its status as a protectorate was beneficial to them for the prohibition from any invasions which mean no wars that would affect the territory negatively

One of the reasons that made Britain accept Bechuanaland as a protectorate was to help Cecil Rhodes to expand the power of the British South Africa Company as he wanted to transform it into a European settlement along the fertile eastern part (Picard, 1987, p.30). However, the chiefs of Bechuanaland were against the British South Africa Company's control and with pressure on the queen to maintain the protectorate under British control, the plan did not succeed. Moreover, Jameson Raid proved to the British authorities that it was totally risky to grant all the power of Bechuanaland to BSAC, and that was the result of losing British support. This event led to the Second Boer War "which brought a re-evaluation of British policy in southern Africa, and the realization on the part of the British that Bechuanaland's future seemed intimately tied to the Republic of South Africa" (Colclough and McCarthy, 1980, p.13-14). Furthermore, the South Africa Act that was held in 1910, called for the annexation of Bechuanaland, however again, the people of Botswana unified their opposition to joining the union of South Africa (Rasmay, 1998, p.84). The British wanted to combine Bechuanaland and South Africa after the Second World War; however, Bechuanaland refused strongly and they succeeded to thwart this plan thanks to the National movements after World War Two and also to the National Party which was formed in 1948 (Scot Beaulier, 2003, p.7). Thus, attempts to annex Botswana to South Africa, BSAC, and South Africa Act led to unifying all the people of Botswana which led to the adoption of

unified nationhood and that was an important factor in the success of Botswana after independence.

Although Bechuanaland was a British protectorate, the British had no interest in managing it since they thought that it was poor in natural resources. Moreover, the British budget was not enough to colonize Bechuanaland; thus, they simply left it alone. Historians agree that the British applied the "benign neglect" approach to the protectorate (Dale, 1995 Paraphrase in Scott Beaulier, 2003, p.6). This approach would serve the territory, unlike other African colonies in which there would be a minimal impact compared to other African colonies. The British spent 75% of the administrative expenses and another large portion was spent on upgrading tribal militants (Scott Beaulier, 2003, p.7). The British armed the people of Botswana to save the territory against the Boers to the south and the Germans to the west, which helped Botswanans acquire enough military experience.

Britain started to lose control of the protectorate with the rise of nationalism and political parties. In 1965 "Britain could no longer hold on the Bechuanaland protectorate, and Botswana's national independence was officially recognized" (Scott Beaulier, 2003, p.8). Botswana sustained free, fair, and democratic elections where Botswana Democratic Party won and Seretse Khama became the president (Robinson James A, 2009, P.1). Therefore, post-independent Botswana emerged from colonial rule with minimal losses as British colonial rule was particularly soft and with benign effects.

The impact of the "benign neglect" situation

British colonialism for Botswana was considered by most scholars as "light rule" (Acemoglu et al, 2001, p.13) that followed the "benign neglect" approach (Beaulier, 2003, p.229). The high commissioner explained the British rule in Botswana:

"We have no interest in the country to the north of the Molpe (Bechuanaland), except as a road to the interior; we might, therefore, confine ourselves for the present to preventing that part of the protectorate being occupied either by filibusters or foreign powers doing as little in the way of administration or settlement as possible" (Quoted in Acemoglu et al, 200b, p.13).

The British did not invest in the Bechuanaland, and that resulted in putting the territory in a type of limbo (Charles Andrew Barclay, 2008, p.26). The limbo approach meant little political interference, as pre-colonial institutions were kept unchanged and progressive introduction for British institutions. The Bechuanaland's administration was located in South Africa, and that shows clear neglect from the British (p.26). Authors argued that there was no need for British permanent administration in Bechuanaland because the British thought that the country was poor in natural resources (Raphaeli et al, 1984, p.11). The British increased assistance (which was not completed like in infrastructure) in Bechuanaland when they failed in joining it into South Africa and also when they felt that the territory was in its way to independence (Harvey and Lewis, 1990, p.23).

The British applied the limbo approach in health and education and their outlay was under £ five million per year in 1948 (Charles Andrew Barclay, 2008, p.27). The British imposed taxes such as "hut tax" and "poll tax" to recover the costs. Picard (1987, p.98-99) explained that because: "in 1899, police were consuming 51% of the protectorate's budget for both British Bechuanaland and Bechuanaland was 60 % of the total budget. By 1912, this had fallen to 30%". Unlike other British colonies, Britain did not plan to stock ethnic groups that would lead to post-independence ethnic conflict (Charles Andrew Barclay, 2008, p. 28). Furthermore, Bechuanaland in its way to independence, Britain did not use military action to maintain control of the territory, and that influenced Botswana's government after independence (p.28). MP demonstrates when he said, "since we did not fight for independence, our politics of development was not the politics of ideology" (Raphaeli et al, 1984, p.13).

Britain during the colonial period of Botswana kept and maintained Bechuanaland's institutions like Kgotla. Authors argued that prospered democracy after independence was the result of maintaining Kgotla (Molutsi and Holm, 1990, p.325; Odell, 1985, p.61). In the 1950s, a delegation to Britain claimed that: "Kgotla had been invested with authority in the determination of our affairs equivalent to that of parliament to the British people" (Willaims, 2006, p.99). Thus, Kgotla was one of the reasons for social stability in Botswana. This

approach led to minimal impact on Botswana after independence, unlike other former colonies where it was harsh.

Botswanan National Unity and Political Stability:

Botswana under British protection raised nationalism against any invasion, which resulted in the Botswana unity that is a crucial factor in Botswana's success after independence. The people of Bechuanaland favored being under the British authority than being incorporated into South Africa or South Rhodesia (Rasmay, 1998, p.62). This led to the development of nationalism to resist Afrikaner annexation (Morton, 1998, p.44). The Nationalism that was developed in Botswana by the British led to a less hostile relationship with Britain in which their people worked with colonial authorities against South Africa and South Rhodesia (Rasmay, 1998-a, p.103-104). Therefore, resistance and opposition to South Africa and South Rhodesia fostered tribal cooperation and created Tswana unity. The origins of nationalism in Bechuanaland started during the resistance to Afrikaner. Tlou and Campbell (1977) said: "The most important result of the wars was the uniting of Botswana against a common enemy. This was to play the foundation for a future republic of Botswana, in which merafe recognizes a common unity." (p.170). Therefore, the rise of nationalism against the enemies is the result of finding unified Botswana identity and feeling unified nationhood which is responsible for the development of the country. All the factors together with the intention of the unified people to develop the country led to social and political stability that in turn lead to post-independence economic success.

Post-independence Institutions

The result is that "Botswana enjoyed one of the best working set of institutions on the African continent. Botswana's mature democracy has seen peaceful transitions of governments after free and fair elections" (Valentin Seidler, 2001, p. 58). The British applied a little colonial administration in the protectorate. They kept the institutional powers like the chiefs who worked with colonial commissioners and benefited from their position. The British had no interest in the protectorate because they thought that there were no natural resources thus they did not invest in infrastructure, education, and health as mentioned above that British spending was on administrative expenses and upgrading tribal militants.

Britain did not enter in any kind of building the nation (Scott Beaulier, 2003, p. 229-231). Furthermore, the British imposed taxes (hut tax and native tax) which were collected by chiefs.

Despite the avoidance of clash of institutions in Botswana, British rule influenced the development trajectories of various institutions of the protectorate mainly in areas of language, social and economic life (Valentin Seidler, 2010, p.17). Factors that promoted this development were: the impact of colonial taxes (strengthen the position of the chiefs, increase of job migration and the introduction of Cush based economy), intensifying the contact with missionaries and traders, and the interest of elites to develop and prosper the economy. (Valentin Seidler, 2010, p.17)

Kgotla was the salient reason for the Tswana to be tolerant with dissent unlike other African tribes (Scott Beaulier, 2003, p.4-5). Kgotla created a connection between the chief and his people in which they could discuss political, economic, and social issues as well as they could criticize and advise the chief. During colonial times, Botswana remained untouched despite the maintenance of rule under traditional authority due to the alteration of the chiefs' position and powers. (More explanation in why Botswana End up with Good Institutions: the Role of Culture and Colonial Rule, p.18). Missionaries expanded and became important political allies that often taking sides with Botswana against the British. (Schapera, 1933, p.407). Informal British (social and economic) institutions developed in areas near to neighboring white colonies due to the Hut tax which "forcibly confronted a considerable part of the population with the new institutions"(Valentin Seidler, 2010, p 19). Political elites supported formal education that was a way of developing the country. Moreover, urbanization promoted contact with British informal institutions (p.19).

Lack of legitimacy, suffer from the rent-seeking political class, and corruption were the results of the clash between local institutions (pre-colonial institutions) and colonial institutions. Botswana unlike most former African colonies did not experience a clash, and institutional transformations were successful (Valentin Seidler, 2010, p. 21). However, Botswana's institutions were influenced under British colonization where new colonial institutions were inserted in local institutions like language, labor markets, and cash-based

economy (Valentine Seidler, 2010, p.21). British practices such as education, taxation, missionaries' work, and urbanization were the most effective factors that affected this development. Taxation was the most influential factor in which chiefs benefited their political and economic powers, they "benefited from the political arrangement with the colonial administration and supported a gradual modernization of Botswana's society" (Valentine Seidler, 2010, p.21).

Various factors helped in the adoption of the British informal institutions (Botswana's institutions remained, taxation, urbanization, Botswana's support for education and developed economy, and peaceful colonization) Moreover, supremacy was given to the British hands peacefully and constructively (p.28). Another reason was the successful transition of institutions "from a traditional society to a modern state" (p.28), and the avoidance of institutional clash where local institutions were preserved and integrated into the British institutional framework. This later adapted to Botswana culture like "Judiciary system incorporates customary courts" (p.28). These factors contributed together to the adoption of an effective institutional framework for Botswana after independence.

The Inherited Tax System and Botswana's Economy:

Another factor of the economic success of Botswana was the impact of British taxes on long-term economic growth. During the colonial period, the British imposed harsh policies on the people of Bechuanaland like the "hut tax" and "native tax" which were paid only in British currency (Scott Beaulier, 2003, p.14). Britain imposed the first tax which was the "hut tax" in 1899, that each per hut or dwelling owned by the head of the family should pay one pound tax to the British Empire (Dictionary of South African English). Furthermore, in 1919 there was another tax imposed by the British on the Bechuanaland's people was the "native tax"; the British levied on "each citizen to pay three additional shillings to the British" (Scott Beaulier, 2003, p.14). A large portion of the population was unable to pay and that was the result for the division of Bechuanaland's people some who chose not to respond with the tax (which resulted in harsh punishments), and others chose to enter the formal labor market (p.14)

The obligation of paying taxes in British currency led to the warp of the Bechuanaland's economy. Schapera showed and explained that when he said: "taxation forced upon the people the necessity of finding a regular sum of (British) money each year" (1947, p. 7). Since Bechuanaland was an agricultural society and its economy was based on self-reliant cattle farming, the impact of these taxes was harsh.

Lack of jobs in Bechuanaland led its people to search for them to pay taxes. That's why they decided to work in the British mines in South Africa since it was the only solution to get money. This would change the Bechuanaland society from a rural economy to a modern wage labor economy (Paterson, 2006, p.16). Job search activity led to massive migration of labor to South Africa and created "proletarianized" (Picard, 1987, p.113) which means "peasantry, a working-class dependent upon urban conditions, but residing in rural areas" (Charles Andrew Barclay, 2008, p.30). The migration of laborers in 1905 was 2.400 and increased in 1925 to 9.000 (p.30). It reached a peak in 1943 with 50%. (Schapera, 1947, p.1-39; Parson, 1984, p. 27).

Taxes and immigration of half the male population led to the economic decline as well as the distortion of the physical, economic, and social infrastructure of Botswana. Scott Beaulier (2003) clarified that:

"Generations of children were raised without a male influence at home. Skilled artisans and entrepreneurs were no longer able to service the missing male population. With less consumer demand, entrepreneurs were probably a significant fraction of the emigrating population. The fabric society was also strained, and women were forced to take on a large role in the household. Most importantly, Botswana's political institutions were crippled"(p15).

British taxes had a harsh impact on the economy of Botswana during the colonial period. However, it had a long-term economic impact on the future of Botswana (Charles Andrew Barclay, 2008, p. 31). The people of Botswana gained great experience in mining that would help them after the discovery of diamonds in 1967. Also, it transformed the economy from rural to a modern wage-labor economy. Furthermore, this system allowed Botswana to normalize taxation to generate government revenue. Working to pay taxes changed the

population from a society that was not working effectively to wage labor sector more effective and diversified. (Picard, 1987, p.2)

Explanation

It was obvious that the British neglected the Botswana colony, where Britain did not spend money on infrastructure and human development including healthcare and education. The legacy of British colonialism was just a squeeze of 40 university graduates and 100 people with a secondary school leaving certificates (Barclay, 2008, p.7) and "only a railway which is an abattoir built and 12 kilometers of the paved road" (Charles Andrew Barclay, 2008, p.6) and no vital private or public sector (Samatar, 1999, Cited Badawy, 2015, p.15). According to AJR (2003), Botswana inherited the "good institutions" of private property and the law of rule (Cited Badawy, 2015, p.15). It is common knowledge that few harsh policies were imposed by Britain (hut tax). Moreover, Botswana was lucky at the time of colonialism when diamonds were not discovered yet, thus Britain exhibited little interest there (Scott, 2003, Badawy, 2015, p.16). Furthermore, Eslam mentioned that: "The colonial government was very small and had a minimum collaboration with the colonial local people. Thus, the existence of British officials in the colony remained marginal" (Badawy, 2015, p.16).

The British colonial rule in Botswana was "light", it was special. The British did not dramatically change the pre-colonial Botswana institutions. Therefore, the clash of customary institutions and British institutions was avoided, unlike other African countries. However, according to Samatar (1999), British colonialism influenced the indigenous system in Botswana and he mentioned three ways:

"First, by defining "tribal reserves" for each Botswana nation, the colonizer solidified what were formerly fluid social and locative processes. Second, by recognizing the "chiefs" as the legitimate traditional rulers of the tribes and proclaiming that they could only be removed by the colonial administration, the British ended informal systems of control on chiefs. Third, the colonial state also reserved the right to recognized new chiefs. This means that the tribe (i.e., the chief) and the colonial administrator became the two administrative anchors of the new order" (Quoted in Badawy, 2015, p. 17).

Therefore, chiefs were left in place but their authority was influenced. Good (1999) explained that influence in two ways: first, Christianity altered their spiritual functions, and second, they benefited from acting both as agents and tax collectors from the British (Badawy, 2015, p.16). Moreover, Schapera(1955) argued that: "the chiefs obtained payments from merchants as well as cash tribute from migrant labor on their way back to their tribes"(Cited in Badawy, 2015, p. 16)

In 1966, Bechuanaland gained its independence peacefully and became the modern state of Botswana. After a brief period, a constitution was written and the form of government was selected. Botswana's constitution and government system have been in place since then (Knuckles, 2006, Cited in Badawy, 2015, p.17). Today, Botswana is a parliamentary democratic republic with its legislative, judiciary, and governmental institutions that are in the European paradigm but adjust to Botswana tradition (Seidler, 2011, Cited in Badawy, 2015, p.16). All adult citizens have the right to vote for the election of the president who will enjoy strong presidential powers. Botswana enjoys a real democracy because of the peaceful transfer of power and fair elections (Badawy, 2015, p. 17).

Directly After independence, the development process of Botswana's political institutions started with the retreating of the chiefs' powers (Seidler, 2011, cited in Badawy, 2015, p. 17). The development process began in 1966 with the management of the tribal territories by the establishment of elected district councils. At the same time, the authorities and rights of the chiefs were realized with the Chieftainship Act (1965) (Badawy, 2015, p. 17). The president was responsible for appointing and removing the chiefs. Therefore, chiefs' authorities were deteriorated, and "their role as chairpersons in the district councils was abolished" (Seidler,2011, cited in Badawy, 2015, p. 17). Moreover, Botswana after independence started to build formal modern state institutions Eslam Badawy argued that Botswana started "to built from scratch" (page 18). Botswana established new institutions on European standards and customized to Botswana culture. Furthermore, the kgotla integrated the official institutional structure. Seidler argued:

"kgotla example demonstrates how the incorporation of traditional institutions into the formal institutions enhances political legitimacy and improves the efficacy of state institutions" (cited in Badawy, 2015, p. 18).

In 1966, Botswana was one of the poorest countries in the world. However, after decades it achieved the world's highest rate of economic growth. The impressive economic performance was very noticeable in the worldwide. According to Knuckles (2006), there are two important reasons for this impressive economy, good fiscal policies, and conscious leadership (Badawy, 2015, p. 18). However, Botswana's economy experienced some problems such as First, unemployment. Second, economic inequality particularly in the rural areas, and thus economic development is backward behind the country's overall economic expansion (Beaulier, 2006, p.108). Third, the HIV/AIDS epidemic, which is the country's biggest challenge. Available data show that the highest infection rate in the whole world is in Botswana.

Ethnic diversity in Botswana is very little; 80% of the population is Tswana. After independence, there were no ethnic conflicts. Botswana was an ethnically homogeneous nation and most of its people shared the same language and religion "Christianity" (Knuckles, 2006, cited in Badawy, 2015, p. 29). Moreover, before the colonial period, there were political institutions that "acted inclusively and successfully included non-Tswana populations into the political structure of the local state" (Robinson and parson, 2006, cited in Badawy, 2015, p.29). So, alternative groups would not act violently against the legitimacy of the new state. And because Britain did not try to stick ethnic differences in Botswana, ethnic conflicts were absent, and therefore "the sense of belonging to a homogeneous group has politically stabilizing effect in Botswana" (Robinson, 2009, p. 9). As a result, the homogeneity of Botswana people leads to post-independence social cohesion.

Unlike other African countries, Botswana's management of its riches (diamonds) is considered as one of the best economic policies. Natural resources in most African countries have ended in a resource curse however, Botswana succeeded to avoid it by applying useful policies. According to Langué (2004) after the discovery of diamonds in 1967, efficient state institutions were established to prevent the resource curse (Cited in Badawy, 2015, p. 31).

The profits from diamonds invested in healthcare and education not personal safes of government officials (Badawy, 2015, p. 30-31). Subsequently, the good institutional qualities were the direct reason for avoiding the resource curse (Fosu, 2011, cited in Badawy, 2015, p. 31)

Other important factors that contributed to the economic success of Botswana are good leadership and intolerance culture (Knuckles, 2006, Badawy, 2015, p. 31). Since independence, corruption was not tolerated thus; examples of corruption are in Botswana rare. Badawy mentioned that: " culture of intolerance discourage a corrupt leader from seeking power and quickly eliminates a leader that becomes corrupt" (page 31) and " the relatively mild and infrequent nature of corruption in Botswana can partially be attributed to a culture that has zero-tolerance for corruption and to citizens who highly trust the impartiality of their representatives and leaders" (32). Therefore, the harsh policies of the government against corruption are important in this impressive success. Economists considered Botswana after independence as the least corrupt country among African sub-Saharan countries where poverty is low and the law of rule is highly respected (Owolu 1999 Cited in Badawy, 2015, p.11).

Economists agree that good governance and effective institutions are the key reasons for Botswana's success as Robinson and Parson mentioned (2006) (Badawy, 2015, p.32). Botswana's good governance and effective institutions stand behind many factors. One important factor is the historical legacy of colonial rule in the Bechuanaland protectorate and the impact this rule had on the development of institutions. Colonial legacy had an important role in creating a suitable background that made Botswana's economic development possible. The nature of British colonial rule in Botswana resulted in a political, economic, and social setting that could prepare a favorable ground for effective institutions to be adapted. Moreover, Botswana escaped disaster and enjoyed one of the best institutional and governmental frameworks thanks to the benign neglect during the colonial period. The special limbo approach which means a little political involvement with the gradual introduction of informal British institutions led to minimal impact compared to other African colonies. The light colonial rule left Botswana institution in place and it was peaceful and

long enough for informal institutions to be adopted. Because the British did not stick ethnic differences, ethnic conflicts and civil wars were absent in post-independence Botswana and with the high ethnical and religious homogeneity (national unity), social cohesion supported the political stability. Therefore, one of the reasons for Botswana's effective institution can be found in its colonial period.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this paper has attempted to explain to what extent the British colonial experience influences Botswana after independence. Important factors contributed together to Botswana's economic success such as national unity, British minimal impact, political stability, social cohesion, good governance, and effective quality of institutions. These factors are rooted in the benign legacy of colonial rule that stands behind creating a favorable background, which paved the way for its economic success. Britain has invested nothing in Botswana but has trained minds and systems to reflect traditions and values for long-terms like the impact of migration of Botswana males to South Africa by gaining excellent experience in mining after the discovery of diamonds. Another example is the absence of ethnic conflicts (homogeneity that contributed to the political stability of Botswana). Botswana inherited from Britain standards that help them in establishing a good institutional framework. Therefore, this article confirms that the British colonial legacy investigates the positive colonial impact in the economy of Botswana.

- References:

- 1) **Abdi**, Ismail Samatar . (1999). An African Miracle: State and Class Leadership and Colonial Legacy in Botswana Development”.
- 2) Acemoglu, Daron; Jhonson, Simon; and Robinson James, A. (2001). *An African Success Story: Botswana*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Economics, Working Paper Series, Room E52-251, 50 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, MA02142.
- 3) ---. (2003). An African Success Story: Botswana. In D. Rodrik's (ed) *In Search of Prosperity: Analytic Narratives on Economic Growth*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press: 80-119.
- 4) Badawy, Eslam.(2015). Botswana and Nigeria the Same Colonial Legacy but Different paths. MPP Professional Paper. The Hubert H. Humphrey School of Public Affairs.The University of Minnesota.

- 5) Barclay, Andrew Charles. (2009). *Factors that Contributed to the Economic Success of Botswana*. Research Project for the Degree of Master of Arts in International Studies. C. Andrew Barckay 2009. Simon Franser University Fall 2009.
- 6) Beaulier, Scott. (2003). *Explaining Botswana's Success: The Critical Role of Post -Colonial Policy*. Mercatus Centre. George Mason University. Working Paper 41.
- 7) Colclough, C and Mc Carthy, S.(1980). *The Political Economy of Botswana: A Study of Growth and Distribution*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- 8) Dale, R. (1995). *Botswana's Search for Autonomy in Southern Africa*. Westport, C T: Greenwood Press.
- 9) Fidzani, N. (1998). *Land Reform and Primitive Accumulation: A Closer Look at the Botswana Tribal Grazing Land Policy's in Botswana*. Politics and Society, Eds .W. Edge. M. Lekorwe, J.L.van Schaik Publishers, Pretoria.
- 10) Feron, James and Laitin David. (2005). *Botswana*. Stanford University.
- 11) Fosu A, k. (2011). Terms of Trade and Growth of Resource Economies; ATale of Two Countries. UNU-WIDER Working Paper, NO.2011/28.
- 12) Gann, L.H., and Duignan, P. (1967). *Burden of Empire*. Stanford, C A: Hoover Institution Press.
- 13) Good, Kenneth. (1999). The State and Extreme PPoverty in Botswana- the San and destitute. The Journal of Modern african studies 37.
- 14) Jmes A , knuckles. (2006). A Study of Corruption's causes in Botswana and Nigeria. Available at:<<http://unpublishedwork.files.wordpress.com/2013/03/a-study-of-corruptions-causes-in-botswana-and-nigeria.pdf>>
- 15) Jerven, M. (2009). *Accounting for the African Growth Miracle: The Official Evidence: Botswana 1956-1995*, (online) Available at: http://www.ise.ac.uk/collections/economic_history/seminars/morten%20jerven.pdf (ACCESSED : March 7,2020).
- 16) Langué, Matthew. (2004) . British Colonial Legacies and Political Development. World development 32(6):905-922.
- 17) Leith, Clark J. (2000). *Why Botswana Prospered*. Paper for Presentation at Canadian Economics Association 34th Annual Meeting University of Colombia.
- 18) Martin, Philippe. (2008). *A Closer Look at Botswana's Development: The Role of Institutions*. Norman Paterson School of International Affairs. Carleton University, Paterson Review. Volume 9, 2008.
- 19) Maipose. G. S and Matsheka T C. (2002). *Explaining African Growth Performance, the Botswana Case Study*. University of Botswana.

- 20) Mogae, Festus. (2005). *Botswana's Development Experience*. The Institute of Development Studies. University of Sussex.
- 21) Molutsi, P and Holm, J. (1990). *Developing Democracy when Civil Society is Weak: The case of Botswana*. African Affairs, vol.89, (356), pp.323-340.
- 22) Morton, F. (1998). *Land, Cattle and Ethnicity: The Creation of Linchwe's Backgates, 1875-1920, in Botswana Politics and Society*. Eds.w.edge and M. Lekorwe, J.L.van Schaik publisher, Pretoria.
- 23) Odell, M. (1985). *Local Government: Traditional and Modern Roles of the Village Kgotla. In the Evolution of Modern Botswana*, Ed. L. Picard, Nebraska Press, Linclon.
- 24) Owolu, Bamidele. (1999).Combating Corruption and Economic Crime in Africa. The International Journal of Public Social Management 12 (7):606.
- 25) Parson, J. (1984). *Botswana: Liberal Democracy and the Labor Preserve in Southern Africa*. Boulder, CO: West view Press.
- 26) Parsons, N. (1998). *King Khama , Emperor Joe, and the Great White Queen: Victorian Britain through African Eyes*. Chicago. University of Chicago Press.
- 27) Paterson, S. (2006). *Economics Growth in Botswana in the 1980s: A Model for Sub-Saharan Africa*. Africa World Press. Trewon and Asmara.
- 28) Picard, L. (1985-a). *Bureaucrats, Elections and Political Control: National Politics, the District Administration and the Multi-Party System in Botswana. In the Evolution of Modern Botswana*. Ed.L.Picard, Nebraska Press, Linclon .
- 29) ---. (1987). *The Politics of Development in Botswana: A Model for Success?*. Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder and London.
- 30) ---. (1985). *From Bechuanaland to Botswana : An Overview*. In the Evolution of Modern Botswana. Ed. L. Picard, Nebraska Press, Linclon.
- 31) Raphaelii, N, Roumani, J and Mackellar, A. (1984). *Public Sector Management in Botswana*. World Bank. Working Paper 709. Washington , D. C.
- 32) Ramsay, J.(1998). *The Establishment and Consolidation of the Bechuanaland Protectorate, 1870-1910, in Botswana Politics and Society*. Eds. W. Edge and M. Lekorwe, J. L. Van Schaik Publishers, Pretoria.
- 33) ---. (1998-a). *Twentieth Century Antecedents of Decolonizing Nationalism in Botswana. In Botswana Politics and Society*. Eds.W.Edge and M.Lekorwe, J.L.van Shaik Publishers, Pretoria.
- 34) Robinson, James and Neil Q Parsons. (2006). State Formation and Governance in Botswana. Journal of African Economies 15(AERC Supplement 1): 100-140.
- 35) Robinson, James A. (2009) . Botswana as Role Model for Country Success. Research Paper, UNV-WIDER, No. 2009.40, ISBN978-92-9230-211-5, UNV-WIDER , Helsinki.

- 36) Shapera, Isaac. (1955). *A Handbook of Tswana Law and Custom*. London: Oxford University Press for the International African Institute.
- 37) Schapera, I. (1967). *Government and Politics in Tribal Societies*. New York: Schocken Books.
- 38) ---. (1947). *Migrant Labour and Tribal Life: A Study of Conditions in the Bechuanaland Protectorate*. London. Oxford University Press.
- 39) Seidler valentine. (2011). *Colonial Legacy and Institutional Development: The Cases of Botswana and Nigeria*. Doctoral Thesis , WU Vienna University of Economics and Business.
- 40) ---. (2010). *Why did Botswana End up with Good Institutions: The Role of Culture and Colonial Rule*. Working Paper.
- 41) Tlou , T and Compbell, A . (1997). *A history of Botswana*. Mcmillan, Gaborone.
- 42) Williams, S. (2006). *Colour Bar: The Triumph of Seretse Khama and his Nation*. Allen Lane, London.