

APPENDIX 1

Interview with Joaquim Chissano, former President of Mozambique (1986-2005)

Interviewer: Nathaniel Cogley (Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Political Science, Yale University)

December 21st, 2010

Maputo, Mozambique

NC: So we talked briefly in Johannesburg about the topic that we're going to explore here, so I just want to refresh you with the topic. So if you think about economics, economics they use this assumption called profit maximization so that's to say that if we assume that everyone is trying to maximize their profit then we can best understand economic behavior, if we assume that that's what motivates people, to make a profit. So in political science, what we've come to is we've come to a point where we assume that what motivates Presidents, such as yourself or any other president around the world, what motivates them is to stay in power as long as possible, and that if we have that assumption that that's the best way for us to understand politics. So this project is seeking to look into that, maybe challenge it, maybe propose a better way to think, so we're very much looking to change how people think.

JC: OK.

NC: So let's start first with your own experience. I know that you weren't aggressively seeking the Presidency, it came about at a time of national crisis, when founding President...

JC: Sorry?

NC: Uh, you were not someone that was aggressively seeking the presidency, it came about during a national crisis when founding President Samora Machel died in a fatal plane crash. So can you explain in 1986 what motivated you accept the great responsibilities that come with serving as President of the Republic?

JC: You know, in Mozambique we all were fighting for the liberation of the country. And particularly those who were directly involved in that struggle from the 60s up until independence in 75, none of them, literally none of them was eager to become leader of an independent country, to be President or even minister. We were feeling that we were fulfilling our duty to fight to liberate the country, and then the governance of the country would be seen according to the situation prevailing at the date of the proclamation of independence. So this is the spirit in which we fought. And that was not the first time that we had lost a leader, a President. First, we had lost President Eduardo Mondlane. There was a serious problem of succession because none of us was prepared to go as a successor. We were all ready to continue to fight and we were saying, "let us go on fighting!" And then we had to decide who was going to lead us there, and it was not easy. Now this time again, one felt that we have to continue. And so when I was asked to come and take this seat of President of the Republic, I thought...I felt that I was just responding to an assignment by my party for that matter by the people and still I thought

that I should find ways to confirm that the people really want to give me this task. So this, I received it as just a task and nothing which I would fight for. I would accept as a task, as a heavy responsibility. And there was a condition that this task was given to me by a good will of my colleagues within the party and also the acceptance of the people. That's why after accepting the parliament had to vote for this...to confirm. But even after that we went to organize elections, although it was only one party, but an election where the people would confirm by vote that I was the President. So when the time came we had elections because even in a single party we had our own way of doing democracy, participatory democracy. And I may say, some of the representative democracy because the MPs were elected among different candidates which were put there. So in a nutshell, I felt that I was fulfilling a duty, a task on behalf of the people which I could not refuse in a period of distress in which we all were.

NC: You were a very high level minister during President Samora Machel's tenure. What was the sentiment with the founding president? Was it that he could stay as long as he wanted? Or was the sentiment that he would also serve his time and leave? What was the general sentiment at that time?

JC: At independence we didn't have term limits. We did not fix term limits. But as I say, our measure was the will of the people so we would continue to have elections the way we were doing it to confirm that the people were with that President. But I must tell you in those days there was a challenge of trying to protect our country against external forces which did not like us and we had found in that President a strong President who was able to keep the country strongly united and resist external provocations to try and destabilize, and we were in a period of nation-building. So the tendency was to really think that we should protect our President for as long as possible. But knowing the man, he is one who also felt the same thing—all of us felt at the time—he was there for a duty. If there was a manifestation which was really supported by a sound part of the people, he might have taken a different decision, to say well, "If I am not satisfying the people, I am the first to go out." He was a man like that. So I don't think he would have stayed for life against the will of the people. So to stay longer or for life, he had to act in such a way that the people would repeatedly like him to be in power. But we didn't have limitations of terms in those days.

NC: And then you became President, and what were your own thoughts at the time? Did you think, "I'm going to be President for 18 years?" What was your measure about when you thought you might leave the Presidency?

JC: Yeah, no. With me actually, when I became President, as I say, there was no limitations of mandates, of terms of service, even when I took it. But I had decided already, even before becoming President, that I would stop my active political life, at least in government, at a certain age. And I was thinking actually at an age of 55, 60 and the maximum is what I did: 65. But I was thinking 55, 60. This is something which I had made in to my mind myself. So I would have no big problems with that.

NC: And why did you make that decision to stop at that age?

JC: I just wanted to have time while I have my energies, physical energies to do other things and to live other ways and to live close to my people because since my youth I did not have that chance to stay inside the country for a long time. You see, I left the country when I was about 20 years old and I stayed outside the country 14 years. And when I came back, I was foreign minister going around the world. So I wanted a chance to be inside the country and do some practical things which other people do. That's it. It was a feeling of mine.

NC: So certainly in 2004 you peacefully stepped down, but I'm sure there were voices within the administration saying, "No, President Chissano you should stay, the country needs you." How did you handle those internal voices?

JC: Within the administration there were some people, not a few, who just conformed with my feelings, not that they were happy that I go out. And some who thought that it was reasonable since I took the decision by myself, it was reasonable to let me go. But among the people, the ordinary people, that's where I found a lot of attempts to ask me to stay, during the rallies, during private meetings. There was a saying. They would cry when my car was passing: "Chissano, don't play with power! We gave you power! Keep the power! We need you!" Things like that. So it's among the ordinary people where you would find these kinds of demands. On the other side, I was happy that my family and my close relatives were happy that I would be more with them. OK, so there were all these mixed feelings, but people were happy with me so they wanted me to stay. Not all. The problem is to measure. How many people? I cannot say the majority because for that we would have to have elections and participate in elections [laughter]. But there were many people. Yes, that's true. In one of the meetings, in one province, the youth said, "Oh, you stand because the whole province is for you!" I said, "you have to prove that! How can you prove it that the whole province is for me?!" [laughter]. And so among the people is where I found the voices, very strong voices, asking me to stay. But I had made my mind and also, as I say, it would be difficult to determine that it was the majority that wanted me to stay.

NC: It sounds right now as if your decision to retire was more a personal decision based on your personal life and what you wanted to do. Did you also have any thoughts, "Maybe this is best for the country that we have a peaceful transition. Or maybe it's good for my legacy to stop after a good 18 years and not overstay?"

JC: Yeah, when I made a political analysis, it was exactly that. Because, you see, I told you that my idea was maybe when I was 55, 60 I would leave, but I became President in '86, so I had a task fulfill. First is to end the war and make peace. And actually when we signed the peace agreement, the question came to my mind, "Shouldn't I now step out amongst all these applauses?" But then I found out no, the difficulties in the country were still tremendous. The country was destroyed and so on. And I had this support of the people in the country and the international support for the success of this peace process. So I thought that it was my obligation to build upon that confidence which I have gained to be able to accelerate the reconstruction of the country, including the rebuilding of the

social tissue of the country, which was torn by the war. Refugees would come back, millions of refugees around the world, and they displace...they should take their place. And the infrastructure, the social infrastructure and the industrial infrastructure, should be rebuilt. And this could be able to be done if there was a trust from both the people inside and the donors and the partners outside. And so they had confidence on me and that's why I said, "No, I have to stay for that." And I did it. Then what happened is that the reconstruction went together with the economic growth and this was pleasing the world. And I again thought the reconstruction alone was not enough and the consolidation of democracy. You should remember that I was very much instrumental in the change of the constitution. So all these questions came to me: "Should I go out after having changed the constitution and if things go wrong because of this constitution, who is to blame?" So I would have run away from my responsibilities. So I wanted the consolidation of this democratic process with a new shape and the way of doing economy. I wanted some consolidation of this. That's why I stayed for two terms. I had accepted the election of 1994 and 1999. But 1999 I was clear that now I could go out anytime from that time. So it was just creating some basis here and there and to guarantee peaceful change of power to prepare people to accept that I'm going out, the change. And to tell them that well we had twice changed the presidency because a president died. This has to change. We should not wait for that. And also we should not change the president just because one got worn, he is now empty of ideas so people do not like him anymore and he is kicked out. We should not go through this and this would guarantee a smooth transition of power. This is what I thought. So I go out while things are good so that also the others that are coming are going to find a good place to start. And also to be clear about what was wrong, not because there was a quarrel or because there was a fight. They will quietly see it in cold blood. No, what was not going well here and there. There will be no headache. And even if I get involved to discover this, it will be good because the trust will remain there. This is what happened.

NC: If a President is motivated to stay in power as long as possible then the day that he retired would be a sad day, but for you, the day that you retired, what were your thoughts and sentiments? Was a big burden lifted off your shoulders? Were you pleased that you were able to write the ending of your political career?

JC: Oh yes, I felt that. When I took the decision, I was not thinking along those lines. But in practical life you feel relieved of the burden of responsibility that you feel. Although then you don't have time for yourself as you thought that you would have because then people tend to think that you are free, have time, so they will invite you to do all sorts of things which are out of the design you had for your life: to work quietly and go wherever you want to go. It is true I go where I want to go because I accept the invitations or to do things and to join organizations and so on. But again here, I feel sometimes that I cannot say no. We fought our liberation struggle and during my government I was helped by people so and there are things in which I believe. But when they say that no we need someone to come who has spare time to come and help to think on how to help governments to bring hunger to an end, or to create conditions for a good environment in the world by tackling the problems of climate, or people are saying, "Oh let us see how to keep peace or to make peace in the countries which are fighting." You

will start thinking, "We were fighting and people were concerned, people have come to help us to bring peace." I cannot say no. But people will come and say, "You have experience. You have done it. Please, come and share with us." So you accept the things, But then these invitations multiply and then you end up not having as much time as you thought you would have [laughter]. But it's a lighter thing because even if you make a mistake, you are not that much responsible, you know? Because what you are doing is just to give a contribution, and no one is going to say "You are the one who determined it! You are the one who showed us this!" No, you participate freely, and there is a consensus which is taken. And well, you take a bit of responsibility, but not the same as that of a leader who carries the whole country on his shoulders and also vis-à-vis the international organizations, you know?

NC: Now, you're very familiar with African politics, or world politics including Africa, and you understand that technically you could have stayed another term. It wasn't in violation of the constitution.

JC: Yes.

NC: And yet you decided to peacefully retire. But you can see elsewhere in Africa, it's not always the case that a President, even if he's against term limits, might throw out the constitution and change it. We don't need to be specific with names, Mugabe, Museveni, Mamadou Tandja, there's a number of them. What do you think actually motivates those ones that decide to stay? What is it about power that they want to continue? Is it that they enjoy the esteem and respect that come with it? Or the access to economic power? What is it that motivates them to stay?

JC: Well, to be fair with them, I think that the same feelings which I had when I said, "No, I'm not going to go out in 1992 or 1994, and not in 1999," because they see chances of doing things, better things, or their program to be completed and to come out when they are satisfied with what they have done. These may be one of the feelings. The other feelings is that sometimes in the countries the political scenario is so complicated then they feel that they are the ones who are sustaining the—if you want—some sort of harmony, the unity of the people, avoiding conflict, war. For instance, I don't think Houphet-Boigny would have decided to quit because he knew that there would be a war in Ivory Coast, and he told me that. He didn't want to go for a multi-party system because he said that he knew there would be war in his country, and that is true. But one could feel that a man like this is one who felt his, and he felt it himself. And well, it depends on the scenario or the political climate in the country. In Mozambique here, I didn't have to determine who was going to succeed me. We let the party do the elections democratically and find who would be the candidate and yet he was a candidate, he was not sure he was the one who was going to succeed, and he had to go through elections and so on. Because the political situation in Mozambique was that. So I would like to think positively. Now the negative things are very difficult to know. Excessive ambition, it's possible because there are people who fight to become presidents, you know. In Mozambique, we didn't have much of that yet. But people say, "I want to be President." It's not even a group. He grows up with that mind to become president, so

once he's there he wants to stay. That is the negative way of thinking. But I cannot imply that all this who want to stay because of that. I have an example of a President who came to me and he asked my advice. He said, "President, the people at home, because of what I have done, they are asking me to remain for another term, so I'm divided. You who went through this, what do you suggest?" My answer was, "Do what is good for the people. If you think that this is good for your country, to remain there, do what is good for the people." He said, "Thank you very much. I wanted this encouragement and because myself I did not feel that I could do, especially after your example." And he stayed and he was accepted by the country and he was elected and he's still in government with no big quarrel. And yet he went through a process of democratic election with many candidates against him and he succeeded. So I have the tendency of thinking on this positive side. One has to know very well the situation in the country to be able to judge. But if we don't know, we know it superficially, we may commit mistakes or judgments.

NC: Now on the part of the population, do you feel that there has been a change in time? Maybe early in Africa's independence, the population maybe would accept that their leader stay forever. And that maybe now today the population is more insistent that they want a change over.

JC: Yes, they would accept the same way, the same way as in England people would accept that the monarchy should continue. You see, these feelings which may exist. So at independence the rulers of Africa were ruling in some way, they were kings, they were hereditary... So you come in with the figure of "president," the "election," what not. This was not the way of constituting power, you know. So during those days it was logic that people would say, "Our king is here." Even in Mozambique, people still feel that when they refer to the President, they equate it with their ruler in the village in the tribe, cause we still have the chiefs. You people in Europe you don't have, you no longer have chiefs. Here in Africa, we still have the chiefs. We cannot do without them. So the perception of power by the people still has this cultural element which one should not forget. But the people live in this world which is moving, the transformations. Some will go and live in London, live in the United States of America. They start understanding how the other people live, how they constitute the power, and how the people are made to participate in power, and sometimes they like to have this, with some mistakes done there because the Western democracy becomes more and more representative and less and less participative. And now we have to have the democracy through television were the human contact is getting lost because television and newspapers... Well, this is a new way of thinking, a new culture is coming into our peoples also. So that's why they are coming to accept this kind of democracy, of pluralistic democracy with regular elections in order to change if need be the ruler. So it corresponds to a culture which exists in a given time of history. I was in Nigeria the other day and I went to visit the king in Ogun State. There were two kings, each one with a tribe. And he told me, here where you are at the palace, it's not a small palace, and he said, "This was built by the people because they contribute. They go as volunteers, including engineers and architects." They went there voluntarily to build this for the king, for their king. And this is the ruler who is not replaceable until he dies. He's there

for 50 years now and he's still not old [laughter]. He can stay longer, much longer. And the people there like him, you could feel that they like him, although many had passed through this Western democracy. No, the king must be hereditary, he must have the chiefs, the chiefs are also hereditary. So the two systems are coexisting: multiparty democracy and kingdoms where the kings have got their own level of power. You see? So the people will change over time and they are changing over time. There are some elements which are going to remain behind and they will follow. In Britain, there is a queen and they know how to relate the queen with the power, and so on and so on. It's a full democracy. In Morocco, there's a kingdom, they have, it's a different level of relations of power. In Swaziland, there's a king. In Lesotho, there's a king. In many Asian countries and Middle East you have kings and sultans and so on. Things like that. Um. So this may not answer your question, but give you some reflection that we have to understand the world.

NC: Good. This transition now... Now in Africa we see a lot more Presidents peacefully stepping down than maybe we did several decades ago. What we've described so far is kind of an internal process of the culture changing.

JC: No. It falls in what I just said. It's a new culture which is being developed. The countries recognize that they are living in a global world so they have to adjust the way of doing things. In Mozambique, maybe we would have liked to take our time, maybe to come to the same point, but with our own process. But we knew from the outset, the world had its own perceptions on what is happening, no matter what you are doing, maybe it will be good what you are doing. So we thought that maybe it was time for us ourselves to come back to the process of change rather than to have it imposed from outside. I know that there are countries who changed because they could not stay longer without changing because now they have voices and campaigns about the need of democracy, multi-party democracy, now the limitation of terms and so on. And some felt that well, they could not survive and they had to change. I told you about the Ivory Coast. It was not only Ivory Coast. I know a number of countries who thought that they should not change. When we changed here in Mozambique, I went to see some of our colleagues in the region and they were still doubtful. And some, they were saying, "Maybe this is..." what you call a ring of the chain which is?

NC: Link.

JC: Eh link. "...a link of the chain which is being broken." But we felt that no it's better to make the change ourselves because sooner or later we would have to change and sometimes it would change in catastrophe. So we decided to make the changes slowly. Make our consultations. Took more than two years to make consultations for the change with the people. Fortunately, our constitution had been drafted by ourselves for the independence and so ourselves have changed the constitution. And we continue revising it from time to time. So it's a good thing, without that much big pressures from outside.

NC: Speaking of big pressures from the outside, currently in the literature, a lot of the explanation about why Africa's maybe democratized or Heads of State now step down

more than before is focused on the Cold War and the end of the Cold War, saying that during the Cold War the West and the Soviets would fund someone to stay forever, and then now that funding is contingent upon them stepping down. How much of the explanation for the leaders stepping down today falls on the Cold War story and how much falls on this domestic dynamic?

JC: Yeah. I will not elaborate much on this because you have answered. It's true that the same countries who made a lot of campaign for this change and for this multi-party democracy and changes for alternance and so on are the same countries who have supported people or leaders to stay longer as irreplaceable. I will not shy out. If you go to countries like Kenya, Ivory Coast, DRC, Senegal, and other countries, you find leaders who were not never challenged, but they were praised and taken as models. We were all called to look at their examples. And they were there. And this had to do with the Cold War. Yes, this had to do with the Cold War. And on the other hand, leaders who felt threatened by those same countries would join hands with the other side of the world and stay so they would receive more support because they were seen to be the enemies of the enemies, so they would become friends, you know? We had this. For instance, at the same time our country was being fought because of taking a line which would be seen as not that much democratic. The government of President Banda was supported fully, the government which joined hands with apartheid. The very apartheid was not challenged enough. [laughter] The apartheid boomed because it was among the Western way of development of economy. And so, it was among them. If they continued. If it was on those days probably without the challenge of Africa against apartheid, maybe South Africa would have been one of the G8. You see the way South Africa was participating in international relations and yet it was a fierce dictatorship, racialist, no democracy was there. And this was due to the Cold War. So that's why we are proud sometimes we say, "Oh, we have fought for our liberation, but we fought for the liberation of other people too." To think, to change their way of thinking. Salazar³⁸, Caetano³⁹, they were in Europe, despots, fascists, dictators, one single party, and they were members of NATO. [laughing] Members of NATO! So, Cold War. Cold War. But also let me say, there was a lack of respect for the black people. If I choose to be a communist or socialist. They would not look at me as a communist by my own self. I would be a puppet of the Soviet Union or of China because the black man could not have his own ideas. But if I were a capitalist, then I would be a good student [laughing] because I was the correct way. But of course, the others would say he's a puppet of the Americans or the British. I could not have my own choice. So this existed. Of course we came from slavery, we were slaves and so on, to change the mentality of the people to start see other people as equals. It was very... I can speak like this because I'm out of power, you know? [laughing]

NC: So there's two things we can say about your retirement. One is that it was peaceful. And the second is that it was voluntary.

³⁸ António de Oliveira Salazar, Prime Minister of Portugal from 1932 to 1968.

³⁹ Marcelo Caetano, Prime Minister of Portugal from 1968 to 1974.

JC: Yes.

NC: And you were making an interesting point in Johannesburg when you said that there's a lot of President that retire peacefully now, but you felt that very few of them are actually voluntary, that the cases where you can clearly say "he left but he didn't have to" were very limited. How limited are these voluntary resignations? Is it that the populations are forcing presidents out now and they're leaving peacefully?

JC: No, no. The Presidents are forced by the limitation of terms. There are President who might think they could do good for their people if they remain, but since the constitution says there's two terms, they have to go out, they have to go out after two terms. And if they didn't there would be confusion, there would be quarrel because it depends on the consensus and the consensus would not be reached. It's a rule. I think it's a because there were abuses of power in Africa, it was good to have these limitations of terms. But the one thing which I don't like is it's being so much uniform. Why two terms? Is it because the United States of America has two terms? Why not to take the example of France? The example of Britain where there are no terms? Why not to have your own terms, 3 or 4? Why two terms? The thing is uniform. But I agree that it was necessary that we have this limitation because of this abuse of power sometimes to stay by force of arms against the will of the majority of the people. So at least this gives the opportunity to say, "Stop there."

NC: Are there any consistent biographical or personal differences that separate the Heads of State that peaceful step down from power and those that really will fight their hardest to stay. Is there anything different personally about them or biographically about them that separates those two?

JC: No, this I've answered in the previous question because it depends on what takes one president to want to stay. Some have got very valid reasons which we may not know, but there are valid reasons to want to stay, which is in favor of their own countries. So you cannot put all in the same basket or separate them with criteria which are much concrete. You have to go case by case and see. For instance, Gbagbo, who is my friend, who was a socialist, he may have his own reasons but there is an objective thing is that the electoral commission has said that he lost the elections. Well, he has an argument, "Well there were strong irregularities in 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 places." But instead of this court, this constitutional court, instead of this court saying let us have a second vote in those areas to confirm those results in those areas where there are irregularities, they decide to just proclaim him winner. This is something which is not good. Why did they behave like this? Maybe he got strong support from the ground, which we don't know. But even there, he should have tried to show that he has got this strong support from the ground and not just be proclaimed the winner because there were some irregularities here or there. They should have corrected those irregularities by, for instance, going to a second vote, or at least by recounting the votes. [laughing] It's one of those things. By going to second round. We had something similar here in the last elections. The previous elections, where the opposition said no there were irregularities in one, two, three, four districts. And the answer of the winner was OK, take the votes of those areas, should not

waste time recounting, take all my votes and your votes from those areas. If you go beyond me then you'll take power. [Laughter] You go and recount or you go and elect again. But to proclaim... I don't think it's correct.

NC: Good. So we discussed that in political science right now, a lot of political scientists use this assumption of tenure maximization, that leaders want to stay in power as long as possible, that's what motivates them. And it's not enough for us to say, "Look, there's some exceptions. There's President Chissano, President Mandela, President Masire, these guys could have stayed longer but they didn't." It's not enough to point out that there are exceptions, what's best is to say, "No, there's a better way. That the Presidents aren't trying to maximize their time in office, that something else is motivating them, to actually put forward a theory." Do you have one, a theory?

JC: I think that during our conversation I have answered that question already because I said that some leaders want to stay in power for good causes, for the people. And sometimes because they feel that their people like them and they want them to serve as long possible. So we cannot say all the time that to stay as long as possible is the cause of the leadership, of the leaders. To get an economy, to get as much profit as you may, it may be correct to say that. It is a motivation. But even there, even there, I will say that it's a behavior that may be changing a bit. There are people who invest not only to make a profit, but also to contribute for development, to contribute to bring a better life for people. So the profit may be decreased because one takes some of these to apply in the social services. He invests in somewhere else. So even there things may be changing. So when you come to politicians, their primary thing is... What brought them to power is to rule the country in such a way that there is development in the country in favor of the people. So this is the first motivation. So you stay as long as you can but based on the objective of you being in power. OK, there are those who may stay there because of glory, all this way of living, I don't know how to classify it, but that is not the general thing which we can generalize. At least at the beginning one goes there with the aim of developing the country. If he succeeds in developing the country, two things may happen: One, he may take the attitude like me, say, "Well, I have done my part, let the others continue." Another might say, "the country cannot develop without me." So these attitudes depend on the character, different characters. And it depends, as I said earlier, on the political climate around him in the country.

NC: Assuming that development is a positive thing that people would appreciate, and you also talk about legacy a bit, do you think maybe the idea that presidents aren't trying to maximize their time in office, they're trying to maximize maybe their legacy and what they leave behind in this world. Do you think that's maybe a better way to think about what motivates leaders, legacy maximization?

JC: Again, I'm saying it depends on the personalities.

NC: It's too difficult to generalize?

JC: Yeah. Because the legacy you can maximize it the way I'm doing it. Although it is not my intention to do it, people are still thinking about me, about someone who makes peace. So it's there. I'm not in power, but this is continuing around me, around me. They come up, come in and speak about your experience, "How did you come to peace? Why is peace sustainable in Mozambique, but not sustainable elsewhere. Why? Come and change views." Sometimes I don't know what to say because we worked without making philosophy [laughter] and we got these results. So I think that the legacy can be extended many years after you leave office. If you did very good economic work and what not, you can still apply this knowledge to help others, even to local basis. You know.

NC: Good. So Mr. President, you are Chair of the Forum of Former African Heads of State and Government, so you're very familiar with the situation that former Heads of State face and one thing that's very important is the relationship between a current president and a former president. And as you're aware, sometimes this relationship is very peaceful and friendly, and sometimes it can be very adversarial where they view each other as competition, accusations can go back and forth. How important is this relationship between current presidents and former presidents? What principles do you feel should guide this relationship? And how important are these principles in ensuring that we maintain peaceful transitions of presidents into the future?

JC: Well, I think that you have two kinds of transition. One is that people may come from the same political family, even if they may have different opinions within that family. So here the relationship should be a relationship of respect. Maintain the friendship which you have, which makes the one who is in power may be receptive to views and ideas of the one who left, and the one who left also should understand that the one who came came in a different time where things have to occur in a different manner and also be careful and how he doesn't jump and say, "Well, this man is spoiling because he is not doing what I was doing, the way I was doing." So that would be bad. It would be impeding progress, you know? And sometimes the change is good because you are bringing a new way of doing things, you are boosting the thoughts and... Then you may have succession from different political families where the relationship had been a rivalry, but here I think that it would be necessary also to remain that respect for the constitution, and not to try to torpedo what the new one is doing just to prove that your system, your ideology was the best, and so on. Because you would be then guilty also of the unsuccess, for the retardment of the development of the country. But also the one in power should take that advantage of being in power now to correct some of his criticisms of his predecessor which were not based on correct things but just based on the fight for power alone. And try to take something which were positive in the past. That's why one would not destroy all what has been done positive just because it was done by his opponent. So he should take advantage of what has been built, make it perfect. So the difference is not that big between the two cases. In one it's smoother. In the other one you have someone who comes out who wants his party or political family to come back to power and they will see what the one who is doing is wrong even if it's correct. He will be in a hurry to get results while one needs a long time to get results. So this is the kind of relationship which... I'm thinking in a loud voice, I'm not making a thesis

[laughter]. It's a loud voice. So you people at the university can study it deeper and maybe one day show this as something which one can study and follow.

NC: Do you think that perhaps there are some presidents that would step down, but they're concerned, maybe rightly or wrongly, "I'm going to be put on trial," whether it's a real accusation or a false accusation, that this hinders a lot of presidents from leaving office. They feel more secure in office than outside.

JC: Well, I don't know, but... Well, it's difficult to have perceptions about all aspects of government behavior. It's very difficult, but what occurs in my mind very quickly like this, the longer they stay the longer reason they will give to whoever wants to pursue them because they will be committing more and more and more mistakes. So that could not be a reason. That could not be a reason. If you stay 5 more years, what does it change. It's just 5 more years. Well, I would not behave like that.

NC: Mr. President in 2007, I believe it was your 68th birthday, you were announced as the inaugural winner of the very prestigious Mo Ibrahim Foundation Prize...

JC: 2007?

NC: That's what I have. Is that wrong?

JC: No, it was my birthday, but not the 60th.

NC: No, the 68th.

JC: Oh yeah, OK.

NC: The very prestigious Mo Ibrahim Foundation Prize for Achievement in African Leadership. I believe you were not in London at the time, you were maybe in Uganda, I read in the news. What was your reaction when you first learned that you were selected above all the other presidents. How did that make you feel about yourself and your time as president?

JC: Well, actually it was not at that time that I had the feeling because I just did not hear about the announcement because it was not communicated to me, but I had some hints that I might be the one selected to receive the prize. From that time I felt proud, happy to be distinguished because this was a very objective sign that what I was doing was being watched, so myself I could not have felt that I was doing something extraordinary. As I told you at the beginning, I was fulfilling my task. My duties very freely without taking care of who was looking at me. I was not doing things to be seen, but I was doing things to try to get results. But then you feel happy that those who were looking at you were following positively what you do. So that's how I felt. I felt like a student feels when at the end they give diplomas and suddenly they call his name to give him an award because he was the best in this or in that. It is a student who never studied to be seen. No one was seeing him when he was studying, whether he spent sleepless nights or what. Only

when things calmed down, "After all, I've done something extraordinary." So, one feels happy. I was already happy because people were praising me around the world in newspapers and people... Not that there were not people who were criticizing, but the majority they were praising so I was happy. Some because we had peace. Some because the peace was sustainable in Mozambique. Some because there was economic growth, social growth, more changes in political life, democracy, investments were coming and so on. So I heard these things, but at that time I would not try to concentrate all the praises as praises for me, but praises for the governance for the country and the others. But then there was a focus, "No you did something. You deserve this. You were an example." OK. So I felt well, I warned those who want to follow me, not to just follow me by what they see in the surface, cause it's very difficult, the circumstance in which each country lives is different and the challenges are different also. So you cannot just copy by copying. So when one asks me, "What do I feel?" I feel that I have worked the way the people of my country would like me to work. I worked with the people. That's why when I received this I received this on behalf of my people also as a symbol for the praise to the whole people because what made me successful and distinguished is that when I came to power I did not know if I could manage to do this, but I believe that together in the leadership of the party, membership of the party, the people in general with all other forces, together we could do something, we could make a difference. So I felt that this aim had succeeded and it was seen by other people outside our country. And you have a jury who discuss about this who classify and don't know whether they put marks, I don't know how it works, but then you come and they say this is the best among the good. OK.

NC: Mr. President, obviously when you were president this Mo Ibrahim prize didn't exist so there's no way that you behaved in a certain way to try to influence this prize. But now that it does exist and you have some winners such as yourself and President Mogae, who has also participated in this project. Do you think that going forward in the future that maybe today's generation of presidents that maybe their behavior can be influenced by the fact that this prize exists, maybe they want to behave extra good so that maybe one day they can win this prize?

JC: I would advise them not to behave that way, because if they behave because they want to get a prize, they will not do the things which they should do for their people. Because they would be working for themselves; for the prize. Of course this prize did not exist and the world peace prize, Nobel prize was not given to political leaders, but it existed. There was a Nobel peace prize, and I never thought about working to get a Nobel peace prize in anything, because the time you start thinking like that you are working for yourself. You are being selfish, so you will neglect your main work which is to bring the upliftment of your people. So I tell all people who discuss with me about this Mo Ibrahim prize that this is not a prize to attract people to be good leaders. It is a prize which is given to the best leaders, but they should not be leaders for the prize. And if they do that they will never get it. [laughter] They will never get it! Because they will never behave the way the prize expects them to behave. Yeah. So in a nutshell what I can say.

NC: That's wonderful. Mr. President, on behalf of the Department of Political Science at Yale University, we'd like to thank you for your time. I know you keep a very busy schedule, and what you've done here is make a fantastic contribution to this project and helping us rethink what motivates leaders on a very academic and theoretical level. It's an honor to meet with you today and it's an honor to gain your participation for this project.

JC: Thank you very much...

APPENDIX 2

Interview with Abdou Diouf, former President of Senegal (1981-2000)

Interviewer : Nathaniel Cogley (Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Political Science, Yale University) [French transcription by Fabrice Lorne]

April 14th, 2011

Paris, France

NC : Monsieur le Président, vous êtes devenu le Président de la République du Sénégal le 1er janvier 1981, quand l'ancien Président Léopold Senghor, volontairement démissionna de la Présidence au milieu de son cinquième mandat. Pouvez-vous, s'il vous plaît, nous décrire les motivations autour de cette transition pacifique du pouvoir à partir des perspectives suivantes : premièrement, d'après votre compréhension qu'est-ce qui avait motivé le Président Senghor à démissionner s'il avait pu rester au pouvoir plus longtemps ? Deuxièmement, qu'est-ce qu'il l'a motivé à vous choisir comme son successeur ? Et troisièmement, qu'est-ce qui vous a motivé, vous-même, a accepté cette responsabilité et ce poste de la Présidence ?

AD: Je vous remercie pour votre question. Je crois que les trois aspects de votre question sont liés. Ce qu'il faut savoir, c'est que le Président Senghor, n'a jamais été un homme de pouvoir. Lui même était un homme qui voulait servir son peuple. Comme il m'a enseigné à la faire. Euh, le Président Senghor a dit que ce qu'il voudrait que l'on retienne de lui plus tard, ce n'est pas son œuvre politique. Mais son œuvre littéraire, poétique et philosophique. Il dit : « Je suis tombé... je suis arrivé en politique par accident ! » et je crois que son but, pendant tout le temps qu'il était au pouvoir, c'était de servir son peuple, mais aussi de trouver quelqu'un en qui il trouverait les qualités lui permettant de continuer son œuvre. Donc, c'est très tôt que le Président Senghor m'a fait comprendre que j'étais celui qu'il aimerait voir lui succéder. Déjà, en 1964, il a dit à mon épouse, pas à moi, mais à mon épouse, sachant bien que mon épouse allait me le dire. Il m'a nommé à différents postes à côté de lui. J'ai été d'abord Gouverneur de région, directeur de cabinet du Président du ministre des Affaires étrangères. Mais à partir du moment où il a fait de moi son directeur de cabinet, il a entrepris avec beaucoup de vision, d'organisation et de méthode, il a entrepris de faire de moi son successeur. Et il m'a formé. Directeur de cabinet, de Directeur de cabinet je suis devenu Secrétaire général de la Présidence de la République. Ensuite brièvement, ministre du Plan et il a modifié, fait modifier la Constitution pour que je devienne premier ministre. Et ensuite il a fait modifier la Constitution pour que si le Président de la République démissionne, que ce soit le premier ministre en fonction qui continue le mandat. Donc il avait eu de la vision, mais il avait eu aussi de la détermination, dans le but qu'il s'était fixé. Et donc, comme moi même, j'étais déjà au courant de ses buts, j'ai été dans cette direction et c'était mon devoir aussi d'accepter de devenir Président de la République pour continuer l'œuvre de Senghor. Et cela s'est passé d'une façon très harmonieuse. Sa démission le 31 décembre 1980. Sa prestation de serment le 1er janvier 1981, et la suite.

NC : Monsieur le Président vous étiez un leader extrêmement éduqué, ayant terminé vos études de droit à la Sorbonne, et le Corps national de France de Haute Mer. À quel point