

**Part I**

**Have development strategies in post-colonial Africa mitigated or exacerbated inequalities within countries? Explain your answer.**

**State-led Development in Africa: Focusing on Senegal and Kenya**

(Word count: 999 words including sub-headings)

**Introduction**

After the independence, African states faced political and economic challenges while they sought to promote economic growth through state-led developmental initiatives in many sectors from agriculture to social services. Cooper (2002) points out that most African countries accomplished economic growth between 1950 and 1975. However, struggles between African populations to obtain power over the state shaped political conflict and economic policies which contributed to the uneven development in contemporary Africa (Berry, 1993). In this essay, I argue that the development strategies during the post-colonial period have exacerbated inequalities within countries by using the case of Senegal and Kenya.

**The Political Challenges in the Successor States during the postcolonial period**

African successor states faced a period of nation-building after the independence due to the continued existence of colonial legacy politics. “Decentralised despotism” (Mamdani, 1996) is a term describing the political system of African colonial states. Through this decentralisation, the colonial powers were able to easily extract tax and natural resources in Africa. Ajayi (1982) explains that diverse social groups such as intellectuals and political elites emerged, and they did not reach an agreement on their development, pursuing different goals between the 1960s and 1980s. For the intellectuals, economic development was not the most crucial aim, while for the African political elite, politics was a useful tool to assure fame (Ajayi, 1982). Furthermore, the traditional elite who sought to enjoy their privileges from the colonial period demonstrates that the outdated clientelism, such as colonial decentralisation, existed in postcolonial Africa (Ajayi, 1982). From this analysis, I have identified that the absence of clear expectations for the postcolonial era and political linkage with their former colonial powers formed the basis for successor states.

**The Economic Challenges during the postcolonial period**

Economically, African states attempted to raise their revenue, focusing on rural development and

industrialisation. These efforts for development did, however, have some constraints, which can be seen as deeply rooted in the legacies of colonialism. Firstly, in agriculture, the successor states expanded the production of smallholders. Peasants played a pivotal role in generating a high amount of revenue by using their kinship and networks within their societies (Cooper, 2002), which is an economic structure African leaders had yet to radically transform. They maximised the existing agricultural system based on the colonial economic structure, meaning exports were still dependent on primary commodities and the exploitation of mineral resources (Ndulu, O'Connell, Bates, Collier, & Soludo, 2007). The explanation of Ndulu et al. is appreciable because it implies that the mining industry was lucrative in the postcolonial period. From the overall experiences of state-led development, the basis of the economic structure in the 1960s and 1980s was akin to a colonial economic structure, which focused on cash crop and mineral resources production for exports.

### **African Development Strategies: focusing on Senegal and Kenya**

During the post-colonial period, the successor states in Africa employed diverse strategies for development. Cooper (2002) argues that African countries concentrated on rural development through subsidies for crops and fertilisers and state-led developmental projects. However, these development strategies generated the uneven development within countries. African governments were not able to control prices and production, and this led to the impoverishment of African peasants in 1960s and 1970s (Berry, 1993). The cases of Senegal and Kenya illustrate the implications of developmental strategies in the postcolonial period.

The case of Senegal demonstrates the features and challenges of postcolonial states, such as heavy centralism and bureaucracy, and the remarkable regional differences within countries that have deterred development (Boone, 2003). Specifically, Senegal can be an example of a country having diverse political strategies for state-building. As Boone (2003) explains, the Wolof and Lower Casamance, which are two regions in Senegal, show the institutional difference in rural institutions. Compared to the Wolof, Lower Casamance did not have a consolidated rural society because the central government decided to only implement policies for state-building at the lower level (Boone, 2003). In this sense, the failure to adopt unified state-building strategies harmed the politics in Senegal. This political challenge is related to the French, during which time French colonial officials refused to cooperate with leaders and marabouts in Senegal, believing that traditional political structures should be weakened to implement their own colonial policies (Paul, 2010). Hence, the uneven development due to the existence of different institutions within one state originated from the colonial system.

Kenya had also retained the elements of the colonial system in its local government councils (Berry, 1993). For example, the Marketing Boards and Farmers' Association excluded African farmers in the colonial period, but began to include them after colonialism had officially ended (Berry, 1993). From

these institutions in Kenya, as discussed earlier, the successor states did not establish a new form of economic system for development. Meanwhile, it is clear that the government implemented several development initiatives in Kenya. According to Berry (1993), the government attempted to support rural development by establishing The Kenya Tea Development Authority and Special Rural Development Programmes between the 1960s and 1980s. Politically, most African countries had undergone diverse forms of conflict in the first few years of independence. Although the election process existed, there were conflicts between political parties, and opposition parties were removed (Berry, 1993). Through the case of Senegal and Kenya, I argue that African countries expanded their states' revenue through the existing economic system from the colonial period and that this policy could not mitigate the inequalities within countries.

### Conclusion

In conclusion, the detrimental implications of the colonial political system formed the basis of the African political economy, which resulted in many political and economic challenges in the postcolonial period. By looking at the cases of Senegal and Kenya, it was revealed that state-led developmentalism in Africa focused on rural development, but this was not able to mitigate regional disparities within each country. Ultimately, most African leaders tried to accomplish development by utilising the former colonial institutions. Therefore, despite the colonial period ending in Africa, the legacies of colonialism caused political and economic challenges within most successor states.

### Bibliography

- Ajayi, J. F. A. (1982). Expectations of Independence. *Daedalus*, 111(2), 1–9. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.gate2.library.lse.ac.uk/stable/10.2307/20024782?origin=api>
- Berry, S. (1993). *No condition is permanent: the social dynamics of agrarian change in sub-Saharan Africa*. Retrieved from <https://www-fulcrum-org.gate2.library.lse.ac.uk/concern/monographs/kk91fk776>
- Boone, C. (2003). *Political topographies of the African state: territorial authority and institutional choice*. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511615597>
- Cooper, F. (2002). *Africa since 1940: the past of the present*. Retrieved from <https://www-cambridge-org.gate3.library.lse.ac.uk/core/books/africa-since-1940/4A6AADCAEA3125B9100D016B00A33644>
- Mamdani, M. (1996). *Citizen and subject: contemporary Africa and the legacy of late colonialism*. Retrieved from

DV435

47592

<http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/londonschoolecons/detail.action?docID=4906219>

Mkandawire, T. (2014). Can Africa turn from recovery to development? *Current History*, 113(763), 171–177. Retrieved from [https://search-proquest-com.gate3.library.lse.ac.uk/docview/1642629072?rfr\\_id=info%3Axri%2Fsid%3Aprimo](https://search-proquest-com.gate3.library.lse.ac.uk/docview/1642629072?rfr_id=info%3Axri%2Fsid%3Aprimo)

Ndulu, B. J., O’Connell, S. A., Bates, R. H., Collier, P., & Soludo, C. C. (2007). *The political economy of economic growth in africa, 1960-2000: Volume 1*. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511492648>

Paul, N. (2010). *States and Social Contracts in Africa*, *NLR* 63. Retrieved from <https://newleftreview.org/issues/II63/articles/paul-nugent-states-and-social-contracts-in-africa>

**Part 2****What does “structural transformation” of an African economy look like in practice?****Under what conditions could we expect this to happen?****Structural Transformation in Africa with the case of Ethiopia****(Word count: 990 words including and subheadings)****Introduction**

The success of structural transformation is at the core of economic growth. Effective industrial policy can lead to economic transformation, but we must comprehend the characteristic of industrial policy is political (Whitfield & Buur, 2014). In this sense, an understanding of the political process in a country can play a pivotal role in evaluating its overall economic development. According to Whitfield and Buur (2014), structural transformation includes economic development in the process of structural transformation. From these arguments, the political process can be the main determinant of the success of structural transformation. In the African context, structural transformation can be possible with an adequate industrial policy. In this essay, I will examine the actual features of structural transformation in the African political economy and discuss the factors for successful structural transformation in the African context with the case study of Ethiopia.

**Structural Transformation in the African Political Economy**

Many African countries experienced economic growth in the 2000s, but the governments of such countries are still experiencing problems in terms of implementing structural transformation policies because of the low-productive industries. Furthermore, the changing global political economy entailed the drivers of economic recovery in Africa. The emergence of China in Africa has remarkably affected aspects of the African political economy. African countries have begun to trade with China, and this diversification of trading has also generated more trade revenue. In addition to this, the provision of aid and investment from China has increased. According to Mkandawire (2014), the improved terms of trade have enabled African states to experience recovery with improved incomes from exports since the mid-1990s. However, even though African countries have undergone recovery, the questions about sustainability still remain because the improvement of export earnings was heavily dependent on increased prices (Mkandawire, 2014). In short, improved export earnings are vulnerable to the global

market, and this also means that the export revenue tends to shrink when commodity prices are depressed. Therefore, the reliance on export revenue can hamper the sustainability of economic growth in Africa. Mkandawire (2014) argues that the absence of diversification leads to “monocropping”, which means the dependency of one export commodity. Thus, crop export production is vulnerable and less productive because it cannot generate stable earnings. Also, export production is one of the reasons for retarded structural transformation.

Aside from export production, there are diverse challenges inherent in structural transformation in Africa. For example, African governments have prioritised import substitution policies and failed to enhance private markets in the postcolonial period (Aryeetey & Moyo, 2012). It is clear that the state-led developmental initiatives in most African countries have ultimately been failures, resulting in the need to follow the structure adjustment programmes (SAPs). However, the policies of SAPs, such as economic liberalisation, have also failed to promote African economies. According to Whitfield and Buur (2014), ruling elites prefer to maintain existing agricultural exports because the consistent reliance on natural resources in agriculture is an economic policy that has been at the heart of the Sub-Saharan African economic structure, making it the easier method of foreign exchange. Therefore, the detrimental implications derived from the failure of state-led development and SAPs have become challenges that African countries face, and they also have left Sub-Saharan Africa lagging behind.

### **The Conditions for Structural Transformation**

To achieve successful structural transformation, the ruling elites’ capacity to implement appropriate industrial policies are crucial factors. First of all, the role of politics should be central to the structural transformation because the political process can enable change in the composition of the economy to improve productivity. The rapid and successful economic growth in East Asia exemplifies the need for political institutions to play a pivotal role in the process of structural transformation. Aryeetey and Moyo (2012) highlight that industrial policy includes the state not only developing a business environment but also actively cooperating with the private sector through more a profitable production process. Moreover, the relationship between the state and business is necessary for structural transformation because the core aim of structural transformation is to improve productivity. The principle of “vertical policy”(Aryeetey & Moyo, 2012) implies that the cooperation between the state and business is necessary because, for structural transformation, targeting and selecting industries cannot be performed by the government alone.

### **Structural Transformation in the African Political Economy: focusing on Ethiopia**

Despite the unfavourable situations, some African countries such as Ethiopia have demonstrated the possibility of structural transformation with impressive economic growth and stable political

institutions. Ethiopia applied the East Asian developmental state model to improve its economic growth. While the Ethiopian government had interests in promoting agricultural productivity, it emphasised supporting the infrastructural conditions for industrial development from private enterprises (Clapham, 2018). Adopting the developmental state, the government involved in agriculture, which is why it has implemented the Agricultural Extension Programme (Lefort, 2012). In terms of the political system, Ethiopia has worked to strengthen its bureaucratic structure since the early 2000s (Di Nunzio, n.d.). However, the Ethiopian government has also faced some challenges. In terms of the state-business relationship, the principal challenge in Ethiopia is the private sectors' capacity to provide efficiency within the whole industry; therefore, the government tends to depend on foreign direct investment (Clapham, 2018).

### Conclusion

Some scholars such as Whitfield, Aryeetey, and Moyo point out that sectoral industrial policy is central for structural transformation. Whitfield and Buur (2014) state that structural transformation requires a transformation in the reallocation of economic benefits and selective industrial policy. Thus, the role of adequate industrial policy should be implemented by politicians. However, most African countries have a lack of appropriate industrial policy despite such policy enabling economic prosperity with improved productivity. The political elites in Africa have failed to diversify their economic structures, preferring to rely on a certain cash crop production for export. Contrary to Sub-Saharan Africa, East Asian countries have succeeded in structural transformation through their strong political institutions. Thus, the political process is important to transform the overall economic structure within countries.

### Bibliography

- Aryeetey, E., & Moyo, N. (2012). Industrialisation for Structural Transformation in Africa: Appropriate Roles for the State. *Journal of African Economies*, 21(suppl 2), ii55–ii85.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/jae/ejr043>
- Clapham, C. (2018). The Ethiopian developmental state. *Third World Quarterly*, 39(6), 1151–1165.  
<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2017.1328982>
- Di Nunzio, M. (n.d.). What is the Alternative? Youth, Entrepreneurship and the Developmental State in Urban Ethiopia. *Development and Change*, 46(5), 1179–1200.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12187>
- Lefort, R. (2012). Free market economy, “developmental state” and party-state hegemony in Ethiopia: the case of the “model farmers.” *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 50(4), 681–706.  
<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0022278X12000389>

DV435

47592

Mkandawire, T. (2014). Can Africa turn from recovery to development? *Current History*, 113(763), 171–177. Retrieved from [https://search-proquest-com.gate3.library.lse.ac.uk/docview/1642629072?rfr\\_id=info%3Axi%2Fsid%3Aprimo](https://search-proquest-com.gate3.library.lse.ac.uk/docview/1642629072?rfr_id=info%3Axi%2Fsid%3Aprimo)

Whitfield, L., & Buur, L. (2014). The politics of industrial policy: ruling elites and their alliances. *Third World Quarterly*. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&>