

Original Paper

Niccolo Machiavelli and His Influence on Lesotho Political Rulers

Louis Manyeli¹

¹ National University of Lesotho, Lesotho

Received: March 19, 2021

Accepted: March 30, 2021

Online Published: April 15, 2021

doi:10.22158/sss.v2n2p9

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/sss.v2n2p9>

Abstract

In his famous “The Prince”, Machiavelli drastically differs from all political writing of ancient antiquity, the Middle Ages and Renaissance that had one central question: the end of the state. Machiavelli assumes that power is an end in itself, and maintains that the ruler ought to focus on acquiring, retaining and expanding power. While the moralist adheres to the supremacy of his moral code and the ecclesiastic to his religious code, Machiavelli recognizes the supremacy of the precepts of his code in politics: the acquisition, retention and expansion of power. It is argued that most Lesotho political rulers follow in the footsteps of Machiavelli, and this has occurred from gaining independence in the Mountain Kingdom. For Lesotho political rulers heavily influenced by Machiavelli’s amorality, power is regarded as an end in itself. Consequently, the Mountain Kingdom governed by ruthless and tyrant rulers whose aim is to retain and expand power, have subjects who live below poverty line.

Keywords

Power, end-in-itself, immorality, ruthlessness, selfishness, brutality

1. Introduction

The economic situation started declining in the Mountain Kingdom since when it gained Independence from the colonial rule in 1965. In this essay I show that this economic deterioration that has led Lesotho to be below poverty line is to a great extent caused by tyrant rulers who regard power as an end in itself.

I consider Niccolo Machiavelli as the inspirer and model of many corrupt African rulers. I am going to confine myself to the rulers reigned in the Mountain Kingdom since its independence. Machiavelli (1469-1527) was more inclined towards politics as such and less concerned with political philosophy. Having lost his job he resorted to writing two books: *The Prince* and the *Discourses*. *The Prince* that made him famous depicted him as being very notorious since he explicitly expressed his immorality and preferred amorality when comparing the statesman with religion and morality.

In his *The Prince*, Machiavelli intends to impress the Prince (the Medici) hoping to be re-employed by

him. He advises the Prince to ignore religion and morality if he aspires to be a successful ruler. He admonishes him to have a clear and straight forward goal: the acquisition, retention and expansion of power. He argues that the ruler will obtain power only if he uses the second method of fighting, that is, the method of beasts. In this way, if the ruler wants to achieve his goal, namely, power, he must be cruel and ruthless. Machiavelli regards Pope Alexander VI as his model and idolizes his illegitimate son Cesare Borgia because they were tyrant rulers. In short, Machiavelli disregards democracy and considers tyranny as the best form of government.

It is argued in this paper that Lesotho political rulers regard power as an end in itself. This became clear from 1965 when the Mountain Kingdom became independent; and the thirst for power reached its climax in 1970 when the first Prime Minister declared the state of emergency and ruthlessly retained power. I am going to show that Lesotho political rulers imitated Machiavelli by disregarding the central question, that is, the end of the state. By shunning this primary goal, namely, the end of the state, they demonstrated by actions that they were opportunist time-observers selfishly hungering for power.

I will explain and show that before the first general elections in Lesotho the first three political parties reckoned the power of the Armed Forces of Lesotho. The M.F.P. and B.N.P., the two minority parties preferred that the Armed Forces of Lesotho be under the direct control of the Head of State. But the B.C.P. with a large following opted for the Prime Minister being the Head of the Armed Forces of Lesotho. However, the B.N.P. changed its attitude when it won the first general elections in 1965. Chief Leabua Jonathan, the first Prime Minister of Lesotho wanted power to be transferred to him. It then became clear that all political leaders of Lesotho aimed at acquiring, retaining and expanding power.

Machiavelli advised the Prince to disregard religion and morality. The first Prime Minister of Lesotho pretended to value the system of the state and religion, and ignored morality. From 1970 onward he used the Armed Forces of Lesotho and ruthlessly assassinated opposition members of the B.C.P. who had won the 1970 general elections. His heinous immoral acts clearly demonstrated that he was now a Christian by name. In this essay I argue that stability in politics and economic growth in Lesotho can be attained only if political rulers in Lesotho hold to one central question: the end of the state.

2. The End of the State and Power as an End in Itself

2.1 All political writing from ancient antiquity, more especially classical political philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle, including all political writings of the Middle Ages and Renaissance had one central question, and that is the end of the state. Jointly at different times these classic thinkers maintained that power was assumed to be a means only. The means referred to were solely to a great extent intended to serve and lead to high ends such as the good life and justice. Given that the ancient, Middle Ages and Renaissance eras were predominantly religious societies, political power was also assumed to be a means leading to God. Given the fact that the rulers' primary role was to serve, they assumed political power to respond to the needs of the people. Undoubtedly, in this way, selfishness was a vice shunned by the rulers since it would blur their primary goal, that is, the end of the state. These rulers were

clearly not opportunist time-observers, rather, they acted courageously and fearlessly for eternal changeless truths and for the good well-being of their fellow citizens ruled.

In his Republic, Plato expressly stated that the State exists in order to serve the wants of men. According to Plato, the State exists not only to further the economic needs of humans, but also for developing them in the good life, administering justice and ensuring that they finally attain happiness. Clearly, all these are in accordance with responding to the central question: the end of the state.

In the Laws, Plato stated that the State in which the law is above the rulers, and the rulers are the inferiors of the law, has salvation and every blessing which the gods can confer. The rulers assume power not taking into consideration their birth or wealth, rather, assumption of power is due to personal character, fitness for ruling, and rulers must at all times be subject to the law. In Platonic political philosophy the end of the State is general justice. Inevitably, in this sense the ruler assumes political power to administer justice.

For Aristotle, rulers of a representative democracy violate individuals' autonomy. "Representative government removes the individual too far from day-to-day decision-making to allow it to count as giving the individual the degree of control over his or her life which the exercise of phronesis requires" (Taylor, 1995, p. 242). Undoubtedly, Aristotle follows into the footsteps of Plato. This is why like Plato, he also is disgusted with representative democracy of tyrannical rulers who are exclusively selfish. In his communitarian form of government the subjects devote their entire lives for the common good of the polis, just as the monarch does likewise. The polis is conceived as a community existing for the sake of the good life.

2.2 Machiavelli assumes that power is an end in itself. For Machiavelli, the Prince, who happens to be the ruler ought to be self-centred and exclusively selfish. His success in government will depend on one condition that he entirely regards power as an end in itself. Machiavelli is strongly convinced that for the ruler to attain his end, he must resort to war. "Military strength was to remain for Machiavelli the basis of healthy political life; and Germany and Switzerland were to remain his prime examples of modern political virtue" (Anglo, 1969, p. 53). Regardless how ruthless this means to reach his goal to the moralist or religious person, Machiavelli holds that this is laudable to the ruler since assuming power as an end itself is achievable mainly by resorting to war. In this way, "it is necessary for a prince, wishing to maintain himself, to know how not to be good, and to use this – or not use this – according to necessity" (Anglo, 1969, p. 68). All that counts for Machiavelli is that the ruler must at all times assume power as an end in itself. He strongly stresses that this is a necessity that is strictly mandatory.

Machiavelli is preoccupied with devising means that are most suitable for the ruler to get hold of the acquisition, retention and expansion of power. He reverses all political writing that preceded him. For Machiavelli, the one central question is no longer the end of the state, but rather the quest to acquire, retain and expand power.

2.3 Lesotho political rulers assume that power is an end in itself

I assume that all political writing from ancient antiquity, the Middle Ages and Renaissance with their

central question: the end of the state, is an exemplary to be fully adopted by Lesotho political rulers. That could have raised the Mountain Kingdom to be numbered among the developed countries; economic stability, peace and justice could be found in abundance in the Mountain Kingdom. Unfortunately, Lesotho political rulers have resorted to Machiavelli's assumption of power as an end in itself. Consequently, economic instability, injustice and endless serial killings are reigning in the Mountain Kingdom.

From the beginning Lesotho political rulers sought for themselves extraordinary executive powers to utilise according to their fancies. Their insatiable lust for power eventually corrupted them and they ended up being virtual dictators of themselves. In his *Lesotho 1970: An African Coup Under the Microscope*, Bennett Makalo Khaketla has clearly shown that Lesotho political rulers' lust for power has emanated from 1965 when the Mountain Kingdom gained Independence.

In their preparation of the first Constitution of Lesotho a staunch member of a minority party, namely, the Marematlou Freedom Party (MFP), Chief Mohlalefi Bereng proposed an amendment that "the Head of State should be Head of the Armed Forces of Lesotho" (Khaketla, 1971, p. 8). The Marematlou Freedom Party's point of view was strongly supported by Chief Leabua Jonathan, leader of another minority party, the Basutoland National Party in his declaration: "I similarly cannot agree that the Head of the Armed Forces should be the Prime Minister. In the memorandum of our Party we have specifically stated that this power be invested in the Head of State" (Khaketla, 1971, p. 9). Undoubtedly, aware of the unlikelihood of winning the coming first general elections in the history of the Mountain Kingdom, the two minority parties representing their minority parties sought for refuge to the King. They, therefore, proposed that the Head of State should be "Head of the Armed Forces of Lesotho". They already foresaw that political rulers were inclined to assume power as an end in itself; in this way if one assumed power, he would be highly tempted to use the Armed Forces to retain and expand power for himself.

But, the party followed by the majority, namely, the Basutoland Congress Party strenuously opposed the amendment that the Head of State should be "Head of the Armed Forces of Lesotho". Leader of the Basutoland Congress Party, Ntsu Mokhehle indicated by figures collected at various rallies he held throughout the country that the people were vehemently opposed to that amendment. As a matter of fact, "More B.C.P. speakers insisted that Armed Forces of Lesotho should be under the direct control of the Prime Minister" (Chakela, 1971, p. 8). Their contention was based on their claim that the Prime Minister would be an officially elected representative of the people, and the King is merely a hereditary monarch not elected by the people. Inevitably, the Basutoland Congress Party, being the first founded party in Lesotho, at that time being followed by the majority anticipated a glorious win in the first coming general elections in Lesotho. With that assumption they were already claiming to be in full control of the Armed Forces in Lesotho. An attainment of this goal would presumably ensure them of the retention of power they would have acquired after the general elections in Lesotho.

In 1965, Chief Leabua Jonathan, the leader of the minority party, the Basutoland National Party won

the first general elections and became the prime minister of Lesotho. He hurried to London with his deputy prime minister, Sekhonyana 'Maseribane; his purpose being to remind the Secretary of State "that independence was at hand, and that the Secretary should delegate powers to me in preparation for that event without further delay" (Khaketla, 1971, p. 70). Leabua's insatiable lust for power was now obvious; immediately after winning the elections he visited London requesting to be vested with power. Obviously, he echoed Machiavelli's claim that power is an end in itself, and he shunned the central question of the end of the state.

Earlier in 1964 when assuming that the leader of the Basutoland Congress Party was likely going to win the elections, he supported the idea of investing powers of being in control of the Police and the Armed Forces of Lesotho upon the Head of State; "But now that he was the Prime Minister, he saw no reason why they should not be transferred to him" (Khaketla, 1971, pp. 71-72). No wonder why Khaketla reports that when the British Government bestowed all the powers upon Leabua Jonathan, he organized a big cocktail party in Maseru at his home. In his report that he has been granted "control of the Police Force, he pointed at Chief 'Maseribane as the man who would see that the Armed Forces was used for the maintenance of law and order. The latter beamed with pride, and bowed several times" (Khaketla, 1971, p. 73). 'Maseribane was the Deputy Prime Minister; they celebrated the acquired acquisition of power and presumably hoped for its retention and expansion. Indeed they retained and expanded that power for twenty years. Undoubtedly, the priority for these political rulers was to assume power as an end itself. From the onset they were not primarily interested in the common good; rather, they sought for power they needed to retain and expand power for two decades.

3. Machiavelli Idolizes Cesare Borgia

3.1 Cardinal Rodrigo Borgia admired by Machiavelli

Machiavelli defends and boldly expresses his immoral views by citing the examples of notorious rulers and regarding them as his models. Correctly, Omoregbe holds that "Machiavelli cites with approval the examples of Agathocles, in ancient Sicily, who rose to power through crimes. He killed the rich men and the Senators of Syracuse and succeeded seizing political power. He was ruthless and cruel, but his cruelty and ruthlessness brought him to political power" (Omoregbe, 2010, p. 63). For Machiavelli, a good successful ruler needs not to be morally upright, honest or humane. Rather, he ought to pretend to be a person pursuing his thirst for power cunningly.

A notable tyrant ruler that Machiavelli admired was Cardinal Rodrigo Borgia who later became pope in 1492 and assumed the name of Alexander VI. While being a Cardinal, Rodrigo Borgia secretly had four living children, a daughter and three sons. Pope Alexander VI appointed two of his sons as cardinals, presumably hoping that after his departure in this world one of them would succeed him as pope. He left Lucrezia his daughter in charge of the Vatican when he was away from Rome in 1501.

In view of retaining and expanding his power, Pope Alexander VI had his personal hangman and poisoner. This cunning Pope used a cruel and ruthless man to brutally and secretly assassinate his

opponents, and many Cardinals he suspected of overthrowing him were also assassinated under the tyrant Pope's orders with a view of retaining his power. Machiavelli admired Pope Alexander VI because he succeeded to deceive people, and on several occasions shrewdly made assurances and oaths that he himself never observed. For Machiavelli, this deceiver who was succeeding in his regular deceptions, was a model to be imitated by political rulers, if they aspired to acquire, retain and expand power.

3.2 Machiavelli idolized Pope Alexander VI illegitimate son Cesare Borgia

I have shown that Machiavelli admired Pope Alexander VI since he was mischievous and ruthless. But, Cesare Borgia, the illegitimate son of Pope Alexander VI was highly idolized by Machiavelli because more than his father he was the most notorious ruthless tyrant. As Duke of Valentino, Cesare Borgia seriously developed a threat, and his power in the Romagna amazingly increased. As an enemy of Florence, Cesare Borgia planned the restoration of the Medici.

In his *The Prince*, Machiavelli highly praised the Duke of Valentino: "This is virtually an epitome of *The Prince* which is specifically concerned with new states made up of different members, ruled by new princes who are enjoined to follow the procedures of Cesare Borgia" (Anglo, 1969, p. 66). Machiavelli reveals that if he were a new prince, he would without doubt imitate and follow in the footsteps of Cesare Borgia. In my view, Anglo correctly holds that "The longest of these chapters is the seventh, where Machiavelli enlarges upon the career of Cesare Borgia whom he considers, as in his letter of 31 January 1515, the perfect model of a new prince, and especially of a new prince who gains his initial successes with the aid of Fortune and the arms of *others*" (Anglo, 1969, p. 69). Machiavelli's preference of Cesare Borgia as the perfect model of a new prince is due to his conviction that Cesare Borgia utilized more the method of fighting by force, which is the second method of beasts. Indeed, Cesare had recourse to the second method of beasts because the first method of fighting by law is often insufficient.

Cesare Borgia remained and was regarded by Machiavelli as a model to be imitated by all ambitious political rulers thirsting for power. Machiavelli was convinced that "The fact is that Cesare offered an example of a certain dramatic, and relevant, aspect of virtue; and, more important, his special advantages suggested a striking parallel with the present situation of the Medici" (Anglo, 1969, p. 78). Machiavelli was attracted to Cesare's ruthlessness that led to his success as the Duke of Valentino. Cesare's ruthlessness and cruelty could be seen when he brutally assassinated his older brother and mercilessly murdered the husband of his only sister Lucrezia. The number of his assassinations is legion, and his cruelty was beyond compare. Machiavelli knew Cesare Borgia personally and was quite aware of his numerous assassinations. It is this very serial killer that Machiavelli idolized and admonished the prince of Medici to imitate. Later in this work I am going to show that from 1970 onwards Machiavelli's Cesare Borgia was most probably followed by Lesotho political rulers.

3.3 A leader of the Basotho National Party, Chief Leabua Jonathan, utilizes the Armed of Lesotho as means to attain his end.

In their preparation of the first Constitution of Lesotho before the first general elections in Lesotho, political leaders proposed several amendments designed to bestow some powers to the Head of State. A very staunch member of the Marematlou Freedom Party, Chief Mohlalefi Bereng, singled out amendment 2 (e) that stipulated that the “Head of State should be Head of the Armed Forces of Lesotho” (Khaketla, 1971, p. 8). Chief Mohlalefi Bereng’s proposal was the standpoint view of the Marematlou Freedom Party. It must be noted that the M.F.P. was the minority party. Most probably, aware that they were most likely deemed to be losers in the coming general elections, the M.F.P. members preferred that the Armed Forces of Lesotho should be under the control and direct supervision of the King since he was considered to be neutral in party politics in the country.

In like manner, Chief Leabua Jonathan, leader of the Basutoland National Party, seconded the motion of the M.F.P. He publicly declared that he too supported the motion of the M.F.P. that the King ought to be the Head of the Armed Forces of Lesotho. He further reinforced his view by citing the memorandum of his B.N.P. that stipulated that the Prime Minister of Lesotho ought not to be the Head of the Armed forces, he should rather confine himself to the administration of the Mountain Kingdom. Aware of the notable fact that the B.C.P. then constituted the majority, the B.N.P. leader acknowledging that it was classified along with the M.F.P. as minority parties, opted for the amendment that the Head of the Armed Forces of Lesotho should be the King. Thus, Chief Leabua, leader of the B.N.P. “sided with those who advocated that the King should be Head of the Armed Forces of Lesotho to ensure that these Forces would not be used by the Prime Minister to crush his political opponents” (Khaketla, 1971, p. 64). Undoubtedly, the two minority parties, namely, the M.F.P. and B.N.P. were sensing that the B.C.P. led by Ntsu Mokhehle was likely going to win the general elections. They could already foresee that B.C.P. political leader was going to use the Armed Forces to retain and expand power for the B.C.P.

But the amendment of the Head of State being ‘Head of the Armed Forces of Lesotho’ was vehemently rejected by the B.C.P. Clearly the Basutoland Congress Party (B.C.P.) top officials unanimously maintained that the request of the Head of the State being Head of the Armed Forces of Lesotho did not emanate from the people; rather, it was just an opinion of the leaders followed by the minority. Aware of the notable acknowledged opinion that the B.C.P. was the most probable winner of the coming general elections, leadership of the B.C.P. vehemently insisted that the Armed Forces of Lesotho should be under the direct control of the Prime Minister. Bearing in mind Machiavelli’s point of view, most probably the B.C.P. leadership started anticipating and planning for the retention and expansion of power once it had acquired it. The Armed Forces of Lesotho was most probably going to be a necessary equipment to be utilised as a means. The first general elections were undoubtedly going to be regarded as a great political triumph for the B.C.P.

Clearly, aware of his huge following, the B.C.P. leader, already anticipating his win regarding the coming general elections, started humiliating and threatening other political parties, the chiefs and even the King himself. No wonder why a few days before the general elections he said: “we remove the British today, and the next hurdle will be the Chiefs and proceeded to emphasize clearly that among the

Chiefs he included the Paramount Chief” (Khaketla, 1971, p. 65). Undoubtedly, the B.C.P.’s leader’s hunger for absolute power backed by the Armed Forces led to his ultimate desire even to do away with Kingship in Lesotho. Obviously, “It was quite obvious that if, and, when, Mokhehle became the Prime Minister of Lesotho, the King would be relegated to such a position of inferiority that he would be as good as not there at all” (Khaketla, 1971, p. 66). With this attitude, the leader of B.C.P. clearly disregarded the Paramount Chief of Lesotho even before winning the general elections. Undoubtedly, he was featuring Cesare Borgia who was idolized by Machiavelli.

Aware that the leader of B.C.P. was likely going to win the general elections, and aware that he hated the leaders of other parties and chieftainship, the leader of B.N.P. feared him. He “realised that if such treatment awaited the King, he, as Mokhehle’s political adversary, could expect the worst treatment. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that he supported the amendment giving the Head of State control of the Armed Forces of Lesotho merely because he realised that the King could not... allow those Forces to be used to crush the Opposition even if that Opposition was led by himself” (Khaketla, 1971, p. 66). Undoubtedly, the leader of B.N.P. was conscious of the fact that a thirst for power was innate in political leaders, a thirst that would lead to the elimination of political leaders using the Armed Forces of Lesotho as necessary means for the attainment of their ends.

However, the outcome of the first general elections took the whole country by surprise. The leader of what was regarded as being a minority party, the Basutoland National Party won the first general elections. At this juncture, it is good to recall that in 1964 when Chief Leabua thought Mokhehle was winning the election, he seconded the motion of the Marematlou Freedom Party that only the King should be in charge of the Armed Forces of Lesotho. He strongly opposed the B.C.P.’s point of view that the Prime Minister should be Head of the Armed Forces. But now that he was the Prime Minister he changed his mind and wanted to be in full control of the Armed Forces of Lesotho. Chief Leabua’s change of attitude and mind is indicative of the fact that every political leader in Lesotho has a passion and lust for power. Inevitably, Chief Leabua foresaw that being in full control of the Armed Forces of Lesotho could easily lead him to the retention and expansion of power with his Basutoland National Party. Actually his determination to retain and expand power eventually did happen from 1970 to 1986. In 1970 B.N.P. lost the elections, and Chief Leabua leading the defeated party mercilessly utilised his Armed Forces and declared the state of emergency. In his own way he misused the power entrusted to him and thereby retained and expanded the span of his reign. He ruthlessly reigned undemocratically for almost twenty years; and he was incidentally overthrown by a major general of the Lesotho Defence Force after twenty years of his tyrannical rule. If Machiavelli could have risen from the dead, he would surely idolize Chief Leabua Jonathan as he did idolize Cesare Borgia.

Eye witnesses attest that the 1970 general elections came out with B.C.P. as the winner. Khaketla narrates that “It had become clear that the B.C.P. had won the election, for the results at that time, including those which had come in and after the blackout, were B.C.P. 35; B.N.P. 23; and M.F.P. 1” (Khaketla, 1971, p. 21). Under normal circumstances, Chief Leabua, leader of the defeated B.N.P., had

to prepare handing over power to Ntsu Mokhehle, leader of the victorious B.C.P. On the contrary, Chief Leabua's voice on Radio Lesotho boomed: "I, the Prime Minister of Lesotho, in terms of the Constitution, hereby declare Lesotho to be in a state of emergency" (Khaketla, 1971, p. 209). This declared state of emergency was followed by a legion of ruthless killings of the Opposition by the Armed Forces of Lesotho under the supervision of Chief Leabua Jonathan. His ruthlessness led to his success in the then undemocratic Mountain Kingdom, and he illegally ruled until 1986. Undoubtedly, Machiavelli would be attracted to Chief Leabua's brutality that amounted to the retention and expansion of his power; indeed, he resembled and imitated Cesare Borgia. The number of Chief Leabua's assassinations during the 1970 state of emergency was a legion and his brutality could only be compared to by Machiavelli to that of Cesare Borgia.

4. Valuing the System of the State, the Statesman Violates other Systems such as: Religion and Ethics or Morality

4.1 The statesman values the system of the state and ignores that of religion.

Classical Christian concept of "virtue" has always been encouraged and highlighted in Christianity. The term "virtue" in Christian usage consistently has been conceived as leading to humility and cheerful acceptance of suffering. From ancient antiquity onwards in Christianity until the era of Machiavelli followers of Christ rejoiced when encountering torture and severe sufferings and ending their lives in martyrdom. They humbled themselves before ruthless tyrant rulers and imitated their Lord and God Jesus Christ, following in His footsteps of martyrdom.

On the contrary, Machiavelli's use of the term "virtue" is different and antithetical to the Christian concept of virtue. In pre-Christian Rome the term "virtue" derived from the Latin "vir", that is, man meant "manliness"; and this meant military courage. Machiavelli applies the term 'virtue' referring to the glorious and highly successful political ruler of his dreams. Machiavelli's victorious winning ruler is far from being a practicing Church goer. He is actually characterized by ruthlessness and cruelty. In other words, he alienates himself from religion; all he does is to pretend to be religious while strongly encouraging his subjects to practice religion so that they consistently obey him.

Inevitably, an ecclesiastic cannot admit a rival to his religious code. A serial killer characterized by cruelty and ruthlessness is categorically condemned in religion. On the other hand, Machiavellian statesman is solely guided by the precepts of his code, and his end is crystal clear: the acquisition, retention and expansion of power. To attain this end the statesman ought to be cruel and ruthless.

Machiavelli exhorts a ruler "not to encourage such Christian virtues as patience, meekness, mercy, humility, self-denial, compassion" (Omogbe, 2010, p. 61). For the statesman, these virtues are negative and they cannot enable him to attain his end, namely, power. A ruler should, rather, have resort to virtues such as ambition and thirst for power. With this in mind, Machiavelli's ruler will obtain what his goal, that is, power.

Should a ruler keep faith? Machiavelli asks this question and responds to it in his *The Prince*. He does

acknowledge that it is laudable and desirable for a ruler to keep faith. But he stipulates that in practice this likely praiseworthy intention cannot enable the ruler to attain his end, that is, power. Hence, a ruler must not even attempt to keep faith since that can be a stumbling block for him to acquire, retain and expand power. However, he ought to exhort his subjects to keep faith since imbued with Christian virtues they will humble themselves before the ruler and obey him.

4.2 Machiavelli's amorality inevitably implies that the rules of power undoubtedly have priority over those of morality.

A human act like murder or theft will always be considered as evil from a moral point of view. But following Machiavelli's mode of thought, what is regarded as being evil from the point of view of morality may be considered to be good from the viewpoint of the statesman. Thus, assassination of an opponent in view of the acquisition, retention and expansion of power is praiseworthy and good for the prince or the ruler. Brutal killing is heinous and clearly condemnable from a moral point of view and honourable to the prince following Machiavelli's mode of thought. Undoubtedly, following Machiavelli's reasoning, good and evil are no longer absolute but are now relative categories. As such, Machiavelli's amorality is in my view associated with the theory of relativism.

I concur with Omoregbe in his claim that "Machiavelli advises the Prince (the ruler) to ignore morality if he wants to be a successful ruler" (Omoregbe, 2010, p. 60). According to Machiavelli, a ruler will attain his end, that is, power, if he uses any means, even ruthless means such as assassinations. That is why Cesare Borgia idolized by Machiavelli assassinated his own brother, his brother in law and a great many opponents of his. Thus, Machiavelli's amorality consists in that a good that is honourable needs not to be morally upright or honest as moralists think. All that is required of Machiavelli's victorious ruler is simply to pretend to be a morally good person.

4.3 Lesotho political rulers pretend to value the system of the state and that of religion and morality

Chief Leabua, the first Prime Minister of Lesotho grew up as a French Protestant Christian. However, he holds that regardless the fact that he attended Protestant schools, he was never a member of that Church. Khaketla holds the view that later in his life Leabua "joined the Roman Catholic Church after he had become adviser to the Regent Paramount Chieftainness... When he was baptized in that Church he took the name of Joseph" (Khaketla, 1971, p. 24). The Mountain Kingdom being predominantly Christian and the Catholic Church having a majority following, urged him to be a practicing Catholic, and he pretended to be doing so.

The Basutoland National Party was launched by Chief Leabua Jonathan strongly encouraged and supported by the Roman Catholic Church authorities in Lesotho. Undoubtedly, "there is little room for doubt that the idea of such a party [i.e., the B.N.P.] was the brain-child of Roman Catholic authorities, at a high level" (Khaketla, 1971, p. 20). The Roman Catholic priests, especially the French-Canadian priests, unshakeably supported the B.N.P. Given the enormous support of the Roman Catholic Church, Chief Leabua felt obliged to pretend to be a highly practicing religious person. Most probably, his frequent pretence of Church attendance was mainly aimed at attracting Roman Catholics. As a result of

his frequent pretence in no time the B.N.P. gained popularity because every Roman Catholic Parish, particularly in the mountains throughout the country and this Church turned out to be the nucleus of a B.N.P. branch. Thus, Chief Leabua, the potential first Prime Minister of Lesotho, was apparently a morally good religious person because unlike other political leaders he was a Roman Catholic Christian. So, to the Catholics he was highly revered.

However, from 1970 onwards Chief Leabua ignored morality and explicitly demonstrated during the declared state of emergency that he was just a Christian by name. From January 1970 his amorality shown by his ruthlessness and cruelty became necessary means for his retention and expansion of power. Prior to the general elections in 1964 Chief Leabua favoured the motion of the Police and Armed Forces of Lesotho to be under the direct control of the Paramount Chief; but in 1965 when he won the first general elections and became the first Prime Minister of Lesotho he demanded that all powers be transferred to him. With that request as the Prime Minister “the British Government granted Chief Leabua all he had asked for. Upon his return to Maseru he arranged a cocktail party at his house” (Khaketla, 1971, p. 73). Clearly, the new ruler started valuing the system of the state, ignored that of religion and violated the system of morality.

As shown earlier, having lost the 1970 general elections, Chief Leabua declared the state of emergency. The Mountain Kingdom was incidentally plunged headlong into a terrible crisis. The Police and Armed Forces of Lesotho as means were used ruthlessly by the ruler and acted swiftly. The detention of the B.C.P. leader who had won the 1970 general elections was illegal because the defeated former Prime Minister of Lesotho, had no legal right to suspend the Constitution and then arrest the winners of 1970 general elections. It now became clear that Chief Leabua had been pretending to be a morally good person and a stout Roman Catholic faithful person. Thus, the declaration of the state of emergency by the despotic ruler was a means he used to retain his power. The state of affairs turned to abnormality now that the Constitution had been illegally suspended. Many opposition supporters were brutally assassinated by the Armed Forces of Lesotho and they were never sued for their brutal killings. Eventually, the leader of B.C.P. and the many prominent figures of B.C.P. had to flee the country and settle temporarily in Botswana as refugees. Thus, the results of the tyrant political ruler in Lesotho, the man who pretended to value the system of the state and that of religion and morality were undoubtedly disastrous.

5. Conclusion

In his *The Prince*, Machiavelli attempts to separate morality and religion from politics. He regards politics as being autonomous and independent from morality and religion. He admonishes the ruler Lorenzo de Medici to ignore morality and to pretend to be a religious person if he truly and genuinely aspires to be a successful ruler. Chief Leabua Jonathan, the first Prime Minister of Lesotho, apparently ignored morality. Aiming at acquiring, retaining and expanding power he undoubtedly pretended to be a religious person. He applied Machiavelli’s slogan that the end justifies the means. Thus, he used

immoral means such as ruthlessness, cruelty and brutality to retain power.

Unlike his predecessors in politics, Machiavelli does not regard political power on the assumption that it is primarily a means serving higher ends. For him, power is primarily an end in itself. He then strongly advises the Prince, that is, the ruler to aim first and foremost on the acquisition, retention and expansion of power. To obtain this goal the ruler ought to have resort to immoral means such as brutality, cruelty, dishonesty and the like. Just as Pope Alexander VI the most admired man by Machiavelli shrewdly made assurances and often used his personal hangman and poisoner to obtain his goal, he admonishes the ruler to be shrewd and use his most trusted army in his pursuit and retention of power.

Similarly, Chief Leabua, as the Prime Minister of Lesotho and his fellow Ministers simply ignored the issue of the end of the state and focussed on the assumption of power as an end in itself. Their aim was primarily on the acquisition, retention and expansion of power. I have shown that in 1970 he shrewdly retained power by illegally suspending the Constitution of Lesotho and declaring the state of emergency. He then used immoral means deploying the Armed Forces of Lesotho cruelly and brutally assassinating members of the opposition who had won the 1970 general elections. Since then the Armed Forces of Lesotho have been misused by rulers in the Mountain Kingdom to maintain the stability of rulers in power.

Machiavelli's Italy was politically weak and divided. Consequently, the economic situation of Italy was unstable. In like manner, since 1965 when Lesotho gained Independence, the Mountain Kingdom has consistently been politically weak and at war. The economic situation as an end in itself is that they use the Armed Forces of Lesotho primarily to obtain their goal, that is, power. The Armed Forces of Lesotho are no longer serving as the protectors of the Nation, but as mere means to ensure that the masters retain and expand their power.

According to my own point of view, the preferable solution that can redeem Lesotho from its Political power ought to be assumed by rulers in the Mountain Kingdom as a means mainly in the service of higher ends. In this way, rulers will in practice be servants of the people who have authorized them to govern by their votes, not as masters who hunger for power. This can bring a gentle stop to unwanted assassinations caused by a lust for power.

References

- Anglo, Sydney. (1969). *Machiavelli: A Dessection*. London: Victor Gollancz Ltd.
- Barnes, Jonathan. (Ed.). (1995). *The Cambridge Companion to: ARISTOTLE*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Khaketla, B. M. (1971). *Lesotho 1970: An African Coup Under the Microscope*. London: C. Hurst & Co. (Publishers).
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. (1950). *The Prince and the Discourses*. New York: Random House, INC.
- Rauch, Leo. (1965). *Plato's Republic*. New York: Monarch Press.