

Ontwikkeling, 'Good Governance' en Internationale Samenwerking

Transitions after the developmental state model: a comparative case study of Botswana and
Singapore

Bachelorscriptie Internationale Betrekkingen en Organisatie

Delia Molderings

s1177575

Universiteit Leiden

Begeleid door Dr. O.B.R.C. van Cranenburgh

12 juni 2017

8231 woorden

Introduction

Botswana and Singapore have achieved extraordinary economic growth in the past. Leftwich (2005, p. 154) explained their economic growth by the presence of a specific political context in both countries: the developmental state. According to Leftwich, developmental states are a transitional stage (Leftwich, 2002, p. 167). It is therefore interesting to look at the successful cases of Botswana and Singapore now, 15 years after Leftwich published 'States of development: on the primacy of politics in development', and see if the states still show the same characteristics. The goal of this research is to provide more empirical substantiation for the developmental state model and to fill the gap as to the way countries change after the model. The criteria of the developmental state model will thereby be evaluated on their applicability.

The method used in this paper is a comparative case study. The case study provides an in-depth study of the presence of the developmental state model and allows an insight into the various features that affect the model. The comparison between Botswana and Singapore provides a look upon general patterns of changes in developmental states. Because the cases were similar types of developmental states, a comparison shows if their recent political context differs and how these differences can be explained. This provides more insight on the developmental state itself. The comparison is based on Leftwich's developmental state model. The six components that he describes (2005, p. 160) are applied to both cases separately and then compared to each other. Reviewing relevant secondary literature will provide the data for the application of Leftwich's criteria.

Botswana and Singapore might seem to be random choices at first, since the countries differ a lot in size, geographical position, history and population. Both states are however examples of successful developmental states used by Leftwich in 'States of Development' (2005, p. 154). Both states were also defined as dominant-party developmental democratic states: an unchallenged dominant party held power in both countries (Leftwich, 2002, p. 176). The presence of this party explains a lot of the state autonomy and the developmental success in the developmental states. The reason that electoral democracy survived was because the dominant party was unchallenged and therefore had relatively clear run to become a developmental state (Leftwich, 2002, p. 177).

The central question that will be answered is: Do Botswana and Singapore still qualify as developmental states or has there been a transition into another political context? In order to answer this question, the first chapter of this paper will be focused on the components of the developmental state to provide a theoretical framework. In the second chapter, the features

of the developmental state will be applied to the current situation in Botswana to determine whether the country is still a developmental state or whether transitions have been made. The same analysis will be applied to the case of Singapore in the third chapter. The fourth chapter will provide a comparison between the cases of Botswana and Singapore in order to see if the transitions in the countries differ and, if they do, how this can be explained. In the last section I will conclude that although both countries were comparable in the period between 1965 and 1997 (Leftwich, 2005, p. 172) they have made different transitions because of the politics in the countries. Their specific economic policies have led to different transitions in the long run.

Chapter 1: Theoretical framework

Although development includes more than economic growth, it is the correlation between sustainability and economic growth that makes economic growth an important feature of development. Leftwich (2005, p. 29) considers economic growth a good proxy for the Human Development Index. He defined economic growth as the annual average growth of GNP per capita (Leftwich, 2005, p. 28). Nowadays, it is usually measured as the average GDP growth per capita, which is a measurement of the domestic production instead of the production from all people or companies that have the country's nationality (Investopedia, 2017). The GNP and GDP values are similar and since the developmental state explains economic growth within a country the GDP value is comparable to the GNP.

There are only few countries worldwide that have managed to maintain high levels of economic growth through a longer period of time. Leftwich (2005, p. 153) defines this as an average annual GNP growth per capita of more than 4% during at least 20 years. In the period of 1965 to 1999 the only countries that achieved this remarkable level of economic growth were Botswana, South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, China, Indonesia, Thailand and Malaysia (Leftwich, 2005, p. 153). Although these countries differ in their geographic, demographic, cultural and historical background, they achieved this long period of economic growth through specific forms of politics and because of the presence of the developmental state. The definition for developmental states that will be used in this thesis and was formulated by Leftwich is:

A state whose *politics* have concentrated sufficient power, autonomy, capacity and legitimacy at the centre to shape, pursue and encourage the achievement of explicit developmental objectives, whether by establishing and promoting the conditions of economic growth (...), by organizing it directly (...), or a varying combination of both (Leftwich, 2005, p. 155).

The specific politics are the reason for the sustained development. In order to achieve development, the politics are developmentally driven, whilst the development is politically driven. The political drive for development is usually founded by nationalism, a strong ideology and a wish to 'catch up' with the rich countries (Leftwich, 2005, p. 154). The model that Leftwich formulated consists of six components.

The first component is a developmental elite. The ruling elite in developmental states is determined to develop and achieve economic growth. They have remarkable abilities to transform and push the country through. Developmental elites are relatively incorrupt, which refers to the leadership style of the elite. A low level of corruption suggests that public

resources are used to invest in the country and not to enrich the elite. Developmental elites are also known for their tight linkages with the military bureaucracies and use of nationalism (Leftwich, 2005, p 160). The developmental project is often formulated as a security issue, or as the only way to survive as a country. Most developmental states had just become independent and suddenly had to 'make it on their own'. By emphasizing the national unity and using the military bureaucracy the elites ensured that their formulated policies were accepted and correctly implemented (Lim, 2015, p. 146).

Developmental states are also characterized by their relative state autonomy. The state can act relatively independent from specific interests within the society and override those interests if necessary. This enables the state to execute the developmental policies (Leftwich, 2005, p. 162). In general terms, state autonomy can be understood as: "the freedom of the state from direct and indirect control by dominant economic classes and ultimately from structural constraints" (Hamilton, 1981, p. 305). The relative autonomy that Leftwich refers to however is 'embedded autonomy'. This means that the state is not isolated from the dominant classes and social institutions, but is deeply intertwined with them. The social institutions help to re-define and implement policies, but if necessary, the state can and will ignore their special interests to achieve the national goal of high economic growth (Leftwich, 2005, p. 162).

Highly skilled meritocratic bureaucracies develop in developmental states because of the developmental determination and the relative state autonomy (Leftwich, 2005, p. 163). Usually specific institutions are introduced that are responsible for the enforcement of developmental policies. Bureaucrats have therefore much more power and authority than bureaucrats in non-developmental states. Their power is however limited to specific economic and developmental policies (Önis, 1991, p. 115). Bureaucrats are selected by meritocratic standards. Only highly educated people with extraordinary bureaucratic capabilities are recruited. The bureaucracies, military and developmental elite often share an educational background and sense of unity and therefore are tightly linked to implement policies (Önis, 1991, p. 115).

Developmental states have also kept their civil society weak (Leftwich, 2005, p. 163). In exchange for economic growth and welfare, civil societies accept this weakening or oppression by the state (Douglass, 2005, p. 544). Weak civil societies make it much easier for the state to develop a strong bureaucracy that is able to implement policies and the domestic order is easier to control if civil societies are weak (Stubbs, 2009, p. 6). According to Diamond (1997, p. 6), civil societies are: "the realm of organized social life that is open,

voluntary, self-generating, at least partially self-supporting, autonomous from the state and bound by a legal order or set of shared rules". Weak civil societies only partly fulfil these characteristics. Once economic growth has taken place, it is however not unusual for civil societies to strengthen, especially when the state becomes more democratic (Leftwich, 2005, p. 164).

Another component of developmental states is the violation of human rights. Opposition will not be tolerated and individuals or organizations that organize themselves against the state are put down (Leftwich, 2005, p. 165). Just as the civil society does, people accept that democratic rights, such as the freedom of speech or the right to assembly are violated in exchange for economic growth (Douglass, 2005, p. 544). The reason that human rights are weak is that without people organizing themselves or publicly criticizing the regime it is much easier to consolidate the developmental state and its policies. Developmental states however achieve better human rights scores than most non-developmental states (Leftwich, 2005, p. 165). Despite the weakness of the civil society and the neglect of human rights, the developmental states seem to enjoy a degree of legitimacy. This could be explained by the good performance of the state and the way it made economic growth visible for its inhabitants by spending it on education, health care or infrastructure (Leftwich, 2005, p. 166).

Developmental states have specific economic interests. Because the state authority was strong *before* economic development, the state was able to have a high level of influence on how capital should be distributed. The economic policy in developmental states is market-facilitating in order to promote economic growth (Leftwich, 2005, p. 164). The strong will of developmental states to 'catch-up' with Western countries is an important drive for economic growth. In order to be able to 'catch up', developmental states use strategic industrial policies. Specific sectors of the economy are selected and promoted and economic policies make certain investments more attractive than others (Weiss, 2000, p. 26). Although the wish to 'catch up' is an important incentive for economic growth in developmental states, there is also a strong emphasis on equal sharing of the growth. This is an important difference with the neoliberal system. It is partly because of this specific type of developmental policy that the regime is legitimate (Weiss, 2000, p. 27).

The politics of the developmental state are specific and formed in order to achieve economic growth and welfare. According to Leftwich, the developmental state is a transitional form toward a developed modern state. Drastic measures are necessary in order to 'catch up' (Leftwich, 2005, p. 167). The model provided by Leftwich will be the guideline to

determine whether the cases of Botswana and Singapore still qualify as developmental states and how they have made a transition.

Botswana and Singapore were both democracies during the developmental state period. The presence of democracy and a developmental state is rare; because a democracy is a conservative system in the sense that the compromise, consensus and incrementalism that characterize consolidated democracies, rarely lead to radical changes. Development on the other hand is a radical process that requires profound changes within a society. Because of the characteristics of democracies, it is unlikely that the system will bring development (Leftwich, 2005, p. 174). Botswana and Singapore are both countries in which democracy and development were combined, because of the dominant party system in both countries. The dominant parties were able to consolidate their power and to achieve development through the developmental state model. Democracy has remained stable in both countries because of the unchallenged hegemony of the dominant party (Leftwich, 2005, p. 178). The presence of a dominant party system is therefore an important feature of the politics in both countries.

2. Does Botswana still qualify as a developmental state?

A developmental state is above all marked by rapid economic growth. This means an annual average GNP growth of at least 4 percent. Botswana's average annual growth between 1995 and 2016 was 4.3 percent, although the economy is still recovering from the historical low of -11.8 percent growth in 2009 due to the financial crisis and the dependence on the diamond market. After the crisis, growth kept strongly fluctuating and is not yet stabilized (Trading Economics, 2017a). In this chapter I will determine whether this relative high average economic growth in Botswana can be explained because of the continued presence of the criteria of a developmental state.

Developmental Elite

The Botswana Democratic Party (BDP) has always been the governing party and still is. In 2008 Ian Khama, son of founding father Seretse Khama, was elected president. In his inauguration speech he claimed that development is still important to his government: "We as Government have all along appreciated the fact that the key to achieving sustainable diversified economic growth and social security lies in the development of our people" (All Africa, 2014). The National Development Plan (NDP), a detailed plan that is formulated by the government but implemented by the bureaucratic body (MFED, 2009), translates this into policy. The NDP is the guideline for developmental policies and Botswana has shown exceptional capacity in providing sufficient budgetary resources to enforce it (Sebudubudu, 2005, p. 81).

Botswana has a relative low level of corruption with a CPI score¹ of 60 and is ranked 35th out of all 176 countries (Transparency International, 2017a). It has the lowest perceived corruption level in Africa. Nonetheless, perceived corruption levels have slightly increased since 2008, when Ian Khama became president (Transparency International, 2017b). Grand corruption in the form of nepotism and patronage is the main problem in Botswana: government officials are often elected based on family relations or linkages with the government party. There are also cases of government officials that are funded by private companies (Badham-Jones, 2014, p. 3). Petty corruption levels in Botswana are comparatively low (Badham-Jones, 2014, p. 4).

¹ Transparency International (2017a) distinguishes corruption level based on their Corruption Perception Index (CPI) score. A score of 0 is a completely corrupt state and 100 means that a state is completely clean.

The linkages with the military and use of nationalism that is typical for developmental state's elite is still present in Botswana. The president has a long military background in the Botswana Defence Force (Brooks, 2008). Khama appointed almost only ministers with a military background that are also family of the president (Good, 2010a, p.322). Nationalism is used as an instrument for development in the NDP, with a 'united, proud, moral and tolerant nation' as one of its core pillars. The government refers to the many achievements of the country, such as the long democratic tradition and sustained development. Nationalism will be encouraged by the use of national symbols, unifying activities and the Botswana national brand (MFED, 2009).

Although President Khama claims to have developmental goals, the increasing corruption and militarization make his developmental determination questionable. Increasing corruption suggests that public resources are used to strengthen Khama's position rather than to achieve developmental goals. The criterion of a strong developmental elite therefore applies less than during the developmental state years.

Relative state autonomy

Botswana's government traditionally saw the private sector as a threat to economic growth rather than as a partner. Because of the dependence on the diamond market, the country never had any incentives to industrialize in other sectors. The financial crisis seems to have brought changes in this attitude (Botlhale, 2016, p. 28). Co-operation between the government and private sector is starting through privatization and the first Public Private Partnerships (PPPs). The government and private sector are working together to achieve economic development. The PPPs are now mainly used to finance development projects. The government does not treat the private sector as a strategic partner in decision-making processes (Botlhale, 2016, p. 42).

In recent years, Ian Khama seems to have developed a more autocratic governing style. He came into government on the condition that he could govern on his own terms (Good, 2010a, p. 319). This resulted in personalised ruling by a militarized government body and increasing intolerance for independent media and opposition (Bothlomilwe et al., 2011, p.346). The civil society is increasingly excluded from the political process. 72 percent of respondents in Botswana have never joined with others to raise an issue and 91 percent have never participated in a demonstration (Afrobarometer, 2017b).

In regard to the relative state autonomy, embedded autonomy does not seem to be the case in Botswana. The state is just starting to be involved with the private sector and is still

actively trying to keep CSOs out of politics. Therefore the criterion of relative autonomy in Botswana nowadays is weaker than in the developmental state model.

Bureaucratic power

The Ministry of Finance and Developmental Planning (MFDP) is a developmental institution that is typical for developmental states (Leftwich, 2005, p. 162). It has real power and bureaucrats are technically competent and shape the fundamentals of developmental policies autonomously. The mandate of the MFDP is broad: coordinating developmental planning, mobilizing and managing available resources and formulating policies for sustainable economic management (MFDP, 2017a). This shows that the MFDP can operate quite autonomously with regard to economic planning. It is the main actor in developing the NDP and therefore the developmental planning of Botswana. One of the tasks of the MFDP is to “ensure strict adherence to the budgetary processes” (MFDP, 2017a). Not only does the MFDP formulate the developmental policies, but it also monitors and enforces them.

Recruitment of bureaucrats is, in theory, based on meritocratic principles and is open to all groups of society (Sebudubudu & Mooketsane, 2016, p.162). Selection is based on education level, experience in reference to the vacancy, skills and competences (MFDP, 2017b, p.1). As mentioned before, ever since Ian Khama came into power the appointment of government officials is however increasingly based on nepotism and patronage (Good, 2010, p. 319). If recruitment is no longer based on meritocracy, it is likely that the bureaucracy will be less competent and effective than it used to be. It seems that, in regard to this feature, Botswana is changing a lot from the developmental state that Leftwich described and that the criterion of bureaucratic power has become weaker.

Weak civil society, human rights and legitimacy

Civil society in Botswana has never been well organized: on the one hand government has always denied the importance of civil society in the developmental process and on the other hand civil society has always been highly fragmented and lacked funding (Cailleba & Kumar, 2010, p. 334). In the beginning of the new millennium the status quo slightly changed for a short period of time. Civil society organizations (CSOs) grew in numbers thanks to international and private funding and some organizations were even included in the political process and had some, though limited influence on legislation (Cailleba & Kumar, 2010, p. 336). This changed when the international funding that the CSOs depend upon decreased. CSOs cannot organize themselves effectively without funding (Cailleba & Kumar, 2010, p.

336). Under Ian Khama's ruling, civil societies are excluded and the relationship between CSOs and government are basically non-existing. CSOs cannot effectively lobby because they can only reach bureaucrats and not politicians. Bureaucrats are however not permitted to engage in lobbying or other forms of political activity (Lekorwe & MPabanga, 2007, p.8). Civil society is thus still weak in Botswana because of inefficient organization and lack of inclusion from the government.

The protection of human rights is also weak in Botswana. Basic human rights such as the freedom of press and speech have been violated under Ian Khama's governance, even though the constitution provides them. The president has openly shown intolerance against the private press. The state often interferes with media and only allows articles that support government policies (Bothlomalwe et al, 2011, p. 340). Intelligence agencies are increasingly surveilling citizens electronically without proper oversight mechanisms (Freedom House, 2016a). Freedom House (2016a) however classifies Botswana as a free country with a civil freedom score of 2 out of 7. Botswana seems to have a complicated relationship with human rights. Especially in recent years under Khama's governance there has been a tendency to violate certain rights. Overall, Botswana human rights are still violated and therefore this component has not changed from the developmental state.

Although civil rights are often violated in Botswana, the state retains a relatively high degree of legitimacy because of the way that the benefits of economic growth have been allocated within the country (Leftwich, 2005, p. 166). Khama's government is spending most of its budget in 2016 on education and infrastructure, in order to increase human capital and stimulate and diversify the economy (MFDP, 2016). In 2014, 48 percent of respondents trust the president a lot and almost 80 percent of respondents approve of the performance of the president (Afrobarometer, 2017b). In 2001, only 31 percent trusted the president and only 56 percent approved the performance of the president (Afrobarometer, 2017b). This support for the president could be due to the stable environment that his governance has been able to maintain (Badham-Jones, 2014, p. 9). Khama's leadership has brought political and social stability, but it is yet to be seen whether this will remain enough to legitimize his increasingly autocratic leadership. Under Khama's rule, the legitimacy for the state has risen. The criterion of legitimacy seems to have become stronger compared to the developmental state period.

The developmental state and economic interests

Botswana's GDP growth, exports and revenues are mostly dependent on diamonds and the economy was never expanded to other branches. Botswana was unable to escape the resource curse despite the developmental commitment of the political elite and the close linkages between this elite and the private sector (Sebudubudu & Mooketsane, 2016, p.167). The political elite always had a special partnership with the biggest diamond manufacturer in the country and had influence on the market (Sebudubudu & Mooketsane, 2016, pp. 166-167). In recent years however, the problems of the diamond dependent economy started to show. There were never any incentives for structural changes such as further industrialization or enhancement of productivity (Good, 2010b, p. 362). During the financial crisis of 2008 the demand for diamonds dropped and economic growth dropped. Recovery has been slow and it is therefore that the government realizes that diversification is necessary to increase economic growth (Trading Economics, 2017a). The budgetary plans of 2016 were designed to stimulate the internal market through job creation by investing in infrastructure and strengthening human capital by spending more money on education (MFDP, 2016). The financial crisis has shown that the sustainability of the economy depends on diamonds. Structural changes and diversification of the market are necessary to achieve a sustainable economy. Recent economic policies suggest a recapturing of the elite's developmental determination. Although the results of these policies are not yet noticeable, it is clear that the government is still a leading actor in the economy. The economic interest of the elite is therefore not as different from the developmental state that Leftwich described.

The dominant party state

The BDP is still the only governing party in Botswana's history. The 13 opposition parties are weakly organized and do not challenge the BDP dominance. Specific interests of labour, women or disabled are not represented through opposition (Sebudubudu, Osei-Hwedie & Maripe, 2010, p. 87). The lack of a challenging opposition is the reason why democracy survived for such a long time (Leftwich, 2005, p. 178). Although the BDP still seems to be unchallenged, the hegemony does not seem to insure democracy in the future. As seen above, the presidency of Ian Khama has brought important changes on the developmental state criteria in Botswana. Corruption levels are increasing and the bureaucracy is decreasingly recruited by meritocratic principles. The absence of a challenging opposition in Botswana does seem to provide opportunity for deprivation into autocracy rather than to ensure democracy.

Conclusion

The developmental state that Leftwich (2005) describes to be present in Botswana is still noticeable in some components. The weak civil society, involvement in the economy and legitimacy for the government do not seem to have changed a lot. The increasingly autocratic leadership of Ian Khama since 2008 has however brought important changes to the system. The increasing corruption and non-meritocratic methods of recruitment are not characteristic for developmental states. Besides, the autonomy of the state without embedding in the social institutions is a sign that the government is losing its connection with society. The most important sign of developmental states, economic growth, is strongly fluctuating ever since the financial crisis in 2008. The question is whether the remaining developmental state institutions are strong enough to prevent the state from sliding off into autocracy or whether Khama will further expand his autocratic leadership in the future.

3. Does Singapore still qualify as a developmental state?

The average annual GDP growth in Singapore since 1976 is 6.7 percent per year. In 2009, economic growth hit a historical low of -8.8 due to decreased manufacturing and services because of the financial crisis in 2008. In 2010 economic growth was 19 percent, a record high growth. After these fluctuations, economic growth seems to be stabilizing at a much lower level, around 3 percent per year (Trading Economics, 2017b). The lower economic growth in recent years suggests that the developmental state in Singapore is less present nowadays and that the state has made a transition into another direction. In this chapter I will explore whether this is the case.

Developmental elite

The People's Action Party (PAP) is the only government party in the history of Singapore. The party always claimed to rule out of pragmatism rather than ideology (Liow, 2011, p. 247). The primary goal of the leadership was to achieve economic growth through state-led industrialization combined with an open market (Liow, 2011, p. 249). As current president Tony Tan Keng Yem said during his inauguration in 2011: "...discipline and pragmatism has served Singapore well, driving our economy's growth" (Istana, 2013). The president states that Singapore is now at the end of its economic boom and therefore needs to change its economic strategy by focusing on innovation and further diversification of the economy (Istana, 2013). It seems like Singapore is now in a process of 'keeping up' rather than 'catching up' the economy.

Perceived corruption levels in Singapore are low, the country is ranked 7th worldwide with a CPI-score of 84. The CPI-score has slightly dropped since 2010, but it is still one of the cleanest countries worldwide (Transparency International, 2017d). Singapore has effective anti-corruption laws with harsh punishment of corruption. The judiciary acts independently without state interference in most cases, except in cases related to the PAP in which the party usually wins. Overall, the risk of corruption is low in all public sectors. If corruption is found in Singapore, it is mostly related to the media (Business Anti-Corruption Portal, 2016). Corruption-levels in Singapore are not only relatively low, but much lower than Leftwich describes in his developmental state model.

In the developmental state period the developmental elite framed development as a matter of national security and survival within the world system (Lim, 2015, p. 146). Military servants still switch between careers in the military and government, especially high service

officials. The current chiefs of all military branches have had a position in one or more government departments during their career and 4 ministers used to have military careers (MINDEF, 2017). The PAP has used nationalism to legitimize its politics. The party emphasises the importance of national unity to ‘survive’ in the big world (Lim, 2015, p.155). The PAP also frames unity as a necessity for economic growth: “...strong individuals who may have diverse views CAN STICK TOGETHER to work as one effectively” (Refreshing PAP Committee, 2003). In the run-up to the national elections in 2011 nationalism was also defined as national identity and citizenship (Lim, 2015, p. 155). This shows that the elite still uses nationalism and close linkages with the military in order to achieve its economic goals.

The political elite in Singapore has rephrased its economic goal. It now emphasizes the importance of innovation and diversification to keep up, rather than to keep growing. This is also visible through the lower economic growth in the last 5 years. The linkages with the military and the use of nationalism do not seem to have changed however. This suggests that the developmental elite is still present in Singapore, but the strategy for economic growth has changed from the period that Leftwich (2005) refers to.

Relative state autonomy

Although Singapore’s government always co-operated with social institutions, the relationship between social institutions and government has always been quite weak. The government controls social institutions and their influence on policy-making (Khondker, 2008, p. 36). The distinction between state and private sector is sometimes blurry in Singapore. The elite that governs often has a background in the private sector and interests are mingled (Khondker, 2008, p. 48). In 2003 the first Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) were introduced in Singapore to increase efficiency in the market. These partnerships enable the government and private companies to co-operate and specify policy implementations together (Hwang, Zhao & Gay, 2012, p. 425).

The government has limited interactions with NGOs. Local NGOs are managed and controlled, but this is more difficult with international NGOs. International NGOs that criticize government are excluded, but those that complement the government are included to some extent (Khondker, 2008, p. 53). Although the government cannot neglect the presence of international NGOs in Singapore it still chooses when to act upon the demands or when to ignore them. Singapore’s government still has a sufficient level of embedded autonomy, since it does interfere with social institutions, but will overrule them if they do not act in the

perceived government-interest. Compared to the developmental state period, the relative autonomy has not decisively changed.

Bureaucratic power

Singapore is known for its efficient and meritocratic bureaucracy. High-level bureaucrats are selected via the Management Associates Programme (MAP) based on their academic performance. Once recruited, they get trained and evaluated and then divided over the Administrative Service based on their performance during the traineeship (Jones, 2016, p. 309). Salaries are high and rapid promotion is possible in order to provide incentives for high-level performance and to prevent outflow of best performing officials to the private market (Jones, 2016, p. 310). Bureaucrats influence policies by analysing and advising ministers on the effectiveness of policies. The government provides guidelines for the implementation of policies, but on a day-to-day basis, bureaucrats have a certain degree of discretionary space for implementation (Jones, 2016, p. 320). Policy formulation is highly centralized at the headquarters of the ministries and left to top-level officials (Jones, 2016, p. 354).

The Economic Development Board (EDB) is Singapore's main institution to formulate and shape developmental policies. The board is autonomous, but is part of the Ministry of Trade and Industry. It plans and executes the developmental strategies (MTI, 2017). Development is now focused on innovation, knowledge and R&D. The strategy to achieve this is to attract FDI and to diversify the market. Different programmes have been launched in order to provide the necessary resources and stimulate different sectors (EDB, 2017). The EDB is still the main actor in formulating developmental policies and the bureaucracy is still highly professionalised and skilled. This suggests that in this respect, Singapore has not changed its bureaucracy from the developmental state period.

Weak civil society, human rights and legitimacy

NGOs are active in Singapore, but they have to register and co-operate with the PAP through the People's Association. This institution is part of the Prime Minister's office and provides strict and specific regulations that limit and regulate NGOs. In recent years, the NGOs have started to be more active politically through spontaneous signature campaigns or small demonstrations (BTI, 2016, p. 15). From 2008 until 2010 the regulations seemed to soften. After 2010 however, the Public Order Act was implemented that put firmer restrictions on assembly rights. In 2013, the first riots since 1968 broke out and some people even got arrested. Police are now surveilling civilian assemblies more regularly (BTI, 2016, p. 8). The

PAP is still controlling civil society through regulation and strict surveillance. The riots in 2013 and increasing political activism however show that the civil society is strengthening compared to the period of the developmental state that Leftwich refers to.

Civil society is also kept weak because of the limited human rights. Freedom House (2016b) categorizes Singapore as a partly free country. Censorship of the traditional and social media restricts the freedom of expression and belief. Censorship is justified because it is framed as a protection against racial discrimination and terrorism, but actually the government uses it to shut down critics (Freedom House, 2016b). With the increasing importance of social media, the freedom of expression is further limited in recent years. Sites that do not fulfil government requirements are forced to shut down and have to pay fines. Several bloggers were legally prosecuted and all cases ended in favour of the government (BTI, 2016, p. 9). The Sedition Act restricts all these rights under the same law, which prohibits all seditious tendencies and acts and is misused to repress all types of opposition. The government has only expanded this act further in recent years (BTI, 2016, p. 9). Human rights are thus even more restricted than they used to be during the developmental state period and it seems that in this regard the situation has worsened.

Nonetheless, the state still retains a degree of legitimacy. The most important source of legitimacy is the on-going economic success and the distribution of the resources within the country. The PAP spends a lot of money on education and healthcare and therefore 'delivers' what they promised (Morgenbesser, 2017, p. 211). Based on this deli of goods, the PAP claims that in order to keep delivering, political stability is necessary and that how stability is achieved is irrelevant (Morgenbesser, 2017, p. 212). Legitimacy is also gained by regular general elections. Although the elections are free, they are unfair because the opposition is restricted by unfair rules. Although people thus have no real choice, they are able to vote and therefore legitimacy rises (Morgenbesser, 2017, p. 212). This system seems to work: in 2012 almost 80% of respondents said to have a great deal of confidence in their government (WVS, 2017).

The developmental state and economic interest

Singapore has no access to natural resources and therefore the economy is export-oriented on the manufacturing of high-value products and services (Jones, 2016, p. 301). The economic growth was high up until the economic crisis in 2008. After a short period of strong fluctuations, economic growth is stable at around 3 percent annual since 2012 (Trading Economics, 2017).

In 2010 the Economic Strategies Committee was founded in order to stimulate the economy. The strategy they formulated is focused on productivity-driven growth by attracting investment and further diversification through the biomedical sector. This strategy is the basis for the current economic policies (Singapore Medtech Portal, 2017). The government supports the strategy by providing the necessary resources through the annual budgets. In 2016, the 'Industry Transformative Programme' was started, which provided 4.5 billion US dollars to transform enterprises and industries through innovation (Singapore Budget, 2016, p. 4). Although the market is free, the government still plays a key role in the economy by stimulating certain sectors or providing aid to achieve the goal of a sustainable economy.

Interestingly, the government aims at an economic growth of 2 to 3 percent in 2017 (Singapore Budget, 2017). The government's goal thus seems to be sustainability and diversification rather than high economic growth. The government still has the capacity to influence and direct the economy. Although the direction of economic policies has changed from earlier years, the governmental interest in the economy seems to have stayed the same.

The dominant party state

There are 8 opposition parties in Singapore, but none of them have ever been able to seriously challenge the PAP in national elections. In the most recent elections in 2015 however, the opposition parties tried to unify themselves against the PAP via a non-competition agreement for the first time in history (Ong, 2016, p. 192). The idea was to compete against the PAP rather than against each other to increase their chances of winning seats. Due to differences between the opposition parties however the attempt failed. Only one party, the Workers Party, was able to win 6 out of 89 seats (Ong, 2016, p. 192). The recent changes in attitude of the opposition show that the hegemony of the PAP is no longer a given. Although the opposition did not succeed to win a majority, it was a first attempt to seriously challenge the PAP. The changing attitude of the civil society and the opposition seem like the start of a trend of more criticism and challenges towards the PAP.

Conclusion

Singapore has changed from the developmental state that Leftwich described. First of all, the elite's main focus no longer to achieve high economic growth, but sustainable and steady growth. Another noticeable change is that the state has developed even more restrictions on human rights. These restrictions were a reaction to a more active civil society. Singapore's civilians seem to put pressures on the government to respect human rights and although the

government is reacting with a tight grip, this could lead to important changes for the future of Singapore's politics. The changing attitude of the opposition also suggests that the political context might change in the future. Although these are all important changes from the developmental state, there are also a lot of features that can still be found today. The meritocratic bureaucracy, tight linkages between the government and the private sector, relative autonomy of the state and the legitimacy for the regime seem to have stayed intact. The question is whether the changing attitude of the civil society and the opposition can lead to bigger changes in the state, such as further democratization.

4. How does the political context in Botswana differ from Singapore?

Between 1965 and 1997 Botswana and Singapore were comparable cases. Both were dominant-party democratic developmental states, which made it relatively easy for the governing party to achieve economic growth (Leftwich, 2005, p. 178). Although the governing parties have never changed in both countries, the previous chapters have shown that their political context in the last 10 years has changed. Table 1 provides an overview of the current weakening or strengthening of the developmental state features compared to the developmental state period. First, the results of table 1 will be discussed and after that the role of the dominant party state on development will be elaborated.

Table 1

Current features in Botswana and Singapore compared to the developmental state period

Leftwich's features of developmental states	Botswana	Singapore
Economic growth	0	-
Developmental elite	-	0
Relative state autonomy	-	0
Bureaucratic power	-	0
Weak Civil Society	0	-
Human rights	0	+
Legitimacy	+	0
Economic interest	0	0

0 = Feature is similar to the developmental state period

- = Feature is weaker than during the developmental state period

+ = Feature is stronger than during the developmental state period

Results of the comparison

The stability of the Singaporean market and the focus on a stable and sustainable market rather than on high economic growth suggest that the country has made a transition comparable to developed nations. Botswana on the other hand has just recently been confronted with the problems of a dependent economy. In regard of economic growth it seems that Singapore has made a transition from a developmental state as a result from the policies of the developmental state. Botswana however is still in the middle of achieving stable and sustainable economic growth. The question is if it will achieve this through the developmental state, like Singapore did.

The current political elite in Botswana is losing important features of a developmental elite. The increasing levels of corruption could become problematic in achieving developmental goals. The transition Botswana seems to be making in regard to the developmental elite is in the direction of an autocratic elite. Singapore's developmental elite is still present, but the main goal has changed. The process of 'keeping up' will likely enable the country to make a transition to a high-income country.

The embedded autonomy in Singapore is similar to the developmental state. In Botswana, the absence of embedded autonomy does suggest that the government does not take specific interests into account and is yet another feature that points towards increasing autocracy in the country. If the government loses its connections with society, the legitimacy is likely to drop.

The Singaporean bureaucracy is still an important actor in achieving economic goals. In Botswana, Khama's government style has however led to a weaker bureaucracy. The skilled and professional bureaucracy that is necessary to effectively implement economic policies is becoming weaker. The weakening of the bureaucracy suggests that the president prioritizes the consolidation of his position over the economic development in the country.

Although the current situation with regard to civil society and human rights has not changed in Botswana, the question is if these oppressions are meant to achieve economic growth or whether the country is shifting towards autocracy. If Singapore's citizens are able to pressure the government, it is likely that the civil society will become more powerful and that a democratic transition may occur.

The implications of a dominant party system on development

The dominant party system in Botswana and Singapore made it possible for the countries to be democratic and a developmental state at the same time. The absence of a well-organised opposition made development possible through the developmental state model (Leftwich, 2005, p. 177). The comparison between the recent changes in the developmental state model in Botswana and Singapore has however shown important differences in the direction of the transitions.

The party dominance of the BDP has still never been challenged. The opposition is not effectively organized and forms no real challenge to the BDP. The power is still concentrated in the centre of the state, but the way it is used has changed from the developmental state period. The developmental state model has not led to a stable and diversified economy. Botswana has never had any incentives to diversify the economy, because of the highly

profitable diamond-market. Moreover, the increasing corruption-levels and militarization of the bureaucracy combined with the absence of embedded autonomy seem to be signs of an increasingly autocratic state. The unchallenged hegemony of the BDP has led to a loss of democracy in Botswana.

In Singapore on the other hand, the dominant party system combined with the developmental state model has led to a stable and diversified economy. Singapore is now aiming for an innovative rather than just an industrialized economy. Economic growth has led to the development of a stable middle-class that is increasingly protesting against the government's restrictions (BTI, 2016, p. 9). The opposition has made its first attempts to seriously challenge the dominance of the PAP in the 2015 elections. Although the attempt failed, it indicates a changing attitude towards the hegemony of the PAP. As Leftwich (2005, p. 164) predicted, the changes in the socio-economic structure of the country have led to the development of political counter-forces. It seems like Singapore is shifting towards democracy.

Although the dominant party system used to be the cohesion between development and democracy in Botswana and Singapore, it seems that this grip has loosened. The developmental state in a dominant party system is inherently instable; either the party dominance remains intact and democracy is lost as in Botswana, or the party dominance is challenged and democracy increases as seems to be the case in Singapore. In neither cases the developmental state has been remained intact.

Conclusion

Both Botswana and Singapore have made transitions from the developmental state that Leftwich described. Botswana does seem to be making a transition towards a more autocratic regime, where developmental goals are not as important as the assurance that the government will stay in power. In Singapore on the other hand, the developmental state has resulted in stable and sustainable growth. The country is not focusing on achieving growth anymore, but on maintaining and stabilising it. The changing attitude of the civil society does suggest that political counter-forces will develop. The dominant party system in developmental states has not proved to be a guarantee for democracy and development. It has shown that the economic structure and dedication of the party are important indicators of what direction that the states are heading towards. The developmental state system in Botswana and Singapore seems to be inherently instable and lead to either autocracy or democracy.

Conclusion

Botswana and Singapore have changed from the developmental state model that Leftwich described. Although a lot of features from the developmental state are still present in both states, their political contexts have changed. The presidency of Ian Khama in Botswana has brought increasing levels of corruption and the country has to deal with an unstable economic environment. The developmental determination that is the leading force in a developmental state seems to have weakened. Civil society is still weak and excluded and human rights are often violated. Although Botswana is known as the 'African Miracle' and as a relatively stable democracy, it seems that the democratic values that were present are disappearing and that president Khama is shifting towards autocracy. Singapore on the other hand has been able to achieve stable and sustainable economic growth. The transition from the developmental state is a result of the success that has been made during the developmental state period. After the period of high economic growth, the country is now aiming for an innovative and sustainable market. The changing socio-economic status of the country also had its implications for society. Civil society is becoming more organised and demonstrations or critique on the government are no longer unimaginable. Although the government's reaction is to further limit human rights, it is likely that this conflict between the ruling elite and society will bring some form of transition. Whether this will be a democratic transition has yet to be seen.

The different economic strategies and leadership styles in both countries have resulted in two almost opposite countries. Where Singapore seems to have been able to transition into a sustainable developed country, Botswana is still focusing on high economic growth and has not been able to diversify the market. It can thus be concluded that it is indeed the specific politics of the state that will determine whether a state can achieve long-term sustainable economic growth, just as Leftwich (2005, p.191) claimed. The differing economic strategies in both countries have resulted in long-term differences of the market. In Botswana, where the developmental determination has weakened and economic policies were always just focused on the diamond market, the state has not been able to achieve sustainable economic growth. In Singapore on the other hand, where the elite was forced to diversify the market and where the developmental determination has remained similar to the developmental state period, the result is a stable and sustainable level of economic growth. This shows that it is not just the developmental determination of the elite that is important to achieve sustainable economic growth, but also the specific economic strategy that has been chosen.

The dominant party system in Botswana and Singapore has had important implications of the recent changes in both countries. The dominant party once used to be the glue between democracy and development, but in Botswana it seems that the system is enabling the country to slip off into autocracy. Civil society and social interest groups are weakly organised and no political counter-force exists to challenge the government. In Singapore, the dominant party system combined with the developmental state has brought economic stability and led to the development of a middle-class. The middle-class is now starting to organise itself and puts pressure on the government. This shows that the developmental state model is instable in dominant party systems and, on the long run, tends to either enable autocracy or shifts towards democracy.

Although it seems like both countries are transitioning into different directions, this is not the case yet. If the developmental state features in Botswana are strong enough and if president Khama is not only aiming for development in his speeches but also in his actions, the country still has a lot of possibilities to achieve sustainable economic growth. Much will depend on the choice of economic strategy, such as diversification of the economy. In the case of Singapore, the government is intolerant towards critiques and opposition. If the elite succeeds to oppress civil society in the future, it is not unlikely that there will be no transitions towards democracy. The future must yet show the direction of the transitions that have been found in this paper.

References

- All Africa. (2014). *Inauguration Address by H.E. The president, Lt. Gen. Ian Khama (press release)*. Accessed on the 26th of April 2017 via https://global-factiva-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2443/ha/default.aspx#!?&_suid=149319471029607694127480285998
- Afrobarometer. (2017a). *Botswana*. Accessed on 26th of April 2017 via <http://www.afrobarometer.org/countries/botswana-0>
- Afrobarometer. (2017b). *Afrobarometer data analysis*. Accessed on the 26th of April 2017 via <http://afrobarometer.org/online-data-analysis/analyse-online>
- Badham-Jones, M. (2014). *Overview of corruption and anti-corruption in Botswana*. Accessed on 23th of April 2017 via http://www.transparency.org/files/content/corruptionqas/Country_Profile_Botswana_2014.pdf
- Bothale, E.K. (2016). Financing development through Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) in Botswana. *Africa's Public Service Deli and Performance Review* 4(1). pp. 26-48.
- Bothlomilwe, M.Z., Sebudubudu, D. & Maripe, B. (2011). Limited freedom and intolerance in Botswana. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies* 29(3). pp. 331-348.
- Brooks, H. (2008). Botswana; who is Ian Khama? *New African* 473(1) pp. 30-31.
- Bertelsmann Stiftung, BTI. (2016). *Singapore Country Report*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung
- Business Anti-Corruption Portal. (2016). *Singapore Corruption Report*. Accessed on the 2th of May 2017 via <http://www.business-anti-corruption.com/country-profiles/singapore>
- Calleiba, P. & Kumar, R.A. (2010). When customary laws face civil society organisations: gender issues in Botswana. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations* 4(9). pp.330-339.
- Diamond, L. (1997). *Civil society and the development of democracy*. E-studio Working Paper. Accessed on 21th April 2017 via <http://xa.yimg.com/kq/groups/20679041/615551190/name/LARRY+DIAMOND+CIVIL+SOCIETY+DEMOCRACY.pdf>
- Douglass, M. (2005). Local city, capital city or world city? Civil society, the (post-) developmental state and the globalization of urban space in Pacific Asia. *Pacific Affairs* 78(4). pp. 543-558.

- Economic Development Board. (2017). *Our History*. Accessed on the 3rd of May via <https://www.edb.gov.sg/content/edb/en/about-edb/company-information/our-history.html>
- Freedom House. (2016a). *Botswana*. Accessed on the 1st of May 2017 via <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2016/botswana>
- Freedom House. (2016b). *Singapore*. Accessed on the 5th of May 2017 via <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2016/singapore>
- Good, K. (2010a). Briefing: the presidency of general Ian Khama: the militarization of the Botswana ‘miracle’. *African Affairs* 109(435). pp. 315-324.
- Good, K. (2010b). Autocracy, insecurity and pre-modernity in Botswana. *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* 48(3). pp. 348-372.
- Hamilton, N. (1981). State autonomy and dependent capitalism in Latin America. *British Journal of Sociology* 32(3). pp. 305-329.
- Hwang, B., Zhao, X. & Gay, M.J.S. (2013). Public private partnership projects in Singapore: factors, critical risks and preferred risk allocation from the perspective of contractors. *International Journal of Project Management* 31. pp. 424-433.
- Investopedia. (2017). *What is the functional difference between GDP and GNP?* Accessed on the 9th of May 2017 via <http://www.investopedia.com/ask/answers/030415/what-functional-difference-between-gdp-and-gnp.asp>
- Istana. (2013). *Speech by president Tony Tan Keng Yam at the swearing-in ceremony of the 7th president of Singapore at the Istana*. Accessed on the 2th of May 2017 via <http://www.istana.gov.sg/news/speeches/2011/speech-president-tony-tan-keng-yam-the-swearing-ceremony-the-seventh-president>
- Jones, D. S. (2016). Governance and meritocracy: a study of policy implementation in Singapore. In Quah, J.S.T. (red.). *The role of public bureaucracy in policy implementation in five ASEAN countries* (297-369). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Khondker, H.H. (2008). Globalization and state autonomy in Singapore. *Asian Journal of Social Science* 36. pp. 35-56.
- Leftwich, A. (2005). *States of development: On the primacy of politics in development*. Malden: Polity Press.
- Lekorwe, M. & Mpabanga, D. (2007). Managing Non-Governmental Organizations in Botswana. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal* 12(3). pp. 1-18.

- Lim, J. (2015). Popular Nationalism in the wake of the 2011 national elections in Singapore. *Japanese Journal of Political Science* 16(2). pp. 143-159.
- Liow, E.D. (2011). The neoliberal-developmental state: Singapore as case-study. *Critical Sociology* 38(2). pp. 241-264.
- MINDEF. (2017). *Organisation structure*. Accessed on the 2th of May 2017 via https://www.mindef.gov.sg/imindef/about_us/organisation_structure.html
- Ministry of Finance and Economic Development. (2009). *The National Development Plan 10, volume 1*. Accessed via the site of the government of Botswana on 23th April 2017 via http://www.finance.gov.bw/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&id=28&Itemid=126
- Ministry of Finance and Economic Development. (2016). *The 2016/17 Budget-in-brief*. Accessed on the 1st of May 2017 via http://www.gov.bw/globalassets/amfdp/budget-speeches/2016/2016_17budgetinbrief.pdf
- Ministry of Finance and Economic Development. (2017)a. *Mandate*. Accessed on the 27th of April 2017 via http://www.finance.gov.bw/index.php?Itemid=137&option=com_content&view=article&id=18&catid=9
- Ministry of Finance and Economic Development. (2017b). *External advertisement: Project Manager*. Accessed on the 27th of April 2017 via <http://www.finance.gov.bw/images/Recruitment/AdvertProjectSpecialistfinal.pdf>
- Ministry of Trade and Industry, MTI (2017). *About MTI: Statutory Boards*. Accessed on the 3rd of May via <https://www.mti.gov.sg/AboutMTI/Pages/Statutory-Boards.aspx>
- Morgenbesser, L. (2017). The autocratic mandate: elections, legitimacy and regime stability in Singapore. *The Pacific Review* 30(2). pp. 205-231.
- Office of the President (OP). (2012). *2012 State of the Nation Address*. Accessed via the site of the government of Botswana on 25th of April 2017 via <http://www.gov.bw/en/Ministries--Authorities/Ministries/State-President/Office-of-the-President/Tools--Services/Speeches-/2012-State-of-the-Nation-Address/>
- Önis, Z. (1991). The logic of the developmental state. *Comparative Politics* 24 (1). pp. 109-126.
- Ong, E. (2016). Opposition coordination in Singapore's 2015 General Elections. *The Round Table* 105(2). pp. 185-194.
- Refreshing PAP Committee. (2003). *Our Mission*. Accessed on the 2th of May 2017 via <https://www.pap.org.sg/ABOUT/Our-Party/Content>

- Sebudubudu, D. (2005). The institutional framework of the developmental state in Botswana. In Mbabazi, P. & Taylor, I. (red.), *The potentiality of developmental states in Africa: Botswana and Uganda compared* (79-89). Dakar: CODESRIA.
- Sebudubudu, D. & Mooketsane, K. (2016). What has made political institutions in Botswana and Mauritius tick? *Taiwan Journal of Democracy* 12(1). pp. 145-168.
- Sebudubudu, D. & Osei-Hwedie, M.Z. (2010). In permanent opposition: Botswana's other political parties. *South African Journal of International Affairs* 17(1). pp. 85-102.
- Singapore Budget (2016). *2016 Budget in Brief: partnering for the future*. Accessed on 3rd of May 2017 via http://www.singaporebudget.gov.sg/data/budget_2016/download/FY2016_Budget_in_Brief.pdf
- Singapore Medtech Portal. 2017. *Singapore's economic policies and key government agencies*. Accessed on the 3rd of May 2017 via <http://www.medtech.sg/singapore-economic-policies-key-government-agencies/>
- Stubbs, R. (2009). What ever happened to the East Asian developmental state? The unfolding debate. *The Pacific Review* 22(1). pp. 1-22.
- Trading Economics. (2017a). *Botswana GDP Annual Growth Rate*. Accessed on the 23th April 2017 via <http://www.tradingeconomics.com/botswana/gdp-growth-annual>.
- Trading Economics. (2017b). *Singapore GDP Annual Growth Rate*. Accessed on the 2st of May 2017 via <http://www.tradingeconomics.com/singapore/gdp-growth-annual>
- Transparency International. (2017a). *Botswana*. Accessed on the 23th of April 2017 via <http://www.transparency.org/country/BWA>
- Transparency International (2017b). *Corruption Perception Index 2016*. Accessed on the 26th of April 2017 via http://www.transparency.org/news/feature/corruption_perceptions_index_2016
- Transparency International. (2017c). *Anti-corruption glossary*. Accessed on the 1st of May 2017 via <http://www.transparency.org/glossary/term/corruption>
- Transparency International. (2017d). *Singapore*. Accessed on the 2th of May 2017 via <http://www.transparency.org/country/SGP>
- Weiss, L. (2000). Developmental states in transition: Adapting, dismantling, innovating and 'normalizing'. *The Pacific Review* 13(1). pp. 21-55.
- World Values Survey, WVS. (2017). *World Values Survey Wave 6: 2010-2014*. Accessed on the 5th of May 2017 via <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSONline.jsp>

United Nations Development Programme. (2017). *Human Development Report: Botswana*.

Accessed on the 1st of May 2017 via <http://hdr.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/BWA>.