

Lund University  
Department of Political Science

Bachelor of Political Science  
Autumn Term 2009  
Supervisor: Anders Sannerstedt

# Did the state make all the difference?

## A case study of state influence on development in Botswana and Zambia

Silja Emmel

**Abstract:**

This thesis investigates the role states play in promoting and directing a country's development. More specifically, it is examined, which factors determine differences in state performance and why different types of states form. This is done through a comparative case study of Botswana and Zambia, two southern African countries that after a similar start into independence developed very differently. By looking at those two cases it is found that in both countries the level of congruence between pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial state had a strong influence on the type of state that formed after independence. Further, it is found that the respective states played a key role in determining developmental success or failure. Botswana's strong developmental state was able to lead Botswana towards successful economic development. Zambia's development, on the other hand, suffered greatly under its neo-patrimonial state for years. These findings support arguments for an increased focus on the state as an agent of development and raise questions concerning the, until recently, highly influential neo-liberal arguments for a minimal state and free market forces.

**Keywords:**

State-directed development, process of state formation, Botswana, Zambia, state types

**Word Count:** 9.988

# Table of Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	
1.1. Topic of the thesis	3
1.2. Purpose and problem	4
1.3. Structure of the thesis	5
<b>2. Theoretical Framework</b>	
2.1. Conceptual background	6
2.2. Theoretical framework for further analysis	12
<b>3. Methodological Considerations</b>	
3.1. Discussion of the choice of methodology	14
3.2. Selection of cases	15
<b>4. The Cases: Botswana and Zambia</b>	
4.1. Botswana	
4.1.1. The state's developmental role	18
4.1.2. Formation of the state	20
4.2. Zambia	
4.2.1. The state's developmental role	22
4.2.2. Formation of the state	25
4.3. Commonalities and differences between the cases	27
<b>5. Concluding remarks</b>	31
<b>6. References</b>	33

# 1.Introduction

## 1.1. Topic of the thesis

“Africa poses the development challenge of our time. The economies of Africa remain poor. And the quality of Africa’s politics impact adversely the performance of its economies. Those of us who are scholars must continue to search out the lessons Africa is trying to teach us about the political foundations of development.”  
(Robert H. Bates, 2005: xiii)

Against the background of most African countries’ continuous difficulties to catch up with the rest of the world regarding levels of development in general<sup>1</sup> and economic development more specifically, the discussion of the state’s role in achieving successful development seems highly relevant and will provide the basis for this paper.

In the field of political science, the role of the state has always been an area of major focus (Fukuyama, 2004: 3). Questions like “How is a good state organised?”, “What are the roles of an ideal state?” and “What should a state not be involved in?” have been discussed widely in the field for a long time. Also in the field of development studies the role of the state has always been a hotly discussed issue. Perceptions of the state’s role in successful development of a country varied extremely over time. This ranged from the international community’s belief in Keynesian ideas of public sector-led development in the post-World War II period (Ndue, 1999: 76), dependency theory’s arguments for a strong state controlling the market that was the dominant idea in the 1960s and 70s (Stein, 2000: 1), to neo-liberal arguments for a minimal state and free market forces that dominated discourse in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Since the term development is a highly contested one, some specifications seem to be in place. The main focus in the following will be on economic development. This does, however, not mean that other sides of development are not found to be important. The word development can for example also be understood as “a process of expanding the real freedoms that people enjoy” (Sen, 1999: 3), meaning that development is the process of removing major sources of unfreedom like for example poverty, tyranny and social deprivation (Ibid.). In doing that, successful economic development plays an important role but is not the only thing necessary. The different factors that the human development index consists of cover those non-economic issues (see UN 2009). Due to the limited space, however, they will only be addressed briefly.

1980s and 90s (Fine and Stoneman, 1996: 7; Leftwich, 1996: 12, Potter, 2008: 69; Chang and Rowthorn, 1995: 2).

During the last decade, however, perceptions regarding the state's role in achieving development began to change once more. In opposition to the dominant neo-liberal paradigm against state intervention in the market due to its supposed harmfulness to (particularly economic) development, some scholars began to argue for a renewed focus on the state as a possible agent of successful development, a "developmental state" (Kohli, 2004: 10). This reconsideration of the state's role happened against the background of the recent developmental success of the East-Asian countries. In those, the state played a strong role in directing economic development, which then led to an increase in overall-development of the region (see for example Amsden, 1989; Kohli, 2004; Fukuyama, 2004).

Against the background of these findings, a renewed focus on the state, or as Bates puts it "the political foundations of development" could possibly elucidate some of the yet unidentified reasons for a lot of African countries' struggle to catch up with the rest of the world.

## 1.2. Purpose and problem

The purpose of this paper is to shed light on the role, the state plays in promoting development and further, to investigate, which factors determine differences in state performance.<sup>2</sup> This will be done, by examining the role the respective state played in two sub-Saharan African countries' greatly varying development situations. Botswana on the one hand is called "a growth miracle" (Hillbom, 2008: 191) and "a shining example of liberal democracy" (Tsie, 1996: 599). Zambia, on the other hand is after 45 years of independence still one of the poorest African countries (IMF, 2009), with a history of economic and political crisis. Hence, the question that comes up first when reading about the two countries is: "Why can two similar countries in the same region develop so differently and how did that happen?". Keeping the focus of this paper on the state's role in mind, the main questions that arise when looking at the two country cases are: Which role did the two states play in achieving different developmental success in Zambia and Botswana? Were the respective states the

---

<sup>2</sup> The concept of state is used in this paper as defined by Max Weber. Hence, a state is understood as "a human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory" (Max Weber quoted in Fukuyama, 2004: 6)

reason for the two countries developing so differently? Also, it would be highly interesting to know if there has to be a certain set of preconditions to make successful state-influenced development possible. A further, related question to be looked at in the paper is the question of whether or not one can at all make any generalisations regarding the reasons for different states' different success or failure like it has been done in several studies (Englebert, 2000a; Englebert, 2000b; Sylwester, 2008; Kohli, 2004). This seems highly important because the lessons learned from the two cases analysed here could possibly benefit other countries in similar situations. Also, by bringing the "state back in" development discourse could create a renewed focus on political aspects of development, in contrast to the still dominant focus on economic aspects.

### 1.3. Structure of the thesis

The second chapter will contain the theoretical basis of the paper. It will be started with a short review and a critical assessment of preceding works on the topic, followed by an outline of the theoretical framework used. The third chapter will deal with the methodological considerations this thesis is based on. It will be looked at the method chosen and some benefits and problems regarding the Most-Similar-Systems-Design method will be discussed. The fourth part will introduce the two country cases by looking at both states' role in development and the process of state formation. Further, commonalities and differences between the two cases will be analysed. The fifth chapter will conclude.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

What is the role of a state in a country's development and why are some states better in administering development than others? What are the reasons for these differences and are there generalisable reasons? In order to gain an insight into the possible answers to these questions a critical review of theories on different state types and theories that aim to explain differences in states' success to administer development will be given in section 2.1. More specifically, it will first be looked at theories on different types of states and consequently it will be looked at theories explaining why different state types form.

Based on this, a theoretical framework for the analysis of the two cases will be developed in section 2.2. This framework will be the theoretical foundation of this paper and will be tested through an application to the two country cases.

### 2.1. Conceptual Background

According to several scholars, the state plays a vital role in achieving developmental success (Englebert, 2000b; Kohli, 2004; Leftwich, 1996; Fukuyama, 2004; Sen, 1999). The explanations these scholars give for why some states achieve this success and other do not, however, point to different reasons. Some only focus on an explanation for success in economic development. Others look at development in a more holistic way by including social and human aspects of development and theorising about what is necessary for a state to also achieve those aspects of development for its people. All of them address very important points but leave some other important points unaddressed. By critically examining several works, strengths and weaknesses will be identified and consequently used in section 2.2. in order to develop a framework appropriate for addressing the questions raised in this paper.

Atul Kohli's book "State-directed development" will serve as the foundation of a classification of state types and will be supplemented by other scholars' works. In the book he develops a theory that aims to explain why states perform differently well in directing the country's economic development based on examination of four

country cases. His main argument is that “successful states possessed a greater degree of power to define and pursue their goals” (Kohli, 2004: 20). Hence, the more powerful states are better in achieving successful and fast economic development. Through a historical analysis of the four countries’ development he defines three different types of states with different amount of power at their disposal, that all stand for a different degree of developmental success. The three state types are a cohesive capitalist state<sup>3</sup>, a neo-patrimonial state and a fragmented multi-class state<sup>4</sup> (Ibid.: 9, 381, 393, 399).

Kohli finds that cohesive-capitalist states “have proved to be the most effective agents of rapid industrialisation in the global periphery and efficacious in creating new wealth in poor societies”. Pierre and Peters add that these also called “developmental states” did so “through creating powerful states that could then both direct foreign and internal investment and create the political stability needed to encourage foreign investment” (Pierre and Peters, 2000: 181). In the cohesive-capitalist type, the state generally intervenes heavily in the economy to mobilise capital and work force to increase industrial production (Kohli, 2004: 391). Also, contrary to neo-liberal believes developmental states subsidise inputs, while at the same time promoting exports (Vu, 2007: 27). Moreover, the state elite is mostly closely linked to the industrial elites, and workers and peasants are excluded from spheres of influence (Kohli, 2004: 13; Leftwich, 1996: 184; Vu, 2007: 28), which leads to a congruence of state policy and market interest. Regarding this finding, and following van de Walle (Van de Walle, 2009: 321) it could however, be examined if it is possible that this formation in some cases facilitates the establishment of clientelistic networks that are more common in neo-patrimonial states.

It is assumed that state elites in developmental states are highly committed to economic growth, transformation and development and have the power to “push it through” (Leftwich, 1996: 285). With this follows, however, that developmental states are generally right-wing authoritarian states in which highly competent bureaucrats organise society from the top and develop the plans needed to achieve fast growth

---

<sup>3</sup> Cohesive-capitalist states are called “developmental state” by other authors, based on Chalmer Johnson’s work on the Japanese post-World War II development (see Johnson 1982; Leftwich 1996; Englebort 2000a; Radice 2008). The words cohesive-capitalist and developmental state will in the following be used interchangeably.



(Kohli, 2004: 380). The societies of these states on the other hand have been rather compliant, rarely revolting against the stringent state policies and hence making these policies possible (Pierre and Peters, 2000: 181). Civil society in developmental states is often weak, either by nature or because of severe repression by the state. Also, and in relation to that, most developmental states are not democracies (Leftwich, 1996: 284, 287). This developmental or cohesive-capitalist state is, however, a rare type of state due to the difficulty to construct it and can rarely be found to endure for a longer period of time (Kohli, 2004: 419).

The opposite of cohesive-capitalist states, which can be found more often in reality, are according to Kohli neo-patrimonial states<sup>5</sup>. According to Nicholas van de Walle, many African states unfortunately fall into the neo-patrimonial category, and neo-patrimonial practices coexist with modern bureaucracy (van de Walle, 2001: 51).<sup>6</sup> Rather, than boosting economic development, these types of state mostly harm the country's economy during their rule (Kohli, 2004: 15, 393).

Neo-patrimonial states are characterised by a state in which power is highly concentrated, often in the office of the president (Van de Walle, 2001: 52; Gordon and Gordon, 2007: 77). Moreover, the state elite pursues personal goals, often through an extensive network of clientelistic relations. Public and private sphere are not separated, like it is assumed to be the case in modern states (von Soest, 2007: 623, 624; Englebert, 2000a: 72). Instead, government elites make use of public resources for their personal benefit or to further cultivate their network of support through patronage (Van de Walle, 2001: 52; Kohli, 2004: 394). Also, neo-patrimonial states tend to have a large but rather incompetent bureaucracy, as opposed to the highly organised and professional one in developmental states. This effectuates that the state's "downward reach" is limited, meaning that the state is disconnected from society (Kohli, 2004: 15, 393). Hence, the neo-patrimonial state is unable to mobilise its citizens for development because a "joint national project" is missing (Ibid.: 394).

---

<sup>5</sup> Neo-patrimonial states are by others sometimes also called "predatory states" (see Pierre and Peters, 2000; Fukuyama, 2004).

<sup>6</sup> Though present in many African countries, Van de Walle stresses that neo-patrimonialism is not inherent in African culture but a result of the way states were formed after colonialism (Van de Walle, 2001: 127).

Like cohesive-capitalist states, neo-patrimonial states intervene strongly in the country's economy, though often with different objectives.<sup>7</sup> Rather than driven by a dedication to growth, the elite of a neo-patrimonial state intervenes to consolidate their power and enrich themselves and their supporters (Van de Walle, 2001: 53).

The last type of state in Kohli's classification is a fragmented multi-class state, which can be placed between the other two types when it comes to its success in developing the country economically. This type of state is the most "normal" one (Ibid.: 14), and characterised by a fragmented state elite and a broader base of social power. The state elite is committed to state-led development but cannot always achieve it because of the fragmentation of its power. Too many different interests make the pursuance of one goal difficult (Ibid.: 399). Though very interesting, this state type will not be discussed further here, since it is not as relevant for the two cases to be looked at in this paper.

The second part of the theoretical section will move away from Kohli's work as a foundation. The focus will be on theories that can be used for explaining why states form into the just described different types. With regard to the distinction of different state types, Kohli's work is highly relevant for the purpose of this paper. His construction of the three state types that explain the different development outcomes of the four country cases provides a good basis for the analysis of the cases of this paper. However, his explanation for why states' institutions form in different ways seems incomplete.

Kohli argues that the institutional set-up of the state determines the amount of power a state commands.<sup>8</sup> The institutional set-up in turn, is in most developing countries a product of the respective colonial power's influence.<sup>9</sup> Also, Kohli finds in his analysis of the four country cases, that the influence of different colonial powers led to the formation of different post-colonial, independent states (Ibid.: 18, 291, 412).

He argues that the different colonial powers, through their different modes to colonise, promoted different types of state type formation. Also, he finds that British

---

<sup>7</sup> In the few cases where the neo-patrimonial elite really has the aim to promote growth, the attempt is likely to fail because of the unfavourable institutional set-up (Kohli, 2004: 394).

<sup>8</sup> It is talked about "amounts of power" because Kohli views power in his book as a resource rather than in distributional term (Kohli, 2004: 20).

<sup>9</sup> Though Kohli admits that other factors than the colonial power could have played a role in determining the institutional set-up as well (Kohli, 2004: 17).

colonialism in Africa tended to lead to the formation of neo-patrimonial states after independence due to British reluctance to invest in their colonies (Ibid.: 309, 409). The incompleteness and maybe even incorrectness of these two findings becomes apparent when looking at the two cases dealt with in this paper. Both, Botswana and Zambia were former British colonies and as will be argued later on, formed into very different types of states after the end of colonialism. Hence, in order to explain *why* the two states developed so very differently, despite both countries being influenced by the same colonial power, further explanation is needed. For this, Pierre Englebert's work on state legitimacy seems to offer some interesting explanations, especially regarding the African context. These will in the following be examined and supplemented with other relevant ideas.

Englebert argues that state legitimacy, as perceived by the country's citizens, determines the type of state a country has and how well the country performs in achieving development (Englebert, 2000a: 5). Like Kohli he looks at countries' history to find clues about the different development performance of countries. Unlike Kohli, however, he begins his analysis already in pre-colonial history. In Africa a significantly high number of states were created by the colonial powers, disregarding former geographical and social arrangements (Pierre and Peters, 2000: 186). Unlike argued by the colonial powers and quite a few scholars at a later date, there were political systems before the beginning of colonialism in Africa. One of those nation-like formations were the Asante who ruled in what now is Ghana, and who were highly organised, having police and army, known territorial limits, a national language and law (Davidson, 1992: 59, 62, 63). Hence, colonialism did not replace and form "nothing" but actual nations and "Africa [actually] stands out as the continent which in the pre-colonial period provided the largest number of emergent state systems" (Persson, 2008: 114). In most cases though, it was not these indigenous forms of organisation that were re-established after independence. Rather, "black men in white masks" (skin replaced by men, Fanon, 1967) were put into power by the colonial state. These elites were, however, often perceived as alien by the people and unlike the rest of the country they believed in the need to reject all tradition and build the new state on European foundations (Davidson, 1992: 33). "As a result, the colonial state was always a foreign creation, superimposed on and separate from the local society and its customs, and regarded as deeply illegitimate." (Van de Walle, 2009: 315).

In line with that, Englebert, using cross-sectional data, finds that states, which are to a high level congruent with the pre-colonial “political systems and norms of authority” turned out to be considered as more legitimate by the citizens and performed therefore better with regard to the country’s postcolonial development (Englebert, 2000b: 13). Most African countries, however, had to deal with “superimposed ...highly divergent and artificial geographical forms and the distortion of traditional social and economic patterns (Gordon and Gordon, 2007: 60). In most of those countries, there is only a low level of congruence between pre- and post-colonial state structures and the post-colonial political elites were faced with having inherited a state that was not perceived as legitimate by the citizens (Englebert, 2000a: 97). As Englebert puts it: “African ‘inheritance elites’ were bequeathed the colonial state but not the colonial power that forced it and kept it in order (Englebert, 2000c: 1823). Hence, “for leaders newly installed at the national level, the challenge was to balance rival power brokers who based their influence on ethnicity, religion or region and prevent their mutual antagonisms from getting out of control” (Boone, 2003: 121).

Consequently, the more illegitimate a state is, the more likely are political elites to resort to the types of neo-patrimonial policies described above, in order to balance these rivalling powers and interests. This however, leads to poor governance and economic stagnation, which in turn makes the patron-client networks even more important because they substitute the legitimacy that cannot be gained through economic success (Englebert, 2000b: 29, Kohli, 2004: 394).

Therefore, in order to gain legitimacy, there were two main strategies, which elites of illegitimate states employed in order to secure their power.<sup>10</sup> The first strategy, Englebert calls “revolutionary-centralising trend”. The state elite tries to build one nation through initiating revolutionary processes, renaming the country after an old kingdom, or giving the president a meaningful name, or abolishing of ethnicity-based parties and groupings (Englebert, 2000a: 98). For example president Mobutu called himself Sese Seko Kuku Ngbendu Wazabanga and “encouraged the press to call him ‘the guide’” (Van de Walle, 2001: 117). The second strategy, which often follows upon the first strategy because of whose limited success, is called

---

<sup>10</sup> Kohli also identifies those strategies but speaks of both under the name of neo-patrimonial state behaviour.

“pragmatic-pluralistic pattern” (Englebert, 2000a: 99). Following this strategy, state elites resort to clientelistic networks in order to ensure their power.

In most African countries, at the time of independence, there were at least several different elites competing for leadership, often due to the “divide-and-rule strategies of colonialism (Van de Walle, 2001: 115). Therefore, if all competing groups can be involved in the clientelistic network, the chances of one elite to stay in power increase because all those that profit from the system will not fight it. Therefore, in a low-legitimacy state, elites tend not to spend time on policies beneficial to the country’s development but rather concentrate all their energy on securing their power. In legitimate states on the other hand, elites do not have to be concerned with securing their power because they are the accepted leaders. Hence, in those states a focus can be put on policies that are good for the country’s development (Englebert, 2000a: 100).

In agreement with Kohli, for Englebert state power plays a very important role in being a successfully developing country. What is added to Kohli’s theory, however, is an explanation for why some states control more power than others. Englebert’s line of argumentation offers an explanation for the variance in state formation in countries with the same colonial power that is highly needed for the purpose of this paper, and that Kohli’s and most other scholars’ findings cannot explain.<sup>11</sup>

## 2.2. Theoretical framework for further analysis

After examining different theoretical approaches several factors can be identified that explain a state’s developmental success or failure and why states form so very differently even though starting with similar preconditions.

First, there are different types of states that are differently successful in directing development, and two state types, the developmental and the neo-patrimonial state are specifically interesting with regard to the cases discussed in the following. Moreover, the amount of power a state commands is crucial in reaching developmental success and the two types of states command differently much power. Developmental states command high amounts of power and are therefore developmentally most successful. Neo-patrimonial states on the other hand

---

<sup>11</sup> Though for example Van de Walle acknowledges and integrates Englebert’s explanation in his works published after 2000.

substantially do not have power and can therefore not successfully direct the country's development.

Second, in order to explain why different types of states form, looking at state legitimacy and history matters. The power a state commands, and hence the type of state, is determined by the amount of legitimacy it has towards its citizens, which in turn is mainly a result of historical legacies. The better the pre-colonial arrangements fit the post-colonial ones, the more legitimate is a state perceived to be by its citizens. States perceived as being illegitimate have to focus their energy on staying in power and creating some kind of legitimacy and hence do not focus on the development of the country.

### 3. Methodological considerations

In the following some methodological considerations concerning the research design will be addressed. Since this paper is a comparative case study and the case study as a scientific method is still subject to much criticism (Yin, 2009: 6), it seems appropriate to explain its scientific usefulness, specifically in the context of this paper. Subsequently, the choice of cases will be explained.

#### 3.1. Discussion of the choice of methodology

In the following it will first be looked at the reasons for choosing a comparative case study method for this research. Afterwards, some of the limitations of this method will be examined.

“The case study is but one of several ways of doing social science research” (Yin, 2009: 2). It is however, according to Robert Yin a well-suited method when the aim of the research is to look into questions of “why” and “how” of contemporary events that cannot, like an experiment, be manipulated and therefore controlled by the researcher (Ibid.: 8, 11, 13). Since exactly that is the case in this paper, by trying to find explanations for two countries’ very differing development, it was chosen to use a comparative case study methodology over other methodologies. Moreover, as Khairul B. M. Noor explains, “case studies become particularly useful where one needs to understand some particular problem or situation in great-depth, and where one can identify cases rich in information” (Noor, 2008: 1602, 1603). Hence, examining the difference in development performance of two countries and the reasons for the different performance can be understood as the particular problem that needs to be analysed in depth and a comparative case study will be used to do so.

More specifically, the research design chosen here is a most similar systems design (MSSD) that “seeks to identify the key features that are different among [two] similar countries and which account for the observed political outcome” (Landman, 2007: 70). This design seems to be the most appropriate because the two countries analysed in this research, Botswana and Zambia, have a variety of commonalities but the outcome to be explained, developmental success, varied greatly in the two

countries. The outcome can also be called the dependent variable in this research (Landman, 2007: 19) and like Moses and Knutsen explain, comparative studies select cases on the dependent variable (Moses and Knutsen, 2007: 95).

Coming to the limitations of the use of comparative case studies, an issue that is very often subject to criticism is the issue of generalisability. It is argued by a number of scholars that an aim of social science is the generation of generalisable knowledge and case studies are due to the limited sample size not suited for fulfilling this task (Landman, 2007: 4; Yin, 2009: 15; Ruddin, 2006: 799; Noor, 2008: 1603)<sup>12</sup>. In opposition to this criticism, however, it can be argued that this method is well suited for reaching analytical generalisations. As Yin explains, there should be distinguished between “statistical generalisation” and “analytical generalisation”, the latter being used to compare a primarily developed theory with empirical results as is done in case of a case study. If the cases analysed support this theory and better than a competing theory, then “replication can be claimed” (Yin, 2009: 38, 39; Ruddin, 2006: 800). Regarding this paper, the theoretical assumptions outlined above are what is to be tested and possibly improved through application to the two country cases. Hence, the aim is first to test theory but potentially also to generate hypothesis through the findings made in the case analysis (Moses and Knutsen, 2007: 132, 133). It should, however, be emphasised that the primary aim of this work is the answering of the research questions with regard to the two specific country cases. It is only hoped that the findings of this research can also be relevant for the analysis of countries in similar circumstances. Hence, it is more transferability than generalisability that is attempted.

### 3.2. Selection of cases

The two cases selected for this research are Botswana and Zambia. As explained above, they were selected on the dependent variable, which in this case is their development performance. Also, it was these two countries that were chosen, because besides this difference in the dependent variable, they have a lot in common, which makes a MSSD possible in order to explain the differences.

---

<sup>12</sup> A review of several critics can be found in Anja Persson’s book “The institutional sources of statehood” (2008: 41).



The commonalities that both countries shared at independence are various. To begin with, both Zambia and Botswana are countries in southern Africa and they are both landlocked.<sup>13</sup> Further, they have both been British colonies for roughly the same amount of time and reached independence, similarly, as some of the first countries of southern Africa. Zambia in 1964 and Botswana in 1966 (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2009). Also, they both are mineral producing and exporting countries, though Zambia exports copper while Botswana exports diamonds (Davis, 1998: 219, 222; Good, 1992: 75). Further, both countries proceeded into independence suffering from colonial neglect; meaning that both started into independence without much infrastructure, industry and graduates. Though, Zambia had a slight advantage over Botswana regarding industrialisation (Good and Taylor, 2008: 753; Van de Walle, 2001: 129; Rakner, 2001: 44, 47; Acemoglu et al., 2003: 80).<sup>14</sup>

Despite all these similarities at independence however, the two countries developed very differently over the following decades and up to the present day. Botswana is often being described as a “growth miracle”, “an oasis of tolerance” and a “shining example of liberal democracy” (Hillbom, 2008: 191; Tsie, 1996: 599). Moreover, it is now being classified as an upper-middle income country and a stable democracy (Mbabazi and Taylor, 2005: 8; Holm, 1996: 101). Zambia, on the other hand has long been seen as a “non-reformer” (Rakner et al., 1999: 8) with democracy-problems at least until 1991 (Rakner, 2001: 2) and now still occupies a place in the lower end of the Human Development Index (HDI) rankings, more precisely place 165 out of 177 (WB, 2007).

Against this background those two cases seem highly interesting to look at when trying to examine the state’s role in the countries’ different development performance. What did the Botswana state do in order for Botswana to, with equal starting positions do so much better with regards to development, than Zambia. Or, to ask the other way around, what did the Zambian state do wrong in order for its developmental record to look so much worse than Botswana’s a few decades after their similar start into independence?

---

<sup>13</sup> This is mentioned because there are theories saying that landlocked countries perform worse when it comes to economic development (see Sachs, 2005; Collier, 2008).

<sup>14</sup> Just to give an example: Zambia had 76 university graduates at independence, while Botswana had 22 and only 100 persons that graduated from secondary school (Van de Walle, 2001: 129; Acemoglu et al., 2003: 80, 81).

In the next section, these issues and specifically the questions posed in the introduction will be examined using the theoretical framework outlined in section 2. To assure clearness and following Alexander George and Andrew Bennett's advice to keep the cases focussed on the issues relevant to the research questions (George and Bennett, 2004: 70), Botswana's and Zambia's state's developmental role and the state formation processes will be analysed separately, where after the main commonalities and differences between the two cases will be pointed out.

# 4. The Cases: Botswana and Zambia

## 4.1. Botswana

### 4.1.1. The state's developmental role

From 1966 on and until at present Botswana was ruled uninterruptedly by the Botswana Democratic Party (BDP)<sup>15</sup>. The BDP had from the beginning of its time in office on a strong focus on economic growth and capitalist economic development of the country (Tsie, 1996: 601; Taylor, 2005: 48). The establishment of a Ministry of Development Planning can for example illustrate this commitment to development right after independence in 1966 (Taylor, 2005: 50). “Responsible for the choosing of [these] appropriate priorities has been a top political leadership of 'unusually high quality', with both Seretse Khama and his successor, Quett Masire, notable for their honesty, pragmatism, and common sense “, which benefited the formation of a developmental state (Good, 1992: 74).<sup>16</sup> That their sense of pragmatism was very pronounced can for example be seen in their decision to leave all expatriate bureaucrats in office after independence until suitable Botswana citizens were trained to take over (Acemoglu et al. 2003: 100, 101).

Further, the government and these bureaucratic elites (and later on the domestic ones) worked tightly together to reach the aim of development (Good, 1992: 74), which lead to what Good and Taylor call a “typical developmental state situation, where the bureaucracy and the ruling party meshed” (Good and Taylor, 2008: 756). The politicians however, “allowed top civil servants who are more educated than politicians a relatively free hand in policy formulation” (Tsie, 1996: 611), which fit very well with the strong and effective bureaucracy that is characteristic of a developmental state (Mbabazi and Taylor, 2005: 4). Also, in order to reach development, the state intervened strongly in the economy, through for example a marketing board that controlled beef prices, a half-state owned diamond mining company, a strict exchange rate policy to prevent the exchange rate from rising like in

---

<sup>15</sup> Ian Taylor explains that reasons for this is partly that the British did not leave a military or organised bureaucracy that could pose serious competition to the BDP rule (Taylor, 2005: 47).

<sup>16</sup> Despite these qualities are these some more questionable attitudes of the Botswana presidents that will be looked at later on.

other mineral economies and prudent fiscal and monetary policies (Acemoglu et al., 2003: 101, 102; Harvey and Lewis, 1990: 7).

Furthermore, another characteristic of the developmental state described above can be detected in Botswana, namely the connection between political and industrial elites (Kohli, 2004: 13; Leftwich, 1996: 184). In Botswana, this characteristic can be found especially pronounced, because many of the top bureaucrats and politicians were at independence large-scale cattle owners, are still among the wealthiest citizens and have a specific interest in the country's economic development (Tsie, 1996: 601, 602; Good and Taylor, 2006: 57). It could, however, in disagreement with theories on developmental states be argued that this close connection can instead of furthering development in some cases also carry neo-patrimonial elements (see Van de Walle, 2009; Good and Taylor, 2006).<sup>17</sup>

This leads to some other, darker sides of the Botswana state and maybe developmental states in general: Their limited commitment to liberal democracy (Leftwich, 1996: 284, 287). Leftwich finds that Botswana is a rare example of a democratic developmental state (Leftwich, 1996: 283). Based on some more recent event and information it will, however, be pointed out here that Botswana's democracy record is far from flawless. This seems relevant since it is not only economic wealth that marks development but also issues related to equality and freedom (Sen, 1999).

First, and interestingly in line with the characteristics of neo-patrimonial states (Van de Walle, 2001: 52) rather than developmental states, the president in Botswana has a "dominant power position" (Holm, 1996: 101). Exemplifying this, all presidents so far have induced constitutional changes to their favour and "repeatedly displayed an immediate reappointment of BDP members of parliament and ministers rejected democratically by their constituencies" (Good and Taylor, 2006: 54). Also, there are fears that Botswana's new president, Seretse Khama's son and ex-military Ian Khama will "introduce a more autocratic style" (Country monitor, 2008; Good and Taylor, 2006: 6-68), which is all not exactly according to democratic principles.

Moreover, and that fits into the developmental state, civil society in Botswana is weak (Holm, 1996: 102) exemplified by weak labour unions, not one legal strike

---

<sup>17</sup> In Botswana, the biggest car magnate Satar Dada is an MP in parliament, the BDP's treasurer and one of the richest men in the country. For election campaigns he organises the cars as well as for the national military (Good and Taylor, 2006: 63). Hence, if industrial and political interest are all to meshed, clientelistic practices seem unavoidable

since independence and relatively weak opposition parties due to a lack of resources (Holm, 1996: 104; Good and Taylor, 2006: 63).

Lastly, Botswana is one of the countries in the world with the highest inequality rates (appendix UN Gini coefficient, 2008), which also puts limits to democracy. Especially the rural population is poor and poverty among them is increasing ever since independence (Good, 1999: 190). Out of those poor, particularly the San or Basarwa are “the most exploited and impoverished” (Ibid.: 191). As Nengwekhulu describes that “some cattle barons still consider Baswara their personal property in the same way classical slave masters considered slaves their personal property” (Nengwekhulu, 1998: 353). Unfortunately, the impoverishment disables the poor to change their situation because the means for political or other involvement are missing (Ibid.: 359).

#### 4.1.2. Formation of the state

In this section the “why-question” posed in the introduction will be addressed. Why did the Batswana state form the way it has just been outlined? While examining the state formation, it will be started with a brief look at the pre-colonial political structures, followed by colonial and post-colonial arrangements. This is done in order to be able to assess in how far those pre-colonial structures matched colonial and post-colonial ones, which is believed to have an influence on the state’s legitimacy as explained in section 2.

Before Botswana was made a British Protectorate in 1885 (Ramsay, 1998: 62), the country consisted of eight chiefdoms<sup>18</sup>, all of which belonged to the ethnic group of the Tswana, and all of which were ruled by a *kgosi* (king) (Tlou: 1998: 11). Formerly independent, they united around the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century in order to prevent the Boers from occupying their territories (Acemoglu et al., 2003: 94). This development lead to the formation of, what is now called Botswana, a country with a rather homogeneous population. Botswana can be called homogeneous because roughly 70 per cent of the population belong to the ethnic group of the Tswana and the remaining 30 per cent to various other small ethnic groups like for example the San and Herero (Mompoti and Prinsen, 2000: 628, 629). This is a fact beneficial to the state’s

---

<sup>18</sup> The eight tribes are: Batawana, Bakwena, Bangwato, Bangwaketese, Balete, Bakgatla, Barolong and Batlokwa; the first four being the biggest (Acemoglu et al. 2003: 92; Mompoti and Prinsen, 2000: 627).

legitimacy and power base, because there have been hierarchical political structures in pre-colonial times that were agreed upon by the majority of the population. These structures survived into independence and therefore no rivalling elites (like for example in Nigeria) competed for power.

To see why the structures could survive into pre-colonial times, a look at the colonial period is necessary. Not very interested in Botswana in the first place, the British changed their mind after Germany occupied Namibia in 1884, and diamonds were found in Kimberly. Suddenly, Botswana was a strategically important place for the British and it became a protectorate in 1885 (Ramsay, 1998: 62). Due to its mere strategic importance however, the British established a system of 'indirect rule', under which colonial officials ruled through the *kgosis* (Ibid.: 69) and hence kept administration expenses at a minimum. This, though, had the side effect that pre-colonial institutions remained for the most part unchanged and when the British decided to "once and for all establish (their) authority over the chiefs in the tribal territories" they could not succeed (Parson, 1984: 27 quoted by Acemoglu et al., 2003: 97).

Despite the just mentioned protest by the chiefs against increased British control in the years before independence, there was a lack of forceful demand for independence like it was present in the surrounding countries. "Liberation from colonialism was not high on the agenda of Seretse Khama (the chief in exile of the Bangwato), nor of the inhabitants of Bechuanaland." (Good and Taylor, 2008: 753; Acemoglu et al., 2003: 96). That was probably part of the reasons for why independence in 1966 came quietly and was prepared from approximately 1962 on and in cooperation with the British (Good and Taylor, 2008: 753).

"The colonial administration and the BDP leadership were 'joined in an informal coalition' to shape the country's politics and further development" (Good, 1992: 72-73) and Botswana was from then on formally run by the BDP, with Serese Khama as its first leader. The BDP consisted mainly of a class of large-scale cattle owners, who did not have an anti-colonialist or African nationalist agenda like most of Botswana's neighbours (Tsie, 1996: 602; Good and Taylor, 2008: 757). Further, Khama was not only the leader of the BDP but also the heir of one of the major Tswana tribes' throne, which gave him, and therewith also the new independent state, legitimacy in the eyes of the citizens (Taylor, 2005: 47). This fits very well with Englebert's theory on state legitimacy being essential for developmental success. This

legitimacy was present in Botswana due to the high level of congruence between pre- and postcolonial political structures. Hence, in disagreement with Kohli's argument that British colonial neglect lead to weak states, the neglect in Botswana's case was highly beneficial to the post-colonial state, since it made the high level of congruence between pre- and post-colonial structures possible. Therefore, it is a main reason for the Batswana state's legitimacy, and as a result power.

Furthermore, the traditional chiefs were included in the state and therewith neutralised as competitors to the government, by making them civil servants that receive a salary from the state and as civil servants are to be loyal to the state (Jones, 1983: 136). Despite that however, traditional structures were roughly maintained because the chiefs brought government policy to the village level. For example five-year development plans from the government were introduced and discussed at the traditional village meeting, *kgotla*, by the chiefs and the villagers. Also, many Batswana considered Seretse Khama to be the *kgosi* of all Botswana (Holm, 1996: 101). It can be argued that, in line with Englebert (2000a, 2000b) all this helped to increase state legitimacy because policies were communicated in the traditional way.

## 4.2. Zambia

### 4.2.1. The state's developmental role

Zambia's state changed significantly over time from independence in 1964 to the present day. Roughly, the time since independence is divided into three phases: The first republic from 1964 until the end of 1972, second republic from 1973 until 1991 and third republic from 1991 until today (Macola, 2008: 17; Rakner, 1998: 59).

During these 45 years, Zambia has been ruled by two parties and in total three presidents. According to Nicholas van de Walle, this lies above the, in any way high, African average of state leaders' tenure length (van de Walle, 2005: 74 quoted in von Soest, 2007: 625). The first of the three presidents, Kenneth Kaunda and his party the United National Independence Party (UNIP) were in office from independence until 1991 and as early as in 1972 changed Zambia's constitution to make it a one-party state (Burnell, 2001: 245). Due to Kaunda being in office during first and second republic and similar policies, these episodes will be treated together here. This will be followed by an examination of the state's role in development during the third republic.

During Kaunda's time in office, he used an extensive public sector to create employment and strengthen his power through the establishment of clientelist structures, characteristic of neo-patrimonial states (Hawkins, 1991: 841; Good, 1986: 251, 254). Hence, in the years after independence, the number of civil servants increased dramatically from 22.500 in 1964 to 51.000 in 1969, though their skills did not increase in an according speed (Rakner, 1998: 49; Tordoff; 1980: 6, 7). Also, as another characteristic of a neo-patrimonial state, power became more and more concentrated in the office of the president after 1970 and through frequent reshuffling of the minister posts competition to the president was kept low (Rakner, 1998: 46,47; Burdette, 1988: 75).

In the first years after independence, however, Zambia did fairly well economically due to high revenues from copper exports (Rakner at al., 1999: 20). Also, these revenues were used by the state to improve the fate of the population, following first an ideology of African Socialism and then Kaunda's own ideology Humanism (Rakner, 1998: 50). This was done through investing heavily in education and health programmes (Burdette, 1988: 64) with the aim of a developmental state that could remove the colonial inequalities (Rakner, 1998: 44).

In order to achieve that, the Kaunda regime maintained the economic structures inherited by the British and used the copper mines, that soon after independence were nationalised in 1969, as the major source of state income (Good, 1986: 246; ), which is another characteristics of a neo-patrimonial state (Kohli, 2004: 397). The mining income was in turn invested in the construction of an extensive, rather subsidy-dependent parastatal sector (Phiri, 2006: 135)<sup>19</sup>, which turned into the major employer and contributor to economic growth, though at the disadvantage of the rural subsistence farmers, who did not receive any support (Thurlow and Wobst, 2006: 605). Also, this move made virtually every part of Zambia's economy very dependent on mining incomes and food imports after a few years (Good, 1986: 251; Hawkins, 1991: 841). This proved to be fatal for Zambia when copper world prices began to fall rapidly in the 1970s (Rakner, 2003: 53)<sup>20</sup> and the state began to borrow

---

<sup>19</sup> As Hawkins further explains: "Although the parastatals were created to be "import substitution" industries, they were by and large highly dependent on inputs purchased with foreign exchange. Foreign exchange was generated primarily by copper sales or foreign borrowing." (Hawkins, 1991: 842).

<sup>20</sup> To give an idea of the severeness of the crisis, from 1974 to 1980, the gross domestic product (GDP) per capita declined by 52 percent (Burdette, 1988: 2).



heavily from foreign creditors, mainly the IMF to be able to keep up the level of state spending (Rakner, 1998: 63-65).

After a decade of both state and IMF ignoring the economic problems, the UNIP-government was in 1983 forced to follow WB and IMF guidelines regarding economic policy making in form of several structural adjustment programmes (Rakner et al., 1999: 21). These were, however, abandoned several times, which led to a cancellation of the loans and an increasingly unsatisfied population, because after 10 years it now began to feel the economic crisis. “Under these circumstances, particularly the decline of the state, the civil society came to occupy an important position in the democratisation process in Zambia” (Phiri, 2006: 168). Hence, due to strong pressure from civil society on the UNIP government, the Movement for Multiparty Democracy (MMD) under Fredrick Chiluba could press for elections and won them in 1991 (Gordon and Gordon, 2007: 90; Rakner, 2001: 522). “People were not only prepared for change, but facilitated that change by withdrawing their support from the moribund UNIP” (Phiri, 2006: 168). They did so, even though extensive economic reforms were to follow under MMD (Rakner, 2001: 522).

These reforms accomplished some of the economic changes long demanded by the international financial institutions; for example to remove the trade protection that shielded the national market (Thurlow and Wobst, 2006: 606). Though, according to Lise Rakner, the economic liberalisation suffered from “partial implementation” and had grave socio-economic consequences (Rakner, 2003: 16; Hansen, 2008: 215; Phiri, 2006: 194). Hence, Zambia’s economic situation did not improve significantly during the 1990s and also “many claimed to see evidence of a decline in the quality of democracy” (Burnell, 2001: 240)<sup>21</sup>. Moreover, neo-patrimonial practices of the first and second republic were not abolished but rather, continued by the new president Chiluba and his associates. This included appointment of ministers to “an all time high of 28 posts” a year after assumption of office and “misuse of state resources often to the advantage of the ruling party” (von Soest, 2007: 626, 627)<sup>22</sup>. In line with that, Chiluba attempted to change the constitution in order to make a third term in

---

<sup>21</sup> For example because former president Kaunda was banned from being a presidency candidate by a constitutional amendment specifically made for that purpose by MMD before the elections (Burnell, 2001: 240).

<sup>22</sup> Also, “an inspection of the bank statements (of Chiluba) revealed a number of illegal and irregular financial transactions involving Chiluba, his family and close associates” (Simutanyi, 2006: 85).

office for him possible. This was, however, prevented through strong citizen protest and in 2001, Levy Mwanawasa was elected president (Simutanyi, 2006: 76).

Under Mwanawasa the state's reform efforts show results and from 2001 on Zambia's economy starts growing by an average of 4.5 per cent annually (Li, 2006: 6). This seems also to be the trend under the newest president, Rupiah Banda who at assumption of office "promised to fight corruption and poverty and embrace sound economic policies that would ensure a strong Zambia to maintain investor confidence" (Nevin, 2008: 72).

#### 4.2.2. Formation of the state

After this examination of state and development performance in Zambia after independence, it will now be looked at the processes that lead to the formation of the predominantly neo-patrimonial post-colonial state. This is done in order to gain an understanding of the differences in the state formation processes of Botswana and Zambia that lead to such different states. Like in the case of Botswana, the analysis will begin in pre-colonial Zambia.

To begin with, "the different peoples of modern Zambia have long and important, though separate histories. Zambia was not a 'nation' as defined by common language, kinship, political authority, or geographical distinctiveness until it was pieced together by British mercantile interests in the late nineteenth century" (Burdette, 1988: 5). This will say that the population of what now is Zambia has already in pre-colonial times been rather heterogeneous. One-fifth of the population is of Bemba origin, one-tenth respectively belongs to the ethnic group of the Nyanja and Tonga and the rest to various smaller ethnic groups (Encyclopaedia Britannica). All these ethnic groups lived on the territory that later became Zambia, but lived rather separated from each other and they all had their own political and social structures distinct from one another. Some were organised in kingdoms and ruled by a chief. Others, like the Tonga, had no chiefs or other form of authority (Burdette, 1988: 10,11). Thus, the political and social structures of the ethnic groups living in the territory of modern Zambia are highly diverse. "One heritage of this diversity is that the peoples who compose modern-day Zambia have historically distinct concepts of political authority and legitimacy" (Burdette, 1988: 11).

This will say that with the arrival of colonialism borders were drawn that mingled together a big number of different ethnic groups that had no common history. Further, the borders also divided some ethnic groups like the Lozi that had in pre-colonial times formed a community (Burdette, 1988: 13). Hence, the pre-colonial forms of organisation just described were changed with the arrival of colonialism and the new “artificial” borders. As a result, no congruence between pre- and post-colonial structures can be found.

A further brief look at the colonial period will examine this in more detail. Zambia has been under British control since 1890/91. First the territory was not directly controlled by Britain, but by the British South Africa Company (BSAC) under Cecil Rhodes. The BSAC negotiated a concession with the chief of Barotseland in 1890, and finally was able to occupy the rest of Zambia in 1891 “through a series of dubious treaties” negotiated with various chiefs (Phiri, 2006: 9). Roughly 30 years later, from 1923 on, Zambia went from being controlled by the BSAC into a territory formally controlled by Britain, as one of its protectorates, until independence in 1964 (Phiri, 2006: 2, 3).

During the whole colonial time, but especially while the BSAC controlled Zambia, British investment in the country was kept at a minimal level. The only area the British did invest in strongly was the copper mining sector, which later on also became the foundation for independent Zambia’s economy (Good, 1986: 246, 248). Like in most British territories, there was only a minimal administration and instead the British ruled indirectly through the tribal chiefs who were responsible for example for collecting taxes from the population, which was met with resistance (Phiri, 2006: 11). The taxes were introduced to force Zambians to work in the mines to be able to pay their taxes (Ibid.: 13). The positive consequence of the shortage of labour for Africans was, however, that some Africans had the chance to occupy relatively high positions in skilled labour and civil service. This led over time to “the emergence of a small elite with the education to understand modern political methods and readiness to take a lead in the development of modern African nationalism” (Ibid.: 13).

Despite this political emancipation of the small African elite, however, the British were highly involved in “choosing” an independence government (Good and Taylor, 2008: 753). On initiative of a businessmen, Sir Ronald Prain, involved in the mining they supported the more moderate Kenneth Kaunda and the UNIP, over the more radical African nationalist Harry Nkumbula and his party, the African National

Congress. Prain introduced Kaunda to the British officials and Kaunda consequently became Zambia's first president in 1964 (Butler, 2007: 468-470).

### 4.3. Commonalities and differences between the cases

In the following, the differences between Botswana's and Zambia's development will be analyzed with help of the theoretical framework outlined in part 2. It will specifically be looked at the role the two states played in Botswana's and Zambia's differing development. Further, it will be examined in how far the theoretical framework explains the emergence of these two states and the differences between them. Also, it will briefly be assessed, if the same explanations can be used for both country cases, or if each requires a specific and individual explanation.

First, the theoretical framework from section 2 can be used to identify and compare the two different state types that formed after independence in Botswana and Zambia and give at least a partly explanation for why Botswana's state was able to successfully direct development while Zambia's was not. One of the main questions of this paper, namely, which role the two states played in achieving different developmental success in Zambia and Botswana will be addressed in this context.

To explain Botswana's success in developing, the concept of a developmental state can be used. Though, it will be argued here that the classification is not completely straight forward, and that Botswana also exhibits characteristics of a neo-patrimonial state that could under unfortunate circumstances turn out to be a hurdle to further successful development.

To begin with, the high amount of state power concentrated in the hands of few for the last fifty years in Botswana fits into the definition of cohesive-capitalist states given above which are perceived as the most successful states in directing economic development (Kohli, 2004: 385, 393, 418; Pierre and Peters, 2000: 181; Leftwich, 1993: 620). Also, the state's extensive downward-reach that enables it to effectively control civil society (for example the labour unions and traditional chiefs) fits into the developmental or cohesive-capitalist state type. The Botswana state focussed on economic development-enhancing policies from the beginning on and had the power necessary to carry out these stringent growth-enforcing policies. This was probably facilitated by the close links between state elite and industrial/economic

elites, which made the state pursue policies beneficial to the country's, and especially these elites' economic development.

However, this is also where aspects of a neo-patrimonial state can be detected. The links between state and industrial elites are very close and as described above, clientelism and the exchange of favours seem to occur due to the elite's unchallenged power position (Good and Taylor, 2006: 63, 64). Poor Batswana on the other hand, do not have much influence and do not seem to feel much of the successful economic development of the country (Good, 1999: 190, 199, 200). This is seen as a possible hurdle to further development, because as Leftwich explains: "To make market-friendly strategies work, developmental states in many societies will also need to liberate the poor, especially the rural poor, from the continued domination of traditional landed elites and anti-developmental oligarchs who both oppose empowerment and often stand in the way of development and democracy" (Leftwich, 1993: 620, 621). The landed elites in Botswana are, however, in many cases still perceiving the poor as their servants and responsible for their own situation (Nengwekhulu, 1998: 353; Good, 1999: 199).

Despite these "dark sides" of the Batswana state, it should be pointed out that overall the state elite managed the country very well, spending mineral earnings on health and education. This was done, it seems, in a sustainable way since Botswana did avoid the resource trap that many other mineral-owning countries, like for example Zambia fell into (Davis, 1998: 222).<sup>23</sup>

Zambia, due to its rather more disrupted state history is more difficult to place into a state classification than Botswana, since its state changed significantly over time with the different regimes in power. Though neo-patrimonial in its main features, later on elements diverging from the neo-patrimonial model can be found as well.

The state in the first and second republic clearly exhibited most features of a neo-patrimonial state and some neo-patrimonial aspects were carried into the third republic. Power is very concentrated in the president, with no instance strong enough to exert control over him especially during the one-party state (Burnell, 2001: 251). Hence, during that time the Kaunda regime used state resources to build up a network of patronage to strengthen its support, which all worked fine, while copper prices were high. The state was however, not strong enough to carry out the "right" policies to deal with the economic crisis that was caused by the copper price collapse. This

---

<sup>23</sup> It should, however, be noted that despite the wealth, there are critics that see Botswana's diamond depend economy and the lack of diversification as a serious problem for future economic development (Hillbom, 2008).

was for example due to its “vulnerability to urban protest” (Rakner et al. 1999: 7, 20-22) and the huge network of beneficiaries that gave support to the government in exchange for favours (Von Doepp, 1996: 30). These would of course no longer support the government if favours stayed out. These neo-patrimonial practices seem to have carried on under the next president, Chiluba (Simutanyi, 2006: 83-85).

During Chiluba’s time in office however, civil society, especially through the trade unions that are amongst Africa’s strongest (Freedomhouse, 2009), grew stronger and a certain extent of control can now be exerted over the president and the government. This can be seen in the fact that Chiluba had to abandon his plan to change the constitution and stay in office for a third term due to strong societal pressure (Ibid.: 76). This does not fit into the stereotype of a neo-patrimonial state and gives hope that against Kohli’s assessment that a move of a neo-patrimonial state towards other state types is very rare (Kohli, 2004: 17), Zambia is on its way to break away from neo-patrimonial patterns, with improved economic management (Nevin, 2008: 72, Li, 2006: 6) and democratic elections in the last few years (Freedomhouse 2009).

What the theoretical framework does not address, however, is the role of external influences on the state’s policy choices. In the case of Zambia, foreign states and international financial institutions had a strong influence on the country’s policies due to Zambia’s heavy debts burden. In Botswana on the other hand the state could make policy choices independently because no significant foreign debt existed.

After having found that in the cases of Botswana and Zambia, two quite different states directed or in Zambia’s case for the most time rather ‘mis’ directed the countries’ development it will now be focussed on the reasons for the formation of these two different states.

Through examining the two cases it becomes clear that an explanation like “certain colonial powers influence led to certain types of states” (see Kohli, 2004: 309, 409) cannot be used in these two cases. Botswana and Zambia were both colonised by the British and suffered both from the neglect of the colonial power at independence. Following this line of argumentation, the Zambian state should actually have better chances to consolidate into a strong state after independence since the British left slightly more administrative and industrial infrastructure than in Botswana. This was, however, not the case. The explanation given by Englebort and

others on the other hand, to start looking for the reasons for state formation already in the pre-colonial history of the country, seems more useful for explaining the two cases dealt with here.

In the examination of state formation in sections 4.1.2 and 4.2.2 it becomes evident that pre-colonial conditions, and related to that the level of congruence between pre-colonial and post-colonial state, vary greatly in Botswana and Zambia. While Botswana's borders roughly resembled the territory of the Tswana kingdoms and therefore one political system, Zambia's colonial borders mingled together a huge variety of different ethnic groups with different forms of political organisation.

As a consequence, congruence between pre-colonial and post-colonial structures was not possible in Zambia due to the "artificiality" of the state created during colonialism. This, in agreement with the framework outlined above, led to a post-colonial state that was perceived as highly illegitimate by most citizens due to its lacking roots in the peoples' pre-colonial political traditions (Englebert, 2000a: 97; Englebert, 2000c: 1823; Gordon and Gordon, 2007: 60). This high level of illegitimacy in turn, is responsible for the state's strong focus on securing its power through patrimonialism and clientelistic practices, rather than focussing on the country's development.

In Botswana, on the other hand, the post-colonial state structures resembled the pre-colonial ones very much with for example the president being the heir of the traditional chieftaincy. Also, one ethnic group dominated the territory, which eliminates the danger of ethnic rivalries for state power. In all, that the state is perceived as a legitimate one can be explained due to its roots in the pre-colonial past. This in turn equips the government with sufficient power to focus on ruling and developing the country, rather than having to invest all its energy in increasing power in order to be able to stay in government.

## 5. Concluding remarks

Coming back to the questions posed in the beginning of the paper, some light could be shed on the reasons for the two countries' differing development. The theoretical framework developed could explain a great deal about the state's differing developmental capacities and also why states with differing developmental capacities form in the two cases examined.

More specifically it was found that in both cases the state played a key role in determining developmental success or failure. Also, and coming back to the debate touched upon in the introduction, Botswana provides a good example for a strong state that successfully directed the country's development. By looking at Zambia and analysing the differences between the two states, an insight could be gained into the conditions that are necessary for such a strong and developmentally successful state to form, and why not all states develop as strong Botswana-like states. It seems, however, very difficult to generalise from these findings because as pointed out, already when looking at the two cases, different factors influenced the developmental outcomes in differing degrees. A point to be highlighted in this relation is that in Zambia outside influences in form of lender countries and institutions seem to have had a much stronger impact on the state's ability to act independently. Also, the formation of the state in both cases has been highly influenced by external factors, though leading to different results that were more favourable for Botswana's state than for Zambia's. The issue of external influences could due to the limited space not be investigated further but a better understanding of this process could be helpful in improving development cooperation between developed and less developed countries and provide an interesting topic for further research.

Lastly some critical thoughts concerning the findings of the paper should be voiced. These concern the issues of equal distribution of the benefits of development and the importance of democracy. First one could question whether a strong state elite as in the case of Botswana could in the long run hinder an equal distribution of the benefits of successful economic development and therewith development for parts of the population. Moreover, one could argue that a strong state with a small elite, which is beneficial to development, necessarily comes at the expense of democracy. If that is



the case, then is this type of state in the long run really beneficial to the populations' (not only economic) development? Next to the question of external influences, these two issues could prove interesting to look at further.

Word count: 9.988

## 6. References

Acemoglu, Daron; Johnson, Simon and Robinson, James A. (2003) “An African Success Story: Botswana”, in Rodrik, Dani (2003) “In Search of Prosperity – Analytic Narratives on Economic Growth”. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 80-119

Amsden, Alice (1989) “Asia's Next Giant: South Korea and Late Industrialization”. New York: Oxford University Press

Anonymous (2008) “Good Khama?”, in *Country Monitor*; Vol. 16, No. 12; p. 6

Bates, Robert (2005, originally 1981) “Markets and States in Tropical Africa. The Political Basis of Agricultural Policies”. London: University of California Press

Boone, Catherine (2003) “Political Topographies of the African State: Territorial Authority and Institutional Choice”. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Burdette, Marcia M. (1988) “Zambia-Between Two Worlds”. Boulder: Westview Press

Burnell, Peter (2001) “The Party System and Party Politics in Zambia: Continuities Past, Present and Future”, in *African Affairs*, Vol. 100, pp. 239-263

Butler, L.J. (2007) “Copper empire, mining and the colonial state in Northern Rhodesia, c.1930-64” New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Collier, Paul (2008) “The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries are Failing and What Can Be Done About It”. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Chang, Ha-Joon and Rowthorn, Robert (1995) “The Role of the State in Economic Change”. Oxford: Clarendon Press

Davidson, Basil (1992) “The Black Man’s Burden – Africa and the Curse of the Nation-State”. London: James Currey

Davis, Graham A. (1998) “The minerals sector, sectoral analysis, and economic development”, in *Resources Policy*, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 217-228

Englebert, Pierre (2000a) “State Legitimacy and Development in Africa” Boulder, Col.: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2000.

Englebert, Pierre (2000b) “Pre-Colonial Institutions, Post-Colonial States, and Economic Development in Tropical Africa”, in *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 53, No. 1, pp. 7-36

Englebert, Pierre (2000c) "Solving the Mystery of the AFRICA Dummy", in *World Development*, Vol. 28, No. 10, pp. 1821-1835

Fanon, Frantz (2000) "Black Skin, White Masks". New York: Groove Press; Reissue edition of 1967

Fine, Ben and Stoneman, Colin (1996) "Introduction: State and Development", in *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 1, Special Issue: State and Development

Fukuyama, Francis (2004) "State-Building – Governance and World Order in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century". Ithaca: Cornell University Press

George, Alexander L. and Bennett, Andrew (2004) "Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences". Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press

Good, Kenneth (1986) "The Reproduction of Weakness in the State and Agriculture: Zambian Experience", in *African Affairs*, Vol. 85, No. 339, pp. 239-265

Good, Kenneth (1992) "Interpreting the Exceptionality of Botswana", in *Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 69-95

Good, Kenneth (1999) "The State and Extreme Poverty in Botswana: The San and Destitutes", in *Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 185-205

Good, Kenneth and Taylor, Ian (2006) "Unpacking the 'model': presidential succession in Botswana", in Southall, Rodger and Melber, Henning (eds.) "Legacies of Power. Leadership Change and Former Presidents in African Politics". Uppsala: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet, pp. 51-72

Good, Kenneth and Taylor, Ian (2008) "Botswana: A Minimalist Democracy", in *Democratization*, 15, 4, pp.750-765

Gordon, April A. and Gordon Donald L. (eds.) (2007) "Understanding contemporary Africa". Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner Publishers

Hansen, Karen Tranberg (2008) "The informalization of Lusaka's economy: Regime change, ultra-modern markets, and street vending, 1972-2004", in Gewalt, Jan-Bart; Hinfelaar, Marja and Macola, Giacomo (2008) "One Zambia, Many Histories-Towards a History of Post-colonial Zambia". Leiden: Brill, pp.213-239

Harvey, Charles and Lewis Jr., Stephen R. (1990) "Policy Choice and Development Performance in Botswana" The Macmillan Press and OECD Development Centre: London

Hawkins Jr., Jeffrey J. (1991) "Understanding the Failure of IMF Reform: The Zambian Case", in *World Development*, Vol. 19, No. 7, pp. 839-849

Hillbom, Ellen (2008) "Diamonds or development? A structural assessment of Botswana's forty years of success", in *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 46, 2, pp.

191–214

Holm, John D. (1996) “Development, Democracy and Civil Society in Botswana”, in Leftwich, Adrian (ed.) “Democracy and Development” Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 97-113

Johnson, Chalmers (1982) “MITI and the Japanese Miracle” Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press

Jones, David S. (1983) “Authority and State Administration in Botswana”, in *Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 133-139

Kohli, Atul (2004) “State-directed development: political power and industrialization in the global periphery” Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Landman, Todd (2007) “Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics – An Introduction”. London: Routledge

Leftwich, Adrian (1993) “Governance, democracy and development in the Third World”, in *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 14, No.3, pp. 605-624

Leftwich, Adrian (1996) “On the Primacy of Politics in Development” and “Two Cheers for Democracy? Democracy and the Developmental State“ in Leftwich, Adrian (ed.) “Democracy and Development” Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 3-24, and 279-295

Li, Janet (2006) “Making Progress – Zambia’s Improved Condition”, in *Harvard International Review*; Vol. 28, No. 3; p. 6

Macola, Giacomo (2008) “Harry Mwaanga Nnkumbula, UNIP and the roots of authoritarianism in nationalist Zambia”, in Gewalt, Jan-Bart; Hinfelaar, Marja and Macola, Giacomo (2008) “One Zambia, Many Histories-Towards a History of Post-colonial Zambia”. Leiden: Brill, pp.17-44

Mbabazi, Pamela and Taylor, Ian (2005) “Botswana and Uganda as Developmental States (?)”, in Mbabazi, Pamela and Taylor, Ian (2005) “The Potentiality of ‘Developmental States’ in Africa – Botswana and Uganda Compared”. Dakar: Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa, pp. 1-15

Mompati, Tlamele and Prinsen, Gerard (2000) “Ethnicity and Participatory Development Methods in Botswana: Some Participants Are to be Seen and Not Heard”, in *Development in Practice*, Vol. 10, No. 5, pp. 625-637

Moses, Jonathon W. and Knutsen, Torbjørn L. (2007) ”Ways of knowing, competing methodologies in social and political research” Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Ndue, Paul Ntungwe (1999) “Restoring Legitimacy to Public Authority in Twentieth-Century Africa”, in *Perspectives on Political Science*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 75-82

- Nengwekhulu, R. (1998) "Human rights, development and the rule of law in post-colonial Botswana", in Edge, W. A. and Lekorwe, M. H. (1998) "Botswana: Politics and Society". Pretoria: JL van Schaik Academic
- Nevin, Tom (2008) "Banda marches to familiar beat", in *African Business*, Vol. 348, pp. 72-73
- Noor, Khairul Baharein Mohd (2008) "Case Study: A Strategic Research Methodology", in *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, Vol. 5, Issue 11, pp. 1602-1604
- Persson, Anna (2008) "The Institutional Sources of Statehood – Assimilation, Multiculturalism, and Taxation in Sub-Saharan Africa". Gothenburg: Department of Political Science
- Phiri, Bizeck Jube (2006) "A Political History of Zambia. From the Colonial Period to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Republic". Asmara: Africa World Press
- Pierre, Jon and Peters, Guy (2000) "Governance, Politics and the State". London: Macmillan Press
- Potter, Robert B. (2008) "Theories, Strategies and Ideologies of Development", in Desai and Potter (2008) "The Companion to Development Studies", London: Hodder Education, pp. 67-71
- Radice, Hugo (2008) "The Developmental State under Global Neoliberalism", in *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 6, pp. 1153-1174
- Rakner, Lise, Van de Walle, Nicolas and Mulaisho, Dominic (1999) "Aid and Reform in Zambia. Country Case Study for the AID AND REFORM IN AFRICA PROJECT
- Rakner, Lise (2001) "The Pluralist Paradox. The Decline of Economic Interest Groups in Zambia in the 1990s", in *Development and Change*, Vol. 32, pp. 521-543
- Rakner, Lise (1998) "Reform as a Matter of Political Survival. Political and Economic Liberalisation in Zambia, 1991-2001", Dr. Polit dissertation, University of Bergen
- Rakner, Lise (2003) "Political and Economic Liberalisation in Zambia 1991-2001". Uppsala: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet
- Ramsay, J. (1998) "The establishment and consolidation of the Bechuanaland Protectorate, 1870-1910", in Edge, W. A. and Lekorwe, M. H. (1998) "Botswana: Politics and Society". Pretoria: JL van Schaik Academic
- Ruddin, Lee Peter (2006) "You Can Generalize Stupid! Social Scientists, Bent Flyvbjerg, and Case Study Methodology", in *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 12, Issue 4, pp. 797-812
- Taylor, Ian (2005) "The Developmental State in Africa: The Case of Botswana", in Mbabazi, Pamela and Taylor, Ian (2005) "The Potentiality of 'Developmental States'

in Africa – Botswana and Uganda Compared”. Dakar: Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa, pp. 44-56

Tlou, T. (1998) “The nature of Batswana states: Towards a theory of Batswana traditional government – The Batawana case”, in Edge, W. A. and Lekorwe, M. H. (1998) “Botswana: Politics and Society”. Pretoria: JL van Schaik Academic

Tordoff, William (1980) “Administration in Zambia”. Manchester: Manchester University Press

Tsie, Balefi (1996) “The Political Context of Botswana's Development Performance”, in *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 4 (Dec., 1996), pp. 599-616

Sachs, Jeffrey D. (2005). “The End of Poverty: How we can make it happen in our lifetime”. London: Penguin Books.

Simutanyi, Neo (2006) “The contested role of former presidents in Zambia”, in Southall, Rodger and Melber, Henning (eds.) “Legacies of Power. Leadership Change and Former Presidents in African Politics”. Uppsala: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet, pp. 73-97

Sen, Amartya (1999) “Development as Freedom” Oxford University Press: Oxford

Sylwester, Kevin (2008) “Historical Legacy and Institutions Across Countries”, in *Journal of Applied Economics*; Nov 2008; 11, 2; ABI/INFORM Global, p. 373

Thurlow, James and Wobst, Peter (2006) “Not All Growth is Equally Good for the Poor: The Case of Zambia”, in *Journal of African Economies*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 603–625

Van de Walle, Nicholas (2001) “African Economies and the Politics of Permanent Crisis, 1979-1999”. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Van de Walle, Nicholas (2009) “The Institutional Origins of Inequality in Sub-Saharan Africa”, in *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 12, pp. 307-327

Von Doepp, Peter (1996) “Political transition and civil society: The cases of Kenya and Zambia”, in *Studies in Comparative International Development*, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 24-48

Von Soest, Christian (2007) “How does neopatrimonialism affect the African state’s revenues? The case of tax collection in Zambia”, in *Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 45, No. 4, pp. 621-645

Vu, Tuong (2007) “State Formation and the Origins of Developmental States in South Korea and Indonesia”, in *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 41, No. 4, pp. 27-56

Yin, Robert K. (2009) “Case study research, design and methods” Los Angeles: Sage Publications

Internet Sources:

<http://freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=363&year=2008&country=7522>,  
accessed 30.06.2009

<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/655568/Zambia>, accessed 24.06.2009

<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/75170/Botswana>, accessed 23.06.2009

<http://hdrstats.undp.org/indicators/147.html> (UN Gini coefficient), accessed  
19.06.2009

<http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/> (UN HDI), accessed 17.06.2009