UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

CENTRE FOR
SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Donor influence, the Minister of Finance and welfare policy reform in Zambia, 2003-11

Abigail Kabandula
Jeremy Seekings

CSSR Working Paper No. 395

Legislating and Implementing Welfare Policy Reforms

December 2016

E·S·R·C ECONOMIC & SOCIAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

UKaid from the British people

Research jointly supported by the ESRC and DFID

CSSR Centre for Social Science Research

Published by the Centre for Social Science Research
University of Cape Town
2016

http://www.cssr.uct.ac.za

This Working Paper can be downloaded from:

http://cssr.uct.ac.za/pub/wp/395/

ISBN: 978-1-77011-382-4

About the authors:

Abigail Kabandula is a PhD student in the Department of Conflict Resolution, Human Security and Global Governance at the University of Massachusetts in Boston, USA; she was a researcher in the Centre for Social Science Research at the University of Cape Town (email: abbykabandula@gmail.com).

Jeremy Seekings is Professor of Political Studies and Sociology, at the University of Cape Town. Email: jeremy.seekings@uct.ac.za.

Acknowledgements:

Earlier versions of this paper were presented at workshops and seminars in 2014-15. We are grateful for comments made then and subsequently. We are especially grateful to Singumbe Muyeba for his assistance with the research, and to Hangala Siachiwena for comments. Daniel Kumitz has been an invaluable source of advice. This research was funded in part through an award from the UK Department for International Development and the UK Economic and Social Research Council for the project on 'Legislating and Implementing Welfare Policy Reforms'.
This paper is a product of the 'Legislating and Implementing Welfare Policy Reforms' research project funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and Department for International Development (DfID) in the United Kingdom.

Donor influence, the Minister of Finance and welfare policy reform in Zambia, 2003-11

Abstract

In Zambia, as in much of Africa, the introduction of 'social cash transfers' was driven by donors and international agencies. Donors initiated pilot cash transfer programmes in Zambia in 2003-04. Although the Zambian Movement for Multiparty Democracy (MMD) government included in policy documents a notional commitment to scaling up these pilot programmes, it had barely begun to implement this commitment by the time of its electoral defeat and removal from office in 2011. Donors mobilised limited support within the Ministry of Community Development and Social Services, but ran up against serious resistance, personified in the Minister of Finance. Resistance to policy reforms was in part ideological. The Minister of Finance was deeply sceptical about cash transfer programmes. His beliefs – which combined neoliberal, conservative and productivist features – accorded with the general approach of the MMD governments of the 2000s. Whilst the MMD also comprised a coalition of regional patrons, neopatrimonialism played a minor role in the resistance to cash transfer programmes. Indeed, the scholarship on neopatrimonialism – and on party politics generally – underestimates the importance of ideology in countries such as Zambia in the 2000s. The Zambian case points to the limits of donor power, especially when donor-supported reforms contradict deep-rooted ideological beliefs among domestic political elites.

Introduction

In Africa, as across the global South, 'social cash transfer' (SCT) programmes, i.e. 'non-contributory' forms of social assistance, proliferated in the early 2000s (Garcia and Moore, 2012). These programmes, often targeted at the poor through means-tests, have roots across much of Africa in poverty-mitigation programmes, including drought relief and recovery, as well as poor relief. In some parts of Southern Africa, these had evolved into non-contributory old-age pension and other programmes. In Ethiopia and some other countries, they had evolved into cash-for-work programmes (such as the Ethiopian Productive

Safety Net Programme). Generally, however, it was international agencies and donor organisations that put social cash transfers on the policy agenda in the mid-and late 2000s.

In Zambia, donors initiated pilot SCT programmes in the early 2000s in an effort to shift from emergency relief to more sustained programmes of poverty relief. The reform agenda in Zambia was clearly 'donor-driven'. The Zambian government seemed to embrace this new agenda in terms of changes in its policy documents, and these were mirrored in party manifestos. But this embrace proved to be largely rhetorical. In practice, the Zambian government did not extend the pilot programmes to the rest of the country. Donors proved much less influential in changing government policy in practice than they had in shaping government rhetoric.

Donors – notably the British Department for International Development (DfID) – invested considerable effort in understanding the 'drivers of change' and the obstacles to these in Zambia. Donor-commissioned studies identified the problem in primarily institutional terms: The responsible government department – the Department of Community Development and Social Services (as it was called at the time) – weakly supported SCTs, but it was weak relative to the Department of Finance (Barrientos *et al*., 2005; Hickey *et al*., 2009). Other (well-informed) commentators point to enduring 'patrimonialism', as public officials use public resources for private gain and neglect programmatic development (Harland, 2014). These explanations explain part of the story. But they neglect a crucial part of the story: the principled opposition to SCTs within the governing party (the Movement for Multiparty Democracy, MMD), and especially from the Minister of Finance.

In this paper we examine the history of SCTs in Zambia in the 2000s and then focus on the position taken by the Minister of Finance, Ng'andu Magande, from 2003 to 2008. The paper draws on interviews with Magande, other former ministers and Members of Parliament, bureaucrats, personnel from donor or other international organisations, as well as civil society. We show that Magande's position entailed strong neoliberal elements. To some extent these were rooted in the general approach of the MMD, which had been formed in opposition to what was seen as the excessive statism of Kenneth Kaunda, president of Zambia from independence until 1991. But, whilst Magande might have been unusual in the fervour of his (neo)liberalism, he articulated an ideology that had much in common with those of politicians across much of Africa, and from diverse political parties, combining liberal elements with conservatism and productivism.

Poverty, politics and policy in Zambia

Independence in Zambia (in 1964) was followed by three decades of steady economic decline. Real GDP per capita (in US$) troughed between 1995 and 2000, at almost exactly one half of its peak (1965) level. Only in 2001 did the economy begin to grow once again. The economy was heavily indebted, and the government relied on overseas aid. Economic decline meant rising poverty: in 2003, 85 percent of the population lived on less than US$2 per day (with a poverty gap of 46 percent), and 65 percent lived on less than $1.25 per day (with a poverty gap of 27 percent). Almost one half of the population was estimated to be undernourished.[1] Economic decline reflected a combination of over-dependence on copper production and government mismanagement. Poor governance was widely attributed to pervasive 'patrimonialism', as political elites used political office for private gain (e.g. Harland, 2014).

The government's disastrous economic management and prevalent patrimonialism in the 1970s and 1980s led to intense resistance to single-party rule under Kenneth Kaunda (president since independence) and his United National Independence Party (UNIP). In 1991, multi-party elections were won by the opposition MMD, under former trade unionist Frederick Chiluba. Reacting against Kaunda's disastrous statism, the MMD embraced neoliberalism – including privatisation, liberalisation and reducing the size of the state – whilst practicing massive corruption. Chiluba was re-elected in 1996, but in 2001 failed to change the constitution to allow him to run for a third presidential term. His chosen successor, Levy Mwanawasa, was elected, and soon demonstrated his independence from Chiluba by allowing charges of corruption to be brought against Chiluba as part of what Mwanawasa promised would be a 'New Deal'. Chiluba was convicted of corruption by a court in the United Kingdom, but in Zambia itself he was eventually acquitted (although his wife was convicted). Mwanawasa also revived national development planning, saying that 'one of the important lessons' of the 1990s was 'that even in a liberalized economy, development planning is necessary for guiding priority setting and resource allocation' (Mwanawasa, 2006).

Zambia's chronic economic difficulties were exacerbated in the 1990s by AIDS. Life expectancy at birth declined from 52 years in 1980 to 42 years in 2000 (ibid). In 1995, in response to the challenges posed by AIDS especially, the MMD government decided to review and revive its Public Welfare Assistance Scheme (PWAS) (Harland, 2014: 376). The PWAS was a colonial-era system of poor relief, originally intended primarily for destitute European settlers and workers. It had collapsed amidst the economic and fiscal decline of the 1970s.

[1] Data from World Bank, Word Development Indicators.

With support from the European Union, the PWAS was redesigned in 1999-2000. New ‘Guidelines’ were published by the Ministry of Community Development and Social Services (MCDSS) in December 2000, and the new PWAS was rolled out in three phases across Zambia. Funding was minimal, however, and most of the meagre funds that were allocated to it were (reportedly) not disbursed. As of early 2003, the programme remained entirely insignificant, even in districts where it had supposedly been rolled out (Schubert, 2003a).[2] Charlotte Harland – who was involved in the attempted revival of the PWAS – recalled later that ‘requests for support from international agencies were greeted with derision on the foolishness of unsustainable “handouts”… I was sent packing from most of the major donor offices in Lusaka’. The exceptions to this, she recalled, were UNICEF (whose representative, worried about the growing orphan problem, gave encouragement) and the European Commission (who helped to fund capacity development) (Harland, 2011: 13).

Drought in the early 2000s further compounded poverty. The World Food Programme provided massive food aid between 2002 and 2006. International NGOs – including World Vision, the Red Cross, Care International, Catholic Relief and the various bilateral aid agencies – distributed food, especially across the south of Zambia.[3] Whilst providing emergency food relief, however, major aid donors concluded that it was people’s underlying vulnerability that made them susceptible to drought, and this underlying vulnerability needed to be addressed.[4]

AIDS (and the resulting orphans) and drought together provided a local focus for a more global interest in ‘social safety nets’ and ‘social protection’. In 2002, the World Bank published its first Social Protection Strategy document, whilst the International Labour Organisation (ILO) began to consider more fully cash transfers. In Zambia, in 2002, the German Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) funded a ‘Social Safety Net Project’ in the MCDSS, paying for an advisor (Dr Jörg Goldberg). The British Department for International Development (DfID) was also said to be interested in the possibility of cash transfers, i.e. non-contributory social assistance programmes as a mechanism for mitigating poverty and stimulating development. In

[2] A ‘Mid-Term Review’ (by David Johnson and Maria do Rosario Advirta) was completed in January 2002. The EU employed Charlotte Harland as ‘EU Advisor to Public Welfare Assistance Scheme’ (see Schubert, 2003a).

[3] Schubert refers to a “Report on the Distribution of German Food Relief Maize for the Vulnerable through the Public Welfare Assistance Scheme in Lisitu, Siavonga District” (by Pauline Inambao, December 2002).

[4] Donor personnel, interviewed by Abigail Kabandula, Lusaka, 22 March 2014; see also Garcia and Moore, 2012.

February 2003, a 'Stakeholder Workshop' on 'Towards the Development of a Comprehensive Social Protection Strategy Paper for Zambia' was held in Lusaka.[5] At about the same time, GTZ contracted a German researcher – Bernd Schubert – to write a report on support for people in Zambia who had been impoverished by AIDS.

Schubert's report, dated March 2003, but based on interviews conducted in Zambia in March and early April, was to play a crucial role in prompting the GTZ to establish a pilot cash transfer scheme in Kalomo, in southern Zambia. Schubert analysed data from villages in other parts of the South that showed that AIDS had resulted in large numbers of 'orphans and vulnerable children', often living with grandparents, but that AIDS was not the only cause of child poverty. One in ten households urgently required social assistance, typically because AIDS-related death or illness meant that they had no adults of working age. More than one-third of households in the surveyed villages cared for orphans, and most of these households were headed by women or elderly people. Schubert found that poor households were heavily dependent on food relief, with very few receiving remittances from kin (and no one had even heard of the revived PWAS!). Whilst many of the poorest households were 'labour-scarce', 'most interventions aiming at social protection and food security targeted the "capacitated poor" or "viable poor"', and neglected 'the majority of labour scarce and destitute households' (also known as the "incapacitated poor") (Schubert, 2003a: 18).

Schubert returned to Zambia in August 2003 to meet with the PS and other officials in the MCDSS, and with donor personnel, to prepare more concrete recommendations. He proposed a programme focusing 'mainly on households that are headed by the elderly and are caring for OVCs because the breadwinners are chronically sick or have died due to AIDS or due to other reasons' (Schubert, 2003b: 4). He envisaged a two-year pilot, with a total of 1000 beneficiary households. If the beneficiaries were to comprise the poorest 10 percent of all households in the selected area, then the pilot would need to be implemented in a small district or a well-defined area of a larger district. Schubert reported that discussions with 'stakeholders' at 'all levels' identified two possible districts: Siavonga (where GTZ had worked previously) and Kalomo. At a meeting with MCDSS staff in August 2003, three agricultural blocks in Kalomo District were selected (ibid: 11). The Member of Parliament for Kalomo (from 2001), Mr Request Muntanga (from the opposition United Party for National Development), claims that the cash transfer scheme was his

[5] Barrientos *et al*. 2005. refer to a meeting in February 2003, where the findings from the Kalomo Pilot were discussed. If the date is correct, then the findings from Kalomo could not have been discussed, because the project had not been initiated.

idea, and that he approached GTZ to implement the scheme in his constituency.[6] Schubert, however, dismisses Muntanga's claim as 'pure fantasy, the sort certain politicians use to show off'.[7]

Donor-initiated Pilot Schemes, 2003-07

In November 2003, the pilot programme began with a 6-month 'test phase' in Kalomo, using a draft Operations Manual. The test phase was evaluated and the manual was improved in April 2004. In May 2004 the Kalomo pilot cash transfer scheme was officially launched by the then Minister of MCDSS, Marina Nsingo. Over the six months from May to October 2004, the new scheme was rolled out over the selected areas within Kalomo district. As of early 2005, the scheme was paying monthly cash transfers to just over one thousand households (Schubert, 2005b: 20).

The apparent success of the Kalomo scheme seems to have quickly prompted proposals (from donors and consultants) to expand it, but in practice expansion was limited to the initiation of other 'pilot' schemes (supported primarily by DfID). The purpose of the pilot schemes seems primarily to have been to generate the data to convince the Zambian government that cash transfers were possible and effective and would not have negative social effects. In other words, the pilot schemes were essentially an exercise in political advocacy. But they were an exercise that largely failed.

From the outset it was clear that the pilot programme was a donor initiative and enjoyed limited support from the government. In his original report, Schubert had discussed the lack of political will over cash transfers (2003a: 23), and in mid-2003 Goldberg wrote a briefing paper that set out counter-arguments against what were presumably the standard objections raised, presumably by Zambian policy-makers (Goldberg, 2003). Most officials within the Department of Social Welfare (that fell under the MCDSS) were initially sceptical of cash transfer programmes, but had no evidence that they did not work and were open to questioning the effectiveness of in-kind transfers. Delivering relief maize to remote villages required complex transportation and storage as well as actual disbursement. In addition, when maize or blankets were distributed, beneficiaries often sold them to raise cash to buy other goods they needed, such as kapenta (dried fish) or cooking oil, or to pay school fees for children. The discourse of 'empowering' poor or vulnerable people by giving them cash was

[6] Request Muntanga, interviewed by Abigail Kabandula, 12 March 2012. Muntanga made the same claim when interviewed by Habasonda (Habasonda, 2009).
[7] Personal communication.

attractive to some officials.[8] GTZ seems to have hoped that the pilot would help to persuade government ministers as well as officials that cash transfers were an effective mechanism for reducing poverty among the extremely poor.

Harland, who had been involved in the revival of the PWAS, provides a more critical perspective, emphasising how the Kalomo pilot distracted from – and undermined – the rollout of the PWAS. By 2003, the 'redesigned PWAS had been rolled out across nearly half the country, and was due for full coverage by 2005'. When the GTZ approached the Ministry, suggesting the Kalomo pilot, 'the relevant officials requested that the pilot scheme be integrated within the PWAS (not only in the selected district, but importantly at national level)'. Despite this, and for reasons that Harland does not record, 'the project was designed as a separate entity, focusing assistance only on the local capacity and systems necessary for efforts that started in a small part of the Kalomo district'. Not only was 'support to provide equipment and to improve delivery capacity, monitoring and evaluation, targeting, and reporting' shifted to the Kalomo pilot, but 'work previously carried out by Government [was] contracted to international NGOs'. The result was that 'the resources and attention directed to the new national PWAS scheme dwindled' (Harland, 2014: 377).

In December 2004, fired with enthusiasm, Schubert proposed the expansion of the pilot scheme. Early the following year he reported that the MCDSS and the African Development Bank (ADB) had agreed to fund the expansion of the Social Cash Transfer Scheme to eight districts for a period of five years (2005-2009). The ADB would provide a grant of US$ 4 million with the Zambian Government contributing US$ 1 million (with a commitment to continue funding after 2009). GTZ would provide technical assistance. Other international NGOs would also participate. CARE International, for example, would work in Kazungula District. The PWAS would 'serve as the implementing structure' for these cash transfer schemes (Schubert, 2005b: 24).

Whilst the Kazungula pilot scheme did commence in 2005 (see below), the Ministry of Finance refused to accept the grant from the ADB or to make any contribution, and preferred to continue to use donor funds.[9] As Schubert acknowledged, 'the Ministry of Finance expressed reservations to signing the loan agreement (only the cash transfer component is a grant), and the fate of the project – further delays, replanning or cancellation – is not yet clear' (ibid).

[8] Stanfield Michelo, interviewed by Abigail Kabandula, 27 March 2014; Michelo was the Director of the Department of Social Welfare at MCDMCH, and had been with the ministry since 1995.

[9] Ng'andu Magande, interviewed by Abigail Kabandula and Singumbe Muyeba, Lusaka, 30 March 2014. Magande, the Finance Minister, said that the ADB funding was a loan, and the government refused such loans (see further below).

GTZ continued to monitor its Kalomo scheme. 'Mid-term' and 'final' evaluations suggested that the scheme was successful in reducing poverty. A further evaluation of the Kalomo scheme was conducted in 2006. The various studies all pointed to the success of the scheme (Wietler, 2007).

The Kalomo pilot attracted strong interest from the British DfID. DfID's new Social Development Advisor attended a GTZ workshop on the Kalomo scheme during a familiarisation trip, and wrote an official 'note' suggesting that DfID should chair an informal donor group on social protection (to include also the World Bank and GTZ) (Hickey *et al*., 2009: 74-5). Like the GTZ, DfID was looking for ways of moving beyond emergency responses to drought, and saw pilot schemes as a way of demonstrating to the government that it was possible to target very poor people and that poor people would spend cash in appropriate, poverty-reducing ways. For DfID, it was good value for money given the modest costs.[10] The pilot scheme would also help DfID and other donors to assist the Zambian government in developing a National Social Protection Strategy. It is unclear why DfID was uninterested in the PWAS.

From the outset DfID recognised political obstacles to the expansion of social protection in Zambia. In 2003, it had commissioned a study of the possibilities of reform in Zambia with respect to development policy generally.[11] In early 2005 it commissioned a further study of the possibilities of reform with respect specifically to cash transfers. The purpose of the study was made explicit: 'to build a constituency for change in favour of a government owned national Social Assistance Scheme' (Barrientos *et al*., 2005: 52).[12] The 2005 DfID study reported that 'evaluations of the [Kalomo] Pilot Scheme are very positive and have encouraged further initiatives' – including two further cash transfer pilots run by CARE International with support from DfID in Kazungula (from August 2005) and an urban area, Chipata. There was 'growing interest' in expanding cash transfers. Oxfam was reportedly interested in incorporating cash transfers into its humanitarian relief and drought relief in the Western and Southern Provinces (ibid: 25). This 'growing interest' was, however, concentrated

[10] Donor Personnel, interviewed, 22 March 2014.

[11] 'Drivers of Pro-poor Change, an Overview', by A. Duncan, H. Macmillan and N. Simutanyi. (2003)

[12] The study was originally supposed to have been completed in July 2005, but the research only began in July and was completed in September 2005. The research team comprised of four consultants: Denis Wood (a well-connected consultant based in Lusaka); Dr Sam Hickey from the Institute for Development Policy and Management at the University of Manchester; and Dr Armando Barrientos, who at the time was at the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex; and Dr Neo Simutanyi, from the Institute of Social and Economic Research at the University of Zambia, in Lusaka.

primarily among donors and NGOs. Indeed, DfID's involvement had been delayed by the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding between them and the Ministry of Finance.

> Explanations for this delay differ, with some observers citing a bureaucratic error within [the Ministry of Finance] and others Ministerial reluctance. The DfID Advisor wrote to MCDSS on this matter, spelling out the implications of the delay, after which the [Permanent Secretary] for MCDSS approached the Minister of Finance at a cocktail party … The MoU was swiftly signed but with reservations, particularly around the heavy emphasis that the MoU placed on studies, the apparent lack of clarity over financial management and the absence of a strong focus on monitoring and evaluation. (Hickey *et al.*, 2009: 77)

Donors initiated four further pilot schemes between 2005 and 2007. Besides the schemes in Kazungula and Chipata, organised by CARE International and funded by DfID, GTZ initiated another scheme in Monze in January 2007, and CARE International and DfID launched a fifth in Katete (in Eastern Province) in July 2007. The Monze scheme was supposed to have tested the use of 'soft conditions' with grants (although it seems that these were not effected: see Garcia and Moore, 2012: 328-9). It was also the first to be designed with monitoring and evaluation built in from the outset. Whereas the Kazungula, Chipata and Monze schemes all followed the Kalomo model in targeting the poorest 10 percent of households, using the PWAS-derived, community-based procedures, the fifth pilot – in Katete (in Eastern Province) – provided old age pensions to men and women from the age of sixty years. The Katete scheme was first piloted in one ward within Katete, before being extended to 12 out of 24 wards in the district in December 2008, covering over 4,500 beneficiaries (most of whom were women) (CARE International, 2008; Pension Watch, 2009).[13] In addition, the Kalomo pilot was expanded throughout the whole of Kalomo district. By mid-2009, it reached 3,573 households (Garcia and Moore, 2012: 327).

These further pilot schemes were initiated in part in response to the positive mid-term evaluations of the Kalomo scheme. But they were needed because the Kalomo scheme had not convinced the Zambian government of the value of SCTs. According to a subsequent study by the World Bank:

[13] Later, in 2010, a child grant programme was initiated in Kaputa. This targeted households with children under the age of five years.

> The Kalomo SCT pilot showed that social cash transfers were possible in Zambia, but the impact evaluation was not rigorous enough to guide new national policy initiatives. Therefore, an extended pilot was planned to test for the most appropriate targeting, transfer conditions, payment distribution, and other components. The evaluation of the extended pilot would also determine where the transfer program should be seated and how to capitalize on other social protection and development programs. It would also increase understanding of how the transfers affected informal safety nets. It was hoped that piloting over a longer period and a wider geographical area would allow the time to build up further political support for the program. The extension provided time to improve communication through a documentary and website and to conduct site visits by key ministry officials. (Garcia and Moore, 2012: 325-6)

In this account, the continuing ambivalence on the part of Zambian government officials was over primarily technical issues. But these technical concerns masked deeper objections.

The National Policy Framework under the MMD Government, 2003-06

At the same time as donors were initiating and running these pilot programmes, the Zambian government was persuaded to incorporate a rhetorical commitment to social protection in its strategic planning, culminating in its Fifth National Development Plan (2006-2011) published in December 2005, and to participate with donors and international agencies in consultative for a dedicated to social protection.

Prior to 2005 there was no significant mention of social protection in Zambian strategic plans. Zambia, like other heavily-indebted low-income countries, had adopted a Poverty Reduction Strategy Plan (PRSP) in the early 2000s. Zambia's first PRSP ran to December 2004. None of the first, second or supplementary reports on the implementation of the PRSP included any significant discussion of social safety nets, besides reporting the meager numbers of beneficiaries under the PWAS and other programmes (Zambia, 2004, 2005a, 2005b). The only exception to this was a vague reference to a 'national social safety net' in the second report (Zambia, 2005a: 51). The emphasis in the PRSP was on infrastructure, and improved governance. This was despite the fact that a workshop on 'social protection' had been held in Lusaka in early 2003 (see above).

The PRSP process revealed the general inadequacy of the Zambian government's policy-making and implementation. Indirectly, however, the PRSP process was important in that it led to the establishment of 'sectoral advisory groups' (SAGs) to bring 'stakeholders' – donors, civil society organisations, and government – together to discuss policy. The new SAGs discussed the Zambian Government's Second Report on the implementation of the PRSP (Zambia, 2005a: 10). Quarterly meetings of all of the SAGs 'enhanced the entire implementation process', including through expediting the identification of problems in program implementation (ibid: 70).

Under pressure from donors, the Zambian government agreed to establish a SAG for Social Protection (SP-SAG):

> In late 2003, DFID-Zambia and the [World] Bank proposed to [the Ministry of Finance and National Planning] MFNP that they establish a Sector Advisory Group on social protection (SP-SAG) chaired by MCDSS, rather than promote SP as a cross-cutting agenda. MFNP agreed to what would be the only new SAG to be established during the review process for the second PRSP. At the same time, GTZ was not only starting to pilot the Kalomo project but was also advising MCDSS on SP, helping the Ministry to set priorities and strengthen the institutional setup. (Hickey *et al*., 2009: 75)

Barrientos *et al*. (2005) identified three factors that prompted the establishment of the SP-SAG: analysis of the first PRSP revealed that the 'particular problems faced by the poorest households' had been neglected; discussion of the Kalomo Pilot; and 'the World Bank's general policy of trying to mainstream social protection within African poverty reduction strategies through a series of international workshops'. MCDSS as well as GTZ officials had attended one of the World Bank's Social Protection seminars.

The establishment of SP-SAG was delayed by a dispute between MCDSS and the Ministry of Finance and National Planning over control over the poverty agenda (ibid). Hickey *et al*. (2009: 80) imply that the impasse was broken by the Permanent Secretary for the Planning and Economic Management Department, within the Ministry of Finance and National Planning, who was more positive about social protection than his Minister, the Minister of Finance (Magande). In what seems to have been an institutional compromise, the SP-SAG was chaired by an official from the MCDSS but reported to the Planning and Economic Management Department.

The SP-SAG was eventually established in December 2003, with funding from DfID. It became 'the main forum of interaction between MCDSS, other ministries (health, education and labour), donors and NGOs' (Chiwele, 2010: 17). It met almost monthly in 2004-05, for between two and three hours per meeting (Barrientos *et al*., 2005: 28). The SP-SAG established Technical Working Groups (TWGs) to deal with specific issues. For example, a TWG on Social Assistance (TWG-SA), chaired by the Director of Social Welfare in the MCDSS, focused on social assistance programmes (ibid).

The SAG's primary function was to draft a national strategy for social protection, initially for what was expected to be the third PRSP (2006-2008) but which ended up being the Fifth National Development Plan (Barrientos *et al*., 2005: 28). 'After completion of this task, the SP/SAG will be involved in coordinating and monitoring the Social Protection Programs and will eventually advise GRZ [the Government of the Republic of Zambia] on establishing the 2009-2011 PRSP', wrote Schubert in 2005 (2005a: 16). An 'appraisal committee' was established, comprising of two MCDSS staff and one DfID member, to select a consultant to draft the Social Protection Strategy (Hickey *et al*., 2009:75). The SP-SAG appointed Charlotte Harland as a consultant, paid by DfID.

DfID also established an informal group of donor personnel to meet before the full SP-SAG meetings in order to harmonize the various donors' positions. 'The idea was to present a harmonised front and to work through issues of disagreement between themselves in order to reduce the risk that such debates would dominate discussions within the SP-SAG. However, some SP-SAG participants suspected that this was a way of sewing up the agenda and closing down debates in advance' (Hickey *et al*., 2009: 75). According to Barrientos *et al*., 'a number of participants', from government and UN agencies, chaffed at the donors' focus on cash transfers (Barrientos *et al*., 2005). They 'would have preferred a wider approach to social protection, incorporating the vulnerable but not poor and extending to a wider range of instruments (e.g. pension funds)' (Barrientos *et al*., 2005: 30). It is not clear whether disagreements over the prioritisation of the cash transfer pilot schemes over the PWAS were pertinent.

With the end of the first PRSP period (in December 2004), and a new National Development Plan being drafted, by a more technocratic government than hitherto (see below), this was a good moment to propose policy reforms. Harland presented the case for social protection at a retreat attended by senior government officials in August 2004. She continued to engage with the SP-SAG

– a process that involved another eight SP-SAG meetings, a further retreat in February 2005 and several written inputs – in order to produce the draft strategy document by April 2005. ‘Overall, the SP-SAG process has centred on producing a coherent strategy that is likely to attract donor funding’, Barrientos *et al*. reported to DfID soon after; ‘this has been done quite successfully, and is an approach likely to find favour within MoFNP’ (Barrientos *et al*., 2005:30).

The Zambian Government, however, remained wary. Barrientos *et al*. acknowledged that:

> …concerns remain regarding the politics of the process, in terms of both internal and external levels of ownership and commitment. Externally, there have been few efforts as yet by the SP-SAG to secure wider political buy-in from key stakeholders within government (particularly MoFNP) and political and civil society more broadly. There might be a structural issue here, in that the formation of separate SAG for social protection (as opposed to framing social protection as a cross-cutting issue within the NDP process) may have reduced the extent to which the SP agenda has been forced to engage other key sectors (e.g. Education, Health). (2005: 30)

Hickey *et al* (2009: 75) later added that ‘commitment to the SP-SAG within MCDSS was variable across personnel and departments’, with the Minister providing little political support to his bureaucrats. DfID attempted, through the SP-SAG, ‘to engage other key ministries in this agenda, particularly MFNP, Labour, Education and Health, although these efforts rarely targeted high-ranking officials nor met with particular success’ (ibid).

The draft Social Protection Strategy (SPS) was completed in 2005.[14] The following year, it was incorporated (in part, at least) into the Fifth National Development Plan, as Chapter 22 on ‘Social Protection’. The SPS and FNDP identified social protection as crucial to ensuring that the benefits of economic growth were distributed equitably. The documents identified three categories of people warranting special attention: ‘Incapacitated’ households, comprising households without anyone able to work; ‘low capacity’ households which needed assistance in raising production to a subsistence level, and child-headed households (which might have been included in the ‘incapacitated’ category). Policies such as public employment programmes and targeted agricultural

[14] Presumably by Harland. We have not seen this draft, but it was summarised in a presentation by MCDSS officials to a World Bank seminar in Tunis, in June 2005. Without seeing the full draft, it is difficult to identify precisely what was and what was not incorporated into the Fifth National Development Plan.

inputs would be crucial for 'low capacity' households, whilst 'incapacitated' households would require 'direct social transfers as a regular supplement to income', through both Public Welfare Assistance and Social Cash Transfers. Social protection would be targeted on the poorest 20 percent of the population.

The Fifth National Development Plan was perhaps rather more guarded than the draft SPS with regard to cash transfers. The Plan emphasised that 'empowering the poor to earn a decent living income is perceived to be a much more effective approach in addressing their plight than the often unsustainable subsidy programmes that often tend to destroy the very financial and human resource bases that are expected to facilitate positive growth through productive investment' (Zambia, 2006: 18). The Plan prioritised increasing peasant agricultural production (and bemoaned the state's neglect of this in the 1990s) (ibid: 23, 46ff). As Holmes writes, referring to the provisions for 'low-capacity' households: the Fifth National Development Plan 'is clear that social protection is not solely about relief, and situates social protection as a key pillar of growth in Zambia by enhancing household's engagement in the productive economy' (Holmes, 2007: 10). The discussion of cash transfers in Chapter 22 focused on the expansion of the PWAS, not on cash transfers. Whether this reflected Harland's preferences, officials', or the Ministers', is not clear. But it certainly suggests the limits to the efficacy of the SP-SAG as a forum for pro-cash transfer donors to evangelise.

Whilst, rhetorically, the Zambian government endorsed social protection, senior ministers seemed to remain less than fully committed. In March 2006 the Zambian government hosted an African Union meeting on social protection, where the 'Livingstone call for Action' was adopted. Opening the conference, President Levy Mwanawasa described social protection as a 'basic human right' and as affordable.[15] Participants in the conference visited Kalomo and met with beneficiaries of the pilot SCT. Schubert co-authored a report for HelpAge International (who had part-funded the conference) that presented the Zambian experience as a model to be followed elsewhere (Schubert and Beales, 2006). But Mwanawasa's own Minister of Finance, Magande, conspicuously stayed away from the Livingstone meeting.

What the Fifth National Development Plan (FNDP) did do was to emphasise the imperative of strengthening institutional capacity. This included the recognition of the role of SP-SAG in social protection:

[15] The Report may be accessed here: http://www.ipc-undp.org/doc_africa_brazil/Livingstone-call-for-action.pdf.

> The first stage in implementing the social protection strategy is to institutionalise and strengthen the Social Protection Sector Advisory Group (SP-SAG) within the MCDSS to play the role of national level coordinator between the identified activities and all related coordination mechanisms. In this respect, SP-SAG shall be in charge of the oversight function for all social protection programmes, including national level reporting. Other responsibilities shall include the extension of oversight over MCDSS budgeting for social protection activities; resource mobilisation; investment and programming processes; capacity building for social protection; and prioritisation and harmonisation of the FNDP sectorial plans in so far as they relate to social protection (Zambia, 2006: 214)

The SP-SAG would oversee thorough monitoring and evaluation, including ‘a mid-term review of the FNDP social protection activities in mid-2008 as well as a comprehensive review of plan performance in 2010’ (ibid: 215). The establishment of SP-SAGs was also emphasised strongly in the report on the Livingstone Conference, co-authored by Schubert (Schubert and Beales, 2006).

It would seem that there were at least two and perhaps three positions represented in the SP-SAG: DfID and other donors (and some junior officials in MCDSS) favoured the expansion of cash transfers; some other donors and other government officials seem to have favoured the expansion of PWAS. Government ministers – who did not sit on the SAG – may have been ambivalent about both of these positions. The SAG presumably became a forum for contested views of policy reform.

Whilst ministers might have remained ambivalent, support for social protection did grow among the bureaucrats within the MCDSS. An important step in this was when bureaucrats attended a World Bank seminar in Tunis on ‘Mainstreaming Social Protection in PRSPs’, probably in June 2005 (Barrientos *et al*., 2005: 30; Hickey *et al*., 2009: 75).[16]

[16] The World Bank website records some information about a WB seminar held in Tunis at the end (27-30) of June 2005. The participant list includes government officials from 10 African countries (including Zambia, as well as Uganda, Tanzania and Ghana), as well as personnel from government departments, civil society, bilateral donors, and the African Development Bank and World Bank.

The failure to scale up the pilot schemes under MMD governments, 2005-11

Between 2004 and 2008 the GTZ and DfID collected evidence from the various pilot schemes showing that cash transfers were viable and effective mechanisms for the relief of poverty, and probably served modest developmental purposes also. A series of studies demonstrated that scaling up the schemes into national programmes was affordable. But the Zambian government did not implement the reforms being advocated by donors. The MCDSS embraced the rhetoric of scaling up the programmes, and in 2008 assumed formal responsibility for the various pilot schemes. The Sixth National Development Plan (in 2011) promised an expansion of these schemes. But the rhetoric proved empty. GTZ, DfID, the World Bank and the ILO might all have advocated cash transfers, and presented evidence that they were effective and affordable, but the Zambian government declined to take real ownership of or even to support meaningfully cash transfer programmes.

As early as 2004, GTZ argued that the Kalomo pilot scheme could be scaled up. ‘The GTZ project in Zambia shows that, even in extremely poor rural societies and with relatively manageable sums of money, basic social protection is feasible and makes a significant contribution to poverty reduction’ (Wolter, 2004: 19). A national version of the Kalomo scheme, reaching 200,000 households, would cost about €16 million per year. This sum was, however, ‘unlikely to be available from the Zambian national budget without external assistance’ (ibid). This figure was probably based on calculations by Schubert, who himself wrote that extending the scheme ‘to all of the 200,000 destitute households in Zambia’ would cost about US$ 21 million. This, he added, was ‘the equivalent of 5% of the annual foreign aid inflow, or 0.5% of the Zambian GDP’, which (in Schubert’s view) showed that ‘social cash transfers are affordable – especially if the costs are shared between the development partners and the Government of the Republic of Zambia’ (2005b: 24).

The Zambian government was not persuaded, however. DfID’s consultants recommended a more forceful advocacy campaign (Barrientos *et al*., 2005). The Barrientos Report reportedly also prompted GTZ to focus more on advocacy and strengthening ownership within MCDSS (Hickey *et al*. 2009: 76). Crucial to this advocacy strategy was presenting evidence on the efficacy of cash transfers. In early 2006 a series of studies (conducted by the Overseas Development Institute in the UK) examined DfID-funded emergency cash transfers in drought-affected Western Zambia, concluding that cash transfers should be employed more widely in future relief programmes (reported in Harvey and Savage, 2006: 1).

Donors and international agencies had limited success within the MCDSS. In 2006-07, the MCDSS reportedly adopted an 'Implementation Framework for Scaling up a National System on Cash Transfer'.[17] This provided a 'road map' for rolling out social cash transfers to fifteen districts by the end of 2009, thirty districts by the end of 2010, fifty districts by the end of 2011 and nationally (i.e. 72 districts) by the end of 2012 (Chiwele, 2010: 48).[18] The Framework document only provided a framework, however: a 'nationally agreed implementation plan' was needed before any roll-out could begin (quoted in Chiwele, 2010: 6). Before an implementation plan could be agreed, however, the Zambian government required more evidence of the efficacy and affordability of cash transfers. In early 2007, DfID funded the ILO to begin work on a serious costing exercise. GTZ prepared for the MCDSS reports on *A Proposed Monitoring & Evaluation System for Social Protection* (June 2007) and *The Pilot Social Cash Transfer Scheme in Zambia Summary Report* (September 2007).[19] GTZ also published a qualitative study of Kalomo (Wietler, 2007), whilst in August 2007 Holmes completed a study on provision for 'low capacity' households for the Overseas Development Institute and DfID (Holmes, 2007). Researchers were commissioned (with donor funding) to conduct a more systematic study of the effects of the Kalomo, Chipata and Kazungula schemes. The researchers analysed data already collected by CARE International in Chipata and Kazungula, but collected new data in Kalomo (in September 2007) (Tembo and Freeland, 2008). At least one workshop was held in Lusaka on social cash transfer programmes.[20] At the end of 2007, the MCDSS was said to have published a 'Green Paper' on social protection (Chiwele, 2010: 5).[21]

In addition to commissioning research, DfID funded a study tour by (unidentified) government ministers, accompanied by the PSs of MCDSS and the Ministry of Labour and two Members of Parliament, to South Africa[22] and Lesotho in late 2007, a visit by ten Members of Parliament to Kalomo (in September 2007) and visits by MCDSS officials to Kenya and Maastricht (in

[17] Chiwele (2010) dates this in November 2006. The ILO (2008: 105) dates it in July 2007 (see also Habasonda, 2009:7).
[18] The same figures are reported in a DfID document cited by the ILO (2008).
[19] Holmes also refers to third draft MCDSS document, *Evaluation Study on Appropriate Models of Livelihood Strategies for Social protection in Zambia* (Holmes, 2007: 1).
[20] A workshop was reportedly held on the 'Design and Implementation of Social Transfer Programmes' at the Holiday Inn, Lusaka (11 December 2007). In January 2008, CARE International gave a presentation, also at the Lusaka Holiday Inn, on the experiences of capacity-building in the Chipata and Katete pilot schemes (CARE International, 2008).
[21] This is not mentioned in any other study, and Chiwele does not provide a reference.
[22] Where they were reportedly especially impressed by a presentation by Michael Samson at the Economic Policy Research Institute in Cape Town.

the Netherlands, for a training workshop). DfID also funded radio and television programmes. Hickey *et al*. later reported that these efforts had resulted in increased support within MCDSS. The new permanent Secretary of MCDSS (who took up his post in 2006) became an articulate supporter of cash transfers, 'and has independently undertaken several advocacy initiatives, including meetings with the Minister of Finance and taking MPs to pilot ST schemes. … A senior officer within MCDSS cites the PS' strong support (and the appointment of a new Minister in 2007) as having been significant in terms of securing the buy-in and commitment of civil servants throughout the Ministry' (Hickey *et al*., 2009: 78). A new Technical Working Group brought together donor and MCDSS personnel.

Social transfer programmes were clearly being discussed, but resistance continued. Holmes reports that, by mid-2007, the new Technical Working Group was considering the replacement of the PWAS with a national cash transfer programme for incapacitated households, as soon as 2009. This would be 'largely based on the experiences of small pilot cash transfer schemes', and have a dedicated budget. But, she reported also, unidentified sceptics wondered whether this target group had needs 'other than cash' and whether cash transfers were 'suitable in all places e.g. where the barter economy [was] still strong' (Holmes, 2007: 10-11).

Donors continued to exert pressure on the Government of Zambia through 2008, with further evidence of both the beneficial effects of cash transfers and criticisms of the Government's parsimony, and analysis of the affordability of countrywide programmes. DfID-commissioned researchers Tembo and Freeland produced a draft report for the MCDSS on their evaluation of the pilot schemes. This was, they claimed, 'the first comprehensive treatment of the impact of SCT programmes' in Southern Africa outside of South Africa (Tembo and Freeland, 2008: 3). They found that beneficiary households invested in assets (including small livestock) and their children's education. In June 2008, the International Labour Organisation (ILO) published its DfID-funded assessment of social assistance programmes in Zambia (as well as Tanzania), concluding that they had failed to alleviate poverty because they were under-funded and failed to target those most in need (ILO, 2008; see also Holmes and Slater, 2008; Mboozi, 2008). In fact, public expenditures may have been lower even than the sums budgeted, with 'releases … as low as 10 to 12 per cent of the budget amount in some years' (Chiwele, 2010: 5).

The ILO also published a thorough study of the costs of health, education and social protection programmes. They costed the MCDSS's *envisaged* national rollout of cash transfers in terms of the Fifth National Development Plan as rising from about US$1m (2008) to $7m (2009), $14m (2010), $28m (2011) and

$41m (2012). The ILO noted, however, that the Zambian government had supposedly committed itself only to modest increases in PWAS funding over the next five years, and to take over complete financial responsibility for these cash transfers only after five years (ILO, 2008: 106-11). The ILO went on to cost two new social assistance schemes in addition to the poverty-targeted programme envisaged in the Fifth National Development Plan (i.e. targeted on the poorest 10 percent of destitute households). A universal old-age pension (from the age of sixty) would cost approximately twice as much as the poverty-targeted programme. A child benefit programme would cost at least six times as much. Rolling out the poverty-targeted programme and introducing a universal old-age pension together would cost less than 1 percent of GDP, and was 'affordable'. A 'universal but limited child benefit scheme' (covering only the first child in each family) would cost an additional 1.2 per cent of GDP initially (ILO, 2008: 174).[23]

Despite assessments by the ILO and other agencies that expanded social assistance programmes was affordable, the Government of Zambia showed little real interest and made little effort to expand the existing cash transfers in line with the Fifth National Development Plan. In the face of this obduracy, donors seem to have backed off (Hickey *at al*., 2009: 78). First, GTZ withdrew from policy advocacy in late 2007, although it continued to provide technical support (ibid: 79). Then DfID took more of a back seat, adopting a 'wait-and-see approach' (ibid: 84). Donors' hesitancy may have reflected in part the changing political context within Zambia. In the 2006 election (see below), the opposition Patriotic Front (PF) challenged strongly the governing MMD, especially in urban areas. The PF accused the MMD of being slavishly subordinate to foreign organisations (including the International Monetary Fund) and investors (especially China). Whilst the MMD was re-elected, continuing pressure from the PF led the MMD government to assert its independence from international agencies, including through reducing income tax rates and not introducing VAT in 2007 (Larmer and Fraser, 2007: 635). In 2008, President Mwanawasa died, leading to a presidential by-election. The Minister of Finance tried to secure the MMD candidacy, but failed. In the by-election, the MMD's candidate, Rupiah Banda, was narrowly elected against challenges from the PF's Michael Sata and Hakainde Hichilema (of the United Party for National Development, UPND).

[23] Aguzzoni (2011) later built on the earlier ILO analysis. Despite strong economic growth, he reported that tax revenues in Zambia had declined in the 2000s, and tax arrears had risen. After a careful examination of public finances, Aguzzoni concluded that a combination of increased taxes, better debt management, redirection of expenditure, and modest borrowing would raise 3% of GDP in 2012, rising to 5% by 2015, making possible (inter alia) the full social protection programmes costed by the ILO in 2008. Donor funding would be required during the scaling up, he suggested, but not thereafter.

The Zambian government did remain formally committed to a national scale-up, and under the new president – Banda – did expand the cash transfer programme, although not at the pace envisaged in the Fifth National Development Plan. When, in 2009, the World Bank collated information from Zambia as part of an Africa-wide study, its researchers concluded that the set of five pilots

> … was expected to finish a final period of learning and adjustment by the end of 2008. Plans for the program's scale-up began in mid-2008. By the end of 2009, a 10-year plan was completed. National rollout has begun. (Garcia and Moore, 2012: 322).

Citing an interview in June 2009 with Michael Kaingu, Minister of MCDSS, Habasonda wrote that the Zambian government planned to scale up the cash transfer programme to an additional five districts in 2009, in addition to the five where the programme was already being implemented (2009: 7). In practice, however, as Hickey *et al*. noted in 2009, 'the current regime cannot be described as particularly pro-poor'. The (by then former) Minister of Finance had 'repeatedly stated that poverty does not exist, that "poor people" are simply lazy, and that policy should focus on wealth creation rather than poverty reduction'. The 'prevailing political discourse' emphasised 'the "productive" segment of the population', not the 'vulnerable' households in which no one was able to work (Hickey *et al*., 2009: 21). Cash transfers might 'have received favourable mentions in Presidential speeches', and proponents suggested 'that the only obstacle to scaling-up the ST pilots is now financial', but 'ownership within MCDSS is patchy and the Ministry lacks the capacity and political clout to make serious headway with this agenda'. Crucially, 'key decision-makers' in the Ministry of Finance and National Planning were not convinced of either the viability or the desirability of cash transfers. Writing after the appointment of a new Minister of Finance, they concluded that 'there is little evidence that the Minister of Finance and others in powerful positions have overcome their strong ideological opposition' (ibid: 22). This assessment was echoed the following year by Chiwele. Social protection had attracted 'little political support' and the Ministry of Finance remained 'unconvinced regarding its economic merits' (Chiwele, 2010: 5). The Social Welfare Policy document had never been completed. Chiwele suggested that ambivalence was not confined to the Ministry of Finance: 'Other line ministries continue to protect their areas and are not collaborating effectively with the MCDSS. Social protection programmes are too thinly scattered in various ministries. Larger ministries such as Finance, Health, and Education are able to marshal a lot of support' (ibid: 26).

In reality, the rollout did proceed, very slowly. In 2007, only 11,000 households benefitted. Four years later, in 2011, the number had more than doubled, to

26,500 households. This was, however, a small fraction of the rollout envisaged in the Fifth National Development Plan. The share of the budget allocated to social protection actually fell between 2008 and 2009 (see Table 1).

Table 1: Budgetary Allocation towards Social Policy (as percentage of total budget), 2005-11							
Sector	Year						
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Social Protection	N/A	N/A	3.8	4.2	2.5	2.7	2.7
Health	12	18	11	11.5	11.9	8.2	8.6
Education	24	26.9	15	15.4	17.2	19.9	18.6
Agriculture	N/A	5.7	8.8	5.8	7.2	6.8	5.9
Source: Zambian Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure (National Budgets).							

The gap between rhetoric and practice persisted under the Sixth National Development Plan (covering 2011-15), published in January 2011. The Plan's overall theme was 'Sustained economic growth and poverty reduction', with a 'strategic focus' on infrastructural and human development. The Plan included a commitment to scale up massively all social cash transfer programmes to reach many more beneficiaries. This promised expansion was least evident, however, with respect to the donors' preferred poverty-targeted cash transfers: The rollout would reach only 69,000 households, in one in five districts, by 2015. The promised expansion of cash transfers would be achieved through the PWAS (which would be expanded from 75,000 to 250,000 individuals), the school-feeding programme (to be expanded to 1 million children) and old age pensions (as piloted in Katete, to 10,000 elderly people in 2012, 50,000 in 2013, 100,000 in 2014 and 300,000 in 2015). The philosophy was that 'low capacity' households would be empowered, through programmes such as the Food Security Pack rather than cash transfers, with 'regular, predictable [cash] transfers' targeted on 'incapacitated' households (Zambia, 2011: 175-6). These promises were not matched by budgetary allocations, however. The projected allocation to social assistance barely rose between 2011 and 2015, despite the envisaged explosion in the number of beneficiaries (ibid: 177).[24] The contrast between rhetoric and budget may have been because the chapter on social

[24] Zambian government funding would double, but donor funding was predicted to shrink, so that by 2015, donors would fund only just over half of the expenditure.

protection had initially been omitted from the draft Plan, and was only re-inserted after protests from civil society and donors.[25]

By the end of the year, the MMD had lost power. In elections in September, incumbent President Banda was defeated by Michael Sata, and the MMD Government was replaced by a PF one. After a period of adjustment, the PF did accelerate the rollout of the poverty-targeted cash transfer programme, to 190,000 households by 2015. The PF Government also completed and published the National Social Protection Policy that had been in the pipeline for years (Siachiwena, 2016).

The policy reforms following the change of government suggest the importance of partisan politics and the limits to the influence of donors. Larmer and Fraser (2007) argue that the MMD government was consistently more responsive to aid donors than to its own constituents. They quote the then Finance Minister, Magande, saying (during public sector strikes in 2004 resulting from fiscal austerity imposed under the PRSP) that 'We are running the country but the budget is controlled by donors' (quoted, ibid: 623). Yet, with respect to social protection policy, the MMD government defied international agencies (led by the ILO) and donors (led by DfID) in resisting calls for the expansion of social assistance programmes. Pushed by donors, the MMD Government included grandiose promises in some of its documents, but its rhetoric was never matched by action.

The role of Ng'andu Magande

Between 2003 and 2011, international agencies and aid donors promoted SCTs as a mechanism for poverty reduction. They funded and ran pilot programmes, collected and presented evidence attesting to their benefits for both individual recipients and development more broadly, commissioned reports that concluded that expanded SCTs were affordable, provided technical assistance to government in drafting plans, took politicians and officials on study tours and to international seminars. They secured the inclusion of grandiose promises in (especially) the Sixth National Development Plan. But SCTs expanded very slowly, in terms of coverage and cost. They were clearly not a priority of President Mwanawasa's government. Little changed under his successor, President Banda.

The individual most commonly said to have blocked SCTs was the Minister of Finance and National Planning from July 2003 to November 2008,[26] Ng'andu

[25] Interview with Mutale Wakunuma, 20 March 2014, by Abigail Kabandula.

Peter Magande. Magande, the champion of fiscal austerity, opposed SCTs on narrow fiscal grounds. He also opposed them on more obviously ideological grounds. In his view, SCTs encouraged laziness, undermining both individual morality and national economic development.[27]

Magande had been brought into the MMD Government by President Mwanawasa in mid-2003. Mwanawasa himself had become MMD leader (and then President of Zambia) in 2001. Defections of MMD politicians, especially to the PF which was led by former MMD minister Michael Sata, forced Mwanawasa both to rebrand himself and to reconstitute a governing coalition. Mwanawasa promised Zambia a 'new deal', distancing himself from the corruption associated with Chiluba. He actively recruited opposition party MPs with the promise of government positions and other patronage. And he tried to bring at least one opposition party, the United Party for National Development (UPND) into a formal coalition. In 2003, the veteran Finance Minister, Emmanuel Kasonde, retired.[28] The UPND leader, Anderson Mazoka, declined to join a formal coalition, but offered Mwanawasa UPND members to help to run the country. Mwanawasa asked Magande to assume the position of Finance Minister. Magande was an old friend of Mazoka's and had stood unsuccessfully as a UPND candidate in the 2003 elections.

> I was UPND's and Mazoka's economic advisor … Mazoka informed Mwanawasa that he could get any capable UPND member to help him run the country. I guess that Mwanawasa identified me as one who could help in the financial sector … I had met Mwanawasa only once in 1994 at a workshop in Kitwe just before he resigned as Vice President. The meeting in his office in July 2003 was our second in our lives.[29]

Mwanawasa first appointed Magande as an MP to enable him take up ministerial office, prompting criticisms for 'forcing the election of prospective ministers through parliament'.[30] At about the same time Mwanawasa also appointed Dipak Patel, an MP from another opposition party (the Forum for Democracy and Development), as Minister of Commerce, Trade and Industry.[31]

---

[26] Magande remained chair of the MMD's Economy and Finance Committee until 2010.

[27] Unless specified otherwise, this section is based on an interview with Magande, on 30 March 2014, by Abigail Kabandula and Singumbe Muyeba, supplemented with subsequent personal communications.

[28] Ntomba (2016: 57) describes Kasonde as having been sacked by Mwanawasa.

[29] Personal communication from Magande, 27 July 2014.

[30] *Business Day*, 7 July 2003, accessed at: http://allafrica.com/stories/200307070215.html.

[31] Patel has been an MMD MP (for Lusaka Central) and minister in the 1990s, defecting in 1996.

Magande had considerable experience in government. After completing a Masters degree in Agricultural Economics at Makerere in 1974 and working briefly at the University of Zambia, Magande had joined the civil service. Over the next twenty-three years he held senior positions in various ministries, including as Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Trade, the Ministry of Decentralisation and the Ministry of Agriculture and Water Development, and as Director of Budget in the Ministry of Finance. From 1996 to 2000 he served as Secretary-General of the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States, based in Brussels. He was a 'star technocrat' (Ntomba, 2016: 57).

Magande was appointed to sort out the economic and financial mess that Mwanawasa's 'New Deal' Government had inherited from the Chiluba regime. After years of shrinkage, the Zambian economy had begun to grow again, but very slowly. The country had a double digit inflation rate, and civil servants were demanding large wage increases. In 2002, Anglo-American had pulled out of Zambia, resulting in the closure of a major copper mine. The budget deficit was growing, and the country had massive debts (more than US $7 billion in foreign debt and more than K4.2 trillion in domestic debt). Foreign aid donors had not delivered the pledged budget support.[32]

Magande's choice of policies was determined in part by the economic crisis, but they also reflected his ideology. Magande (born in 1947) saw himself as a self-made man, who had prospered through determination. As a child he had herded his father's cattle. He had seized the opportunities provided by the expanding schooling system, and ended up with a Masters degree. Magande was a Tonga-speaker from the South, and had imbibed the regional culture of free enterprise – as had his friend Mazoka (the UPND leader, a retired businessman whose last job was as Central Africa CEO for mining giant Anglo-American) and Mazoka's successor at the UPND (Hakainde Hichilema, also a very successful businessman).

As Finance Minister, Magande sought to reinvigorate development planning, cut excessive government spending, promote free enterprise and encourage domestic and foreign investment. His first budget speech, in February 2004, had the theme 'Austerity for Posterity'. He defined this as 'the observance of fiscal prudence and postponement of needless present consumption in order to secure our future sustained prosperity.' The 2004 budget would be 'anchored on the premise that the empowerment of the Zambian people must be the only reason

[32] Budget addresses, National Assembly, by Emmanuel Kasonde, 1 March 2002 and 31 Jan 2003.

for all our development endeavours … This will secure sustained and broad-based development, which will create wealth, reduce poverty and raise living standards of all the citizens.'[33] In this and subsequent budget (and other) speeches, Magande promised to focus public expenditure on 'priority' sectors, including agriculture, mining, infrastructure health, education, tourism and enterprise development, so as 'to promote productivity, attract investment, expand markets [and] provide adequate support services.'[34] Direct poverty reduction programmes were not emphasized, except insofar as they were required as a condition for debt relief. Poverty was to be addressed indirectly, through ensuring that economic growth was 'more broad-based and addresses the pockets of extreme poverty found in our midst.'[35] Improved agricultural output was a clear priority, and public funds were allocated for fertiliser subsidies to small-scale farmers, purchases of maize from these farmers, and the Food Security Pack programme for 'vulnerable but viable' farmers. These programmes 'empowered the rural population by creating wealth and distancing them from poverty'.[36]

Individuals had to contribute to 'the realisation of the national goals'. Government policies would therefore 'focus on empowering individuals to participate in national development', through creating 'space and opportunities for individuals'.[37] 'Each one of us must make a contribution to the wellbeing of our country', he told Parliament in 2005.[38] 'The journey to prosperity requires hard work, dedication, focus and concerted effort from each one of us', he stressed in 2006; 'My challenge to fellow Zambians is that they must apply their minds and start thinking as entrepreneurs, ready to produce and contribute positively to the development of "Mother Zambia"'.[39]

> Sir, may I re-reiterate that developing this country is the sole responsibility of the Zambian people. The Government has taken the lead with definite key policy initiatives and I challenge the private sector and all Zambians to do the rest. I have faith in my fellow countrymen and women because they have the skill, innovation, entrepreneurial spirit and the appetite to move the Zambian economy to the next level of development.[40]

---

[33] Budget address, Magande, 6 February, 2004.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Budget address, Magande, 28 January 2005.
[37] Budget address, Magande, 9 February, 2007.
[38] Budget address, Magande, 2005
[39] Budget address, Magande, 3 February 2006.
[40] Ibid.

In what was to be his final budget speech, in January 2008, Magande spoke of the Government's 'increasing investments in education, health and skills' which had enhanced 'the capabilities and capacities of our people'. Through tax and other reforms, 'the New Deal Government has chosen to create an environment that supports individual initiatives and ingenuity'.[41] With strong economic growth, Magande could claim that, 'for the first time in a generation', 'each one of us' has 'the opportunity to choose and follow the path to future prosperity'.[42]

Magande insisted that he had not reined in Government expenditure simply to 'start giving it away'.[43] He was prepared to provide minimal safety nets for the very poor,[44] which were 'easily' affordable if a 'stringent method' (of targeting) was used. But cash transfers might undermine the impetus to individual empowerment, encouraging instead a 'culture of dependency' or 'dependency syndrome'. 'What we need really are things that make people feel, this is now mine, I am in control. And that's how I was trying to phase out this belief that getting this money is okay. You are being assisted. But it's just for now. Tomorrow, if something happens, they can forget you'.[45]

Magande's objection to cash transfers was rooted in his own personal narrative of hard work and determination. 'From where I come', he told us, 'we don't beg … If you said you are poor [46], ah, it's derogatory.' Children must be taught to be responsible: 'If only your children can learn from an early age when they are young, that money doesn't fall from trees; it falls from your own work; then these children are going to say, I have to aim to be somebody to do something to earn the money.' He added:

> … [M]aybe it's the environment in which I grew up in, when I was five years old, my parents were already telling me, you will get old; now, whatever we give you, you look after it. If we give you a chicken, make sure when you come from school, you look after it, after school check if your chicken is still here or it has been taken by a hawk. If we tell you to go in the bush, you are looking after cattle, when you bring them, you count them. Because if you come every day and one is left in the bush, and it's eaten, they won't reproduce. Since we are old now, and you are young, you have to build on what we have. [47]

[41] Budget address, Magande, 25 January 2008.
[42] Ibid.
[43] Interview, Magande.
[44] Budget address, 2004.
[45] Interview, Magande.
[46] Magande used a Tonga word for the poor.
[47] Interview, Magande.

When asked what his solution would be for people who could not work (i.e. were ‘incapacitated’), Magande insisted that they should be encouraged to be responsible and independent:

> It’s better that we buy them two goats, then they milk the goats, and they have that milk. But they are also beginning to learn to be responsible for their life, that once you have property, you look after it … I would rather we stop giving people free money.’ Even elderly widows should be ‘challenged’: Don’t they have adult children who can produce their own food and feed their mothers?[48]

Magande relates that he was not bothered when he heard about the Kalomo pilot scheme because it was funded by foreign aid donors. He became more concerned, however, when it was proposed that the Government applied for a loan (from the ADB) to finance the expansion of the pilot (see above). This seemed to him to be an external initiative that was being imposed upon the Government of Zambia. He pressurised Mwanawasa into blocking the proposal:

> So at that point really, I used my relationship with the president. … I told him when I went there, [to] State House, we actually differed, that if he insists, it is not me implementing the programme, I will leave you to implement it…when you need anyone to talk about it, I will not be the one, the minister responsible will talk about the programme. So when I went to explain this programme to him, he said “no, perhaps then you don’t get that money, if we can get donors, no problem”. So basically, that is how the programme couldn’t move with this huge amount of money.[49]

In Magande’s view, it made no sense to accept a loan for unnecessary social spending after having worked hard to have Zambia’s debts written off under the “Highly Indebted Poor Country” (HIPC) initiative.

Donors lobbied other Government ministers and even the president himself, but Magande enjoyed considerable authority within the Government. Magande was reported to be one of the few ministers who would stand up to Mwanawasa. ‘He would tell him, “Mr President, we can’t do that because we don’t have the money”, and Mwanawasa would concede’, a former minister told one journalist (Ntomba, 2016: 58). Mwanawasa himself was engaged in chronic conflict with

[48] Interview, Magande.
[49] Interview, Magande.

the political barons in his coalition, many of whom were actual or prospective rivals, and probably found it useful to allow a technocrat to wield considerable authority. Magande may even have been Mwanawasa's preferred successor.[50]

Magande had other concerns over SCTs. In addition to promoting dependency and laziness, he suggested, they were also often misspent. He told us that a report had shown that up to one half of the cash benefit was 'misapplied'. He asked his officials 'what is this now? You are saying misapplied, you have to describe what you mean'. Magande then related the story that he had been told. The story revolved around an 'old old woman' who was caring for three or four orphans. After receiving the cash benefit she had visitors, so she went off to buy chibuku (locally-brewed beer), to show off. After this, only 10 Kwacha remained. 'Then I said, but have you investigated, whose children are these? And they would sometimes say, well, these are parents who died from HIV, AIDS. And I said: Didn't they leave any oxen, [an] ox plough, or any fields?' In Magande's view, poor people are often 'reckless', whose irresponsibility and indiscipline rendered them poor. What was needed, he thought, was strong leadership:

> …We have to get a very strong governor who will tell people "if you will not plough your field, you will get hungry, and I won't mind whether you die or not". Our country is not moving forward we are still missing the opportunities of everybody being rich. Because we have the resources, but there are some people who just don't want to get involved in development. They are spending their time doing something else you know…[51]

He added: 'To me, really, that is how we should treat even all these that you find they might be vulnerable'.

Magande was critical also of the way that the SCTs were implemented. He questioned the choice of sites for the pilots. From Southern Province himself, he wondered why Kalomo had been chosen as the initial site. 'By the time I arrived in 2004', he later said, 'Kalomo was the highest maize producer in Southern Province. So I said, "what is all this, what is going on? What are we trying to solve?"'. Moreover, he thought, the means test was not implemented effectively, and the beneficiaries included people who were not poor. Some pay point managers withheld part of the benefit, and told the beneficiaries that, if they complained, they would be removed from the list of beneficiaries. This all

[50] His widow, Maureen Mwanawasa, made the claim in a media statement shortly after his funeral: http://www.zambian-economist.com/2008_08_01_archive.html.
[51] Interview, Magande.

reminded him, he said, of the chronic mismanagement of public programmes under Kenneth Kaunda. In view of all of these concerns, Magande said that he told his officials that he did not want to see anything to do with social cash transfers on his desk.

Magande's views on cash transfers for the poor reflect aspects of neoliberal economic and social thought: The poor should work harder, plan for the future and take advantage of opportunities to lift themselves out of poverty; the role of the state is to facilitate such opportunities, including through public education (i.e. investments in human capital) and infrastructural development, but also through freeing up markets for private enterprise, reining in taxes and removing unnecessary regulation. State interventions risk eroding incentives to work, fostering dependency and breeding corruption.

But to reduce Magande's views to 'neoliberalism' can obscure their roots in local, Zambian thought. Magande's views entailed an extreme version of the conservative liberalism that was widespread among political and economic elites across much of Southern Africa. As Kalebe-Nyamongo has shown with respect to Malawi, much of the elite holds highly disparaging views of the poor and of the causes of poverty, and prioritises government programmes that expand production over those that redistribute to the poor (including through cash transfers) (Kalebe-Nyamongo and Marquette, 2014). The spectre of 'dependency' stalked the corridors of many State Houses in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries (see, for example, Seekings, 2016, on Botswana). In some cases, including Botswana, this was combined with an ethic of responsibility: The state should avoid fostering dependency but at the same time had responsibilities to the poor (ibid). Almost everywhere, however, elites saw work – and hard work – as the solution to poverty, and worried about undermining the value of and need to work.

Conservative liberal ideas may have especially deep roots in Southern Zambia. Under colonial rule, small and medium-sized farmers prospered across much of Southern Province (Momba, 1989), providing a political base for the African National Congress led by Harry Nkumbula (Macola, 2010). Macola quotes a close colleague of Nkumbula criticising Kaunda's doctrine of "humanism" in 1968: in the South, he told the National Assembly, 'achievement ... was far more respected than anything else even than the man ... [I]n our society we did not regard everybody as equal. Even up to the present moment, Sir, at home a poor man is looked down [on] in pure village life' (quoted in ibid: 118; see also Macola, 2014). Magande – like the UPND's leaders Mazoka and Hichilema – was a strong believer in free enterprise in part because of the economic history of the Tonga in southern Zambia. These neoliberal ideas sometimes fuse with evangelical Christianity, with its emphasis on individualism over community, and its acceptance of inequality.

Magande was not opposed to all public policies that entailed hefty expenditure. He seems to have supported the MMD government’s heavy spending on fertiliser subsidies, price support and other programmes that encouraged small and medium-sized farmers to produce more. This ‘productivist’ approach was consistent with the emphasis on hard work because the state was encouraging farmers to work harder – quite the opposite of cash transfers, in Magande’s view, because cash transfers encouraged people to work less. Magande’s beliefs may have had strong neoliberal features, but they should not be collapsed into neoliberalism.

Someone like Magande was attractive to a president like Mwanawasa in part because of the promise of economic growth. Magande was appointed Finance Minister at a time of economic crisis, and after a decade in which the MMD had stopped the country’s economic decline but failed to generate much in the way of economic growth. Magande was attractive also because of the character of the MMD.

The MMD

Magande’s authority depended in part on his close relationship with Mwanawasa and in part on the congruence between his positions on key issues and those of the MMD more broadly. The MMD is usually understood as a non-programmatic, patrimonial coalition of ‘big men’, each seeking to expand his political patronage or simply to enrich himself. This understanding of the MMD underestimates, however, the parameters of its approach to public policy, especially under Mwanawasa (2001-08). The MMD may not have been a programmatic party, but it was not ideologically neutral or all-encompassing, and its ideology, however, vague, did impose some limits on the policies that could be adopted.

The MMD began as a widely-encompassing pro-democracy movement, with strong roots not only in the trade unions (whose importance had grown when Kaunda prohibited opposition parties) but also among students, churches and business interests. Within two years of defeating UNIP in the 1991 elections, the MMD began to fragment, with the expulsion or defections of a reformist leaders, some of whom formed in 1993 a rival National Party. In 2000-01, amidst the politicking that accompanied the struggle to succeed Chiluba, a series of MMD leaders defected to form new parties: former Defence Minister

Benjamin Mwila led one faction into a new Republican Party; other defectors formed the Heritage Party; former MMD deputy national secretary Paul Tembo led another faction into the Forum for Democracy and Development (before he himself was assassinated); and MMD national secretary Michael Sata led a large faction into the Patriotic Front (Ntomba, 2016: 21-9). In the run-up to the 2001 elections, more than fifty of the MMD's 130 or so MPs defected (Rakner and Svåsand, 2004: 53). Former president Chiluba himself endorsed Sata (standing for the PF) against Mwanawasa in the 2006 election. In the 1990s and early 2000s, the breakaway parties did not seem to offer any clear programmatic or ideological alternative to the MMD. Even UNIP, which began to resuscitate itself after its drubbing in 1991, retreated from Kaunda's pre-1990 statism to embrace a largely undefined 'social market' approach. The quality of political debate was poor (Burnell, 1995, 2001; Rakner and Svåsand, 2004). The overall party system was characterised by 'personality politics, elite factionalism and ethno-regional coalition building, rather than a contest of alternative policies' (Larmer and Fraser, 2008: 621).

Mwanawasa himself had resigned as Vice-President in 1994 in protest against Chiluba's leadership. After unsuccessfully challenging Chiluba for the presidency of the party in 1995, Mwanawasa withdrew from politics until 2000, when Chiluba brought him back into political life, endorsing him as the MMD's candidate for the presidency of Zambia in the 2001 elections – perhaps precisely because Mwanawasa was not a provincial baron. Mwanawasa won the presidential election, albeit with only 29 percent of the presidential vote – which was enough to win in a crowded field. The MMD did not win a majority of parliamentary seats, however. Faced with both compromised legitimacy and no parliamentary majority, Mwanawasa had to employ the standard tricks of recruiting ministers and MPs from other parties, including the former televangelist pastor Nevers Mumba as national vice-president. Mwanawasa responded to his narrow victory in 2001 by dissociating himself from the 'Old Guard' within the MMD, and by seeking to rebuild support for the MMD outside of the Copperbelt and Luapula – i.e. areas that were likely to swing behind Sata and the PF. Mwanawasa's re-election in 2006, when his share of the vote rose to 43 percent, was in part due to the MMD's success in retaining the loyalty of some former Chiluba-supporting barons from the Northern Province. Mwanawasa proceeded to distribute cabinet positions to reward barons from the provinces that had voted for him and the MMD (Larmer and Fraser, 2007: 635).

Most scholars assess that the MMD's position on public policy entailed a rather general commitment to market liberalisation. This did not distinguish it from the other major political parties that opposed it in the 2001 elections. Rakner and Svåsand examined the manifestos of the four major political parties that contested the 2001 elections (i.e. the MMD, UNIP, UPND and FDD). They assessed that their proposed economic policies were much the same. All four parties promised pro-poor development, with limited state intervention in generally liberalised markets. The opposition parties criticized the incumbent MMD not for its strategy but for its poor performance in implementing policies. They concluded that the parties did not 'offer the electorate distinctive choices' with respect to either economic policy or governance, and that the lack of distinctive policies 'inhibits the parties' ability to attract a stable electorate and may also make it easier for politicians to switch between parties'. The party system might have been competitive but it was not very pluralist (Renick and Svåsand, 2004: 56-8).

In the standard accounts of Zambian politics, ideology only became important in party politics with the rise of the PF in the mid-2000s. In 2001, the primary challenge to Mwanawasa's MMD came from the UPND, whose roots were in the South. During the 2000s, however, Sata and the PF mobilized very effectively on the Copperbelt and in the North, initially criticizing the investor-friendly policies of the MMD government (and the rival opposition UPND) and pushing instead for expanded roles for the state. Sata adopted a populist ideological position, criticizing the MMD regime for being in hock to business (especially 'foreigners') and neglecting the poor, especially the urban poor (Fraser and Larmer, 2007; Resnick, 2013). In the 2006 presidential election Sata came first in three provinces (Copperbelt, Lusaka and Luapula) with 29 percent of the national vote. The PF won every parliamentary constituency in Lusaka and the Copperbelt, Following this impressive (if unsuccessful) performance, Sata and the PF moderated somewhat their rhetoric so as to render themselves more electable. Mwanawasa responded by distancing his government from the international financial institutions. In other words, both Sata and Mwanawasa revised their public positions on policies in order to maintain or increase their electoral support (Cheeseman and Hinfelaar, 2010: 62).

There is a danger here of underestimating the importance of ideology, in at least the MMD's rhetoric. The MMD's election manifesto in 1991 had proclaimed the party as the party of free enterprise and economic growth through market liberalisation. Its economic programme focused on expanding opportunities for men and women to work to earn a living and to contribute to the economy: 'MMD believes that economic prosperity for all can best be created by free men and women through free enterprise; by economic and social justice involving all the productive resources – human, material and financial, and by liberalising the industry, trade and commerce, with the government only creating an enabling environment whereby economic growth must follow as it has in all the world's successful countries' (MMD, 1991). This meant that the extremely poor, most of whom were unable to work, were left out. The Manifesto restricted social welfare to contributory pensions, with only a vague mention of ‘safety nets for [the] destitute’ (ibid). In its 1996 manifesto, the MMD again emphasised economic growth and market liberalisation. It claimed also to have ‘developed a comprehensive policy to deal with the needs of vulnerable groups in society’, i.e. ‘ensuring that the aged, disabled, children and destitute will be afforded public assistance through well developed social safety nets’ – but did not elaborate (MMD, 1996). In 2001, the MMD was the only party to include any discussion of social welfare in its manifesto. But its programme envisaged that civil society organisation would take care of orphans and vulnerable children, and kin would care for the elderly (MMD, 2001). In short, the MMD consistently employed a growth-oriented rhetoric. The fact that other parties – at least until the rise of the PF – did not differ significantly from the MMD does not mean that ideology was unimportant for policy-making, but rather suggests that the MMD espoused an ideology that had become, for a while, hegemonic.

In practice, Chiluba purged the MMD of many of its more committed reform-minded leaders, and many Zambian businessmen became estranged from Chiluba and his increasingly patrimonial supporters (Handley, 2008). Mwanawasa, however, governed differently – and emphasized this by labelling his government a ‘New Deal’ government. Ideology became more important under Mwanawasa who, not unlike Magande, was not a party political baron but was rather a technocrat who tended to micromanage much government policy. His government embraced ‘development’ more clearly than Chiluba’s had done. It completed the poverty review process and qualified for debt relief. It revived development planning through the Fifth and Sixth NDPs. It pursued conservative fiscal policies (as recommended by the international financial institutions and donors) but refused to raise value-added taxes (as recommended by international financial institutions) and expanded support for farmers through both purchases of maize at higher prices and subsidized fertilizer and other inputs (in defiance of the international financial institutions and most donors).

As Rakner (2014) shows, tax became an important electoral issue during the 2000s. The MMD had reformed taxation in the 1990s, creating a semi-autonomous Zambia Revenue Authority and introducing both ‘Pay as You Earn’ (PAYE) income taxation and a Value-Added Tax (VAT). By the 2000s, they were resistant to further increases in taxation. Opposition parties – UNIP in 1991, the PF from 2006 – promised to raise taxes, especially on the mining companies. In 2008, the MMD government appropriated one of the PF’s campaign issues, raising existing taxes on mining revenues and introducing a new provision for taxing windfall profits – only to repeal, under pressure, the windfall tax the following year. Tax was to be a very prominent issue in the 2011 election.

Magande's opposition to cash transfers was consistent with the MMD government's general approach, which was not so much neoliberal as productivist, with a strong emphasis on raising production, including through selective public expenditure. Cash transfers were seen – rightly or wrongly – as undermining production. The most that social protection might do is to protect the 'vulnerable', and certainly not the poor. In this, Mwanawasa's approach prefigured aspects of the approach taken a little later in Malawi by Bingu Mutharika (and, later, his brother Peter Mutharika): spend heavily on support for small and (especially) medium-sized farmers rather than on cash transfers.

After Mwanawasa's death, the MMD to some extent reverted to the politics of patronage. In the competition to succeed Mwanawasa as the MMD's candidate for the national presidency, the technocrat Magande lost heavily to Mwanawasa's last vice-president, Rupiah Banda. Banda mobilized support among the key kingmakers within the MMD, including especially foreign minister Vernon Mwaanga. As Cheeseman and Hinfelaar noted, quoting a Zambian journalist, 'Mwaanga's support for Banda, and the internal divisions within MMD between pro- and anti- Banda camps, is best understood in the context of an intra-party tussle between competing factions that represent "two distinct political ideologies that have characterized the struggle for control during the MMD's rule"' (2010: 60). The Mwaanga faction comprised mostly former UNIP and MMD barons, striving to regain control over state patronage, whilst the Magande faction comprised 'reform-minded Young Turks' (ibid). This was a struggle over the character of the party and the uses of state power.

Banda's government did very slowly expand cash transfers, and promised to do much more, but its focus remained on production and growth. The MMD's 2011 election manifesto emphasised the need to address poverty in rural areas through persisting with 'policies and programmes designed to empower the rural people to graduate from subsistence to cash crop farming to improve their living standards' (MMD, 2011). In the election, Banda and the MMD lost to Sata and the PF, who had campaigned around the slogan 'more money in your pocket' (Resnick, 2013).

Magande's ideology was consistent with that of the MMD. The MMD Minister of Community Development and Social Services, Dr Michael Kaingu, who was responsible for most cash transfer programmes, shared the productivist priorities of Magande and the MMD:

> We don't even need to put money into the rural areas, what we need is to create opportunities. For example, if it is in timber, let

> people realise that the bed they sleep on is from timber, if we have a carpenter who makes beds, then we must help him find market.[52]

Kaingu defended Magande, insisting – implausibly – that Magande had not been opposed to scale up the programmes. Kaingu went on to explain, more plausibly, that Magande 'was aware of … competing priorities'; in order to fund infrastructure and other investments, the Government had to be very careful about spending money on cash transfers and other 'consumption' expenditures.[53]

In several other countries, cash transfer programmes were promoted strongly by technocrats and politicians in the ministry responsible for them. In Zambia, the MCDSS/MCDMCH was unusually weak as a state institution (Habasonda, 2009). Its weakness was exacerbated by the rapid turnover of its leadership. Between 2004 and 2008 the ministry had three different ministers[54] (whilst the Ministry of Finance had just one). Dr Michael Kaingu then served for three years, until the 2011 elections. Over the same period of seven years, the Ministry had no fewer than six Permanent Secretaries,[55] whilst the Department of Social Welfare had four directors.[56] These frequent changes in leadership meant that advocates of cash transfers – most within donor agencies – had to repeatedly start again to bring the minister and Permanent Secretary up to speed.

DfID consultants diagnosed in 2009 that donors had focused their lobbying too narrowly on the weak MCDSS/MCDMCH and neglected other parts of the state:

> 'DfID might have built good relationships with other donors, and with some (weak) civil society organisations, but its performance in terms of building relationships with parliamentarians and relevant government officials is less impressive. The main problem here is the decision to work through a notoriously weak ministry – MCDSS – as the main partner. … Although DfID Advisors have generally been able to develop good relationships with key

[52] Interview with Michael Kaingu, 10 March 2014, by Abigail Kabandula.
[53] Ibid.
[54] Judith Kapijimpanga (2004-05), Stephen Manjata (2005-07) and Cathrine Namugala (2007-08).
[55] Teddy Kasonso, Barbra Chilangwa, Gladys Christopher, Chilipamushi Davidson, Ambassador Tens Mapoma and Sherry Thole.
[56] Mzyamba Grace, Monica Masisani, Gilbert Makambwe and Rosemary Mutupo. We are grateful to Obbie Musama (MCDMCH) for his assistance in compiling these lists of ministers, PSs and directors.

> personnel within MCDSS, it has been much less adept at building relationships with those in the powerful MFNP.' (Hickey *et al*., 2009: 84)

It might well be the case that the donors focused their efforts on a weak ministry, but it does not follow that a different strategy would have led to a different outcome. The ministry was weak in part because MMD ideology accorded little importance to support for unproductive members of the population. Persuading other ministries that the Government should spend scarce resources on cash transfers would have run up against the productivist ideology that was hegemonic within the MMD and MMD-fun state.

Conclusion

The MMD in the 1990s degenerated from a pro-democracy movement into a patrimonial party, dedicated to using public resources to entrench and deepen the power of provincial barons so that they could continue to enrich themselves at public expense. For Harland (2014), this patrimonialism persisted in the 2000s, under Mwanawasa and then Banda. In her analysis, 'meeting clientelist demands' always took precedence within the MMD (Harland, 2014: 380). She provides the example of the Farmer Input Support Programme, which was supposed to reach all small-scale farmers but (according to research by Jayne *et al*., 2011) was often captured by non-poor farmers (Harland, 2014: 380).

It is widely imagined that aid donors exert considerable influence on policy-making across most of Africa. This paper has examined a case where this was not true, at least in one particular sector (social protection) in one country (Zambia) at a particular time (the 2000s). The Government of Zambia between 2003 and 2011 consistently resisted pressure from donors to expand (and take financial responsibility for) social cash transfer programmes. This resistance was not based in patrimonialism, however, at least during the period up to 2008 when Mwanawasa died and Magande ceased to be Minister of Finance. Rather, it was based in the conflicting priorities of powerful, members of the Mwanawasa governments, including especially his Minister of Finance, Magande. Magande conformed with the preferences of international agencies and donors with respect to macro-economic policy, development planning and a hard line on corruption. But he resisted the clamour for cash transfer programmes.

Magande's criticisms of cash transfer programmes – which were in practice backed up by Mwanawasa – were, in large part, ideological. In Magande's view, the MMD government was pro-poor only in the sense that economic growth, responsible development planning and selective support for farmers were in the interests of the poor. It was not a ‘pro-poor party’ in terms of direct spending on the poor through anything other than the most parsimonious social assistance programmes. In Magande’s view, however, such programmes were not really pro-poor, because they encouraged demeaning and economically counter-productive behaviour. Insofar as Magande viewed the free market and economic growth as the only real ways of providing the poor with opportunities to pull themselves out of poverty, this was a starkly neoliberal ideology, shorn of even the sense of responsibility for the poor that characterised the New Liberalism in the early and mid-twentieth century, and even more benign and paternalist versions of conservatism. But Magande (and the MMD under Mwanawasa) were not entirely opposed to state interventions, spending heavily on agricultural support programmes. These were productive, and consistent with the worldview that hard work should be rewarded.

Magande led and personified the resistance against cash transfers. But the views that cash transfers promoted ‘dependency’ and undermined the drive for hard work for national development, and that the government should instead empower individuals through opening opportunities for the dedicated and determined, were not unique to Magande. They were hegemonic within the MMD under Mwanawasa, and remained important even after Mwanawasa’s death and Magande’s departure from government. It was to take a change of government – with the election of Sata as president in 2013 – that was to open the space for any significant acceleration of the rollout of cash transfers in Zambia (Siachiwena, 2016).

References

Aguzzoni, L. 2011. The Concept of Fiscal Space and its Applicability to the Development of Social Protection Policy in Zambia. *ESS Paper* 28 Geneva: International Labour Organization, Extension of Social Security.

Barrientos, A., Hickey, S., Simutanyi, N.& D. Wood. 2005. Report of Study on Drivers of Change for a National Social Protection Scheme in Zambia, a study undertaken for DfID Zambia. Brighton: Institute for Development Studies.

Burnell, P. 1995. The politics of poverty and the poverty of politics in Zambia's Third Republic. *Third World Quarterly*, 16(4): 675-90.

-----. 2001. The first two MMD administrations in Zambia: millennium dawn or millennium sunset?. *Contemporary Politics*, 7(2): 95-111.

Cheeseman, N., & Hinfelaar, M. 2010. Parties, platforms, and political mobilization: the Zambian presidential election of 2008. *African Affairs* 109(434): 51-76.

Chiwele, D. K. 2010. Assessing the Administrative Capacity and Costs of Cash Transfer Schemes in Zambia. Brasilia: International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth.

Garcia, M., & C. Moore. 2012. *The Cash Dividend: The Rise of Cash Transfer Programs in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Washington D.C.: The World Bank.

Goldberg, J. Not dated, c2003. Pros and Cons of social transfer schemes for destitute households in Zambia. Included as Annex 3 in Schubert. 2003b.

Habasonda, L. 2009. Political Economy of Cash Transfers in Zambia. London: Overseas Development Institute.

Handley, A. 2008. *Business and the State in Africa: Economic Policy-Making in the Neo-Liberal Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harland, C. 2011. Can the expansion of social protection bring about social transformation in African countries? The case of Zambia, paper presented at conference on 'Social Protection for Social Justice', Institute of Development Studies, Brighton, UK (April).

-----. 2014. Can the Expansion of Social Protection bring about Social Transformation in African Countries? The Case Of Zambia. *European Journal of Development Research*, 6(3): 370-86.

Harvey, P. & K. Savage. 2006. No Small Change: Oxfam GB Malawi and Zambia Emergency Cash Transfer Projects: a Synthesis of key learning. London: Overseas Development Institute.

Hickey, S.,Wheeler, R.S., Guenther, B. & I. Macauslan. 2009. Promoting Social Transfers: DFID and the Politics of Influencing. *Working Paper* 32. London: Department for International Development, August.

Holmes, R. 2007. Social Protection and Low Capacity Households in Zambia. Final draft (August). London: Overseas Development Institute and Department for International Development.

-----. & R. Slater. 2008. Social protection for low capacity households in Zambia. *Project Briefing* No.11. London: Department for International Development.

ILO. 2008. Zambia: Social Protection Expenditure and Performance Review and Social Budget. Geneva: International Labour Organisation).

Kalebe-Nyamongo, C. K. & H. Marquette. 2014. Elite Attitudes towards Cash Transfers and the Poor in Malawi. *DLP Research Paper* 30. Birmingham: Developmental Leadership Programme, University of Birmingham.

Larmer, M., & A. Fraser. 2007. Of Cabbages and King Cobra: Populist politics and Zambia's 2006 election. *African Affairs* 106(425): 611-637.

Macola, G. 2010. *Liberal Nationalism in Central Africa: A Biography of Harry Mwaanga Nkumbula*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

-----. (2014), untitled contribution to Debating Zambia. *Africa* 84(4): 663-6.

Mboozi, B. 2008. Zambia social protection case study. Presentation given at the International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth. Available at: http://www.ipc-undp.org/doc_africa_brazil/Zambia.pdf.

MMD. 1991. Election Manifesto, 1991. Lusaka: Movement for Multiparty Democracy.

-----. 1996. Election Manifesto, 1996. Lusaka: Movement for Multiparty Democracy.

-----. 2001. Election Manifesto, 2001. Lusaka: Movement for Multiparty Democracy.

Momba, J. 1989. The state, rural class formation and peasant political participation in Zambia: the case of Southern Province. *African Affairs*, 88(352): 331-357.

Mwanawasa, L. 2006. Foreword to the Fifth National Development Plan. Lusaka: Government of Zambia.

Ntomba, R. 2016. *The Mwanawasa Years: An Analysis of his Presidency*. Lusaka: Gadsden.

Rakner, L. 2014. Taxation, elections and populism: The salience of taxation in Zambian election campaigns, 2001-2011. Unpublished paper.

-----. & L. Svåsand. 2004. From dominant to competitive party system: The Zambian experience 1991–2001. *Party Politics*, 10(1): 49-68.

Resnick, D. 2013. *Urban Poverty and Party Populism in African Democracies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schubert, B. 2003a. Social Welfare Interventions for AIDS Affected households in Zambia. Report for GTZ/MCDSS (March).

-----. 2003b. Social Cash Transfers for AIDS Affected and other Incapacitated and Destitute Households in Zambia. Report for GTZ/MCDSS (August).

-----. 2005a. The Pilot Social Cash Transfer Scheme, Kalomo District, Zambia. CPRC Working Paper 52: Chronic Poverty Research Centre.

-----. 2005b. Social Cash Transfers – Reaching the Poorest. Eschborn: GTZ.

-----. & S. Beales. 2006. Social cash transfers for Africa: A transformative agenda for the 21st century. Inter-governmental regional conference report, Livingstone, Zambia, 20-23 March 2006. London: HelpAge International.

Seekings, J. 2016. Building a Conservative Welfare State in Botswana. *CSSR Working Paper* 388. Cape Town: Centre for Social Science Research, University of Cape Town.

Siachiwena, H. 2016. Social protection policy reform in Zambia during the Sata presidency, 2011-2014. *CSSR Working Paper* 379. Cape Town: Centre for Social Science Research, University of Cape Town.

Tembo, G., & N. Freeland. 2008. Impact of Social Cash Transfers on Welfare, Investment, and Education in Zambia. Lusaka: MCDSS.

-----., -----., B. Chimai & E. Schüring. 2014. Social Cash Transfers and Household Welfare: Evidence from Zambia's Oldest Scheme. *Applied Economics and Finance* 1(1). Accessed at: file:///C:/Users/T0032076/Downloads/354-2049-1-PB%20(2).pdf.

Wietler, K. 2007. The impact Of Social Cash Transfers on Informal Safety Nets in Kalomo District Zambia. Lusaka: MCDSS/GTZ.

Wolter, B. 2004. Zambia: Freed from the daily struggle for survival. In GTZ, *Social Health Insurance: Systems of Solidarity. Experiences from German Development Cooperation*. Eschborn, Germany: GTZ.

Zambia, Republic of. 2004. First PRSP Implementation Progress Report January 2002 – June 2003. Report to IMF, December. Lusaka: Ministry of Finance and National Planning.

-----. 2005a. Second PRSP Implementation Progress Report July 2003 – July 2004. Report to IMF, March. Lusaka: Ministry of Finance and National Planning.

-----. 2005b. Second PRSP Implementation Progress Report 2004: Supplement on Policies and Objectives for 2005. Report to IMF, February. (Lusaka: Ministry of Finance and National Planning.

-----. 2006. Fifth National Development Plan, 2006-2010. Lusaka: Ministry of Finance and National Planning.

-----. 2011. Sixth National Development Plan, 2011-2015. Lusaka: Ministry of Finance and National Planning.