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“THERE IS NO DEVELOPMENT HERE”: SOCIAL POWER AND THE SHAPING OF A SOUTHERN ZAMBIAN COMMUNITY

Abstract

By Christa M. Abdul-Karim, PhD
Washington State University
August 2012

Chair: Dr. John Bodley

Scale and power theory suggests that growth is an elite directed process that differentially benefits those who are already well-off. The present research is designed to explore the limits of scale theory by analyzing the development process in a well-studied region of rural Zambia. Research conducted among the Gwembe Tonga in the area of Nkandanzovu shows that an individual’s ability to influence the development process or even knowledge of existing developmental structure, i.e. the organizations working in a community may be connected with social power, social standing, ability to access networks, and wealth.

In order to illustrate this, three issues are examined: first, how the Gwembe Tonga conceptualize development; second, what the Tonga feel is needed at the village and household level; and third if the ability to effectively access development opportunities is linked to social power in the village structure.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

The Objectives of this Dissertation

This dissertation illustrates the strategies used by the Gwembe Tonga to access development opportunities in a rural village in the Southern Province of Zambia. In order to illustrate this, three issues are examined: first, how the Gwembe Tonga conceptualize development; second, what the Tonga feel is needed at the village and household level; and third if the ability to effectively access development opportunities is linked to the existing distribution of social power in the village structure.

There are many questions that are raised in this dissertation. What is the history of development in the area? Who are the major power elites involved in development at the local level and how are they shaping life in the village? In other words, who can and cannot negotiate with organizations that are working in the area for their own benefit. Also, in what ways does the ability to utilize these organizations or lack thereof impact stratification in a community? That is, are the people who are able to gain access to these programs able to enhance their wealth and/or position in the society? Also, what strategies do people employ to access development benefits and which, if any, are most effective? Many important studies have been conducted on large-scale development and the impacts on the Gwembe Tonga (Colson 1971, Scudder et al 1982, Scudder and Habarad 1991) and this research adds to what has been done before by looking at how development benefits and costs are distributed unevenly at the household level in the Nkandanzovu area.
My hypothesis is that an individual’s ability to influence the development process or to even have knowledge of existing developmental structure, i.e. the organizations working in a community, may be connected with an individual’s current social power, social standing, ability to access networks and wealth. In addition, it is hypothesized that people with higher social power will have more agency in the development process and will be more actively utilizing strategies to bring development into the area. This helps to explain why solutions to poverty are so problematic, and suggests that development efforts that focus on the creation of an equitable distribution of social power, instead of just focusing on infrastructure and production levels, may be the most successful at reducing and hopefully ending poverty.

This perspective is different from other development theories because there is an understanding that any solution needs to recognize that we have a system where inequities are already in existence. Any solution has to address issues of justice and fairness.

Chapter 1 provides the theoretical framework for the dissertation. Bodley’s Power and Scale theory suggests that growth is an elite directed process that differentially benefits those who are already well-off. Chapter 2 provides a background on the political, economic, and development statistics for Zambia. Chapter 3 describes the Gwembe and Plateau Tonga. Chapter 4 describes village life: the history of the settlement in the region, the village in the Zambian political structure, the history of development in the region, and the village power structure. Chapter 5 looks at how the Tonga conceptualize development and what the Tonga feel is needed at the village and household levels. Chapter 6 gives an overview of the strategies employed by local
people to bring development into the area. Chapter 7 summarizes the findings and has implications for development in the area.

**Theoretical Framework**

The main theoretical perspective that provides the framework for this dissertation is anthropologist John Bodley’s Power and Scale perspective. The Power and Scale theory assumes that “…throughout world history particular individuals, driven by the natural human desire to accumulate social power, have promoted growth, or scale increases, that amplified many human problems by socializing the costs of development and disproportionately concentrating the benefits” (Bodley 2003:xv). In the development context, it is typically the scale of economic flows, tangible and intangible assets, and commercial activities that grow. This process is not inevitable but current development practices often do succeed in elevating growth in the scale of these economic measures.

Power is defined here as social power, which is “the ability of individuals to influence other people and events in order to maintain or improve their own and their children’s material opportunities, or life chances” (Bodley 2003:4). Social power is often gained through one’s imperium or personal power network. All human decision makers have imperia; this can range from household-based imperia found in every society to corporate groups such as governments and businesses. Power elites come into existence because they are able to create larger, more effective imperia and especially when there are few if any limits on their power (Bodley 2003).

The other key component to the theory is scale. Scale “refers to the absolute size of populations, economic enterprises, markets, armies, cities, or anything that affects the well-being of people” (Bodley 2003:5). As a society grows in scale, power becomes
concentrated for the few individuals at the top while the costs inherent in the elite-directed growth process are socialized. In other words, the benefits of growth are seen by only a few while the majority in the society assumes the negative costs. Because the power elites at the top of the hierarchy have the most social power and reap the benefits of growth, they can use their power to convince everyone that this kind of growth is good for everyone (Bodley 2003).

Using the Power and Scale perspective, all cultures can be broken down by their forms of imperia into three cultural worlds. These are the tribal, imperial, and commercial worlds. The household dominates in the tribal world; political rulers dominate the imperial world, and economic elites dominate the commercial world (Bodley 2003).

In the tribal world, societies were small and members lived in politically autonomous villages or in nomadic bands. Because of the small size of the societies, resources were abundant and everyone had direct access to the resources. No one could gain permanent control over the tribe because leadership was on a temporary basis and potentially anyone could be a leader. Every household was able to participate in decision-making. These factors minimized competition, limited accumulation, and met everyone’s basic needs for survival and comfort (Bodley 2003).

In the imperial world, societies became larger and those in the dominant political imperia controlled resources. Social classes also emerged, which led to disadvantaged groups of people. The political imperia consisted of rulers and priests who used religion, tribute, and the military to increase their social power. People no longer had direct access to resources but were only granted access to resources by those who controlled them.
Wealth accumulation greatly increased but primarily among the power elites, which further reduced the majority’s life chances (Bodley 2003).

In the commercial world, “material well-being depends on access to capital, markets, and employment, all of which are controlled by imperia organized by economic elites and the political rulers who support them” (Bodley 2003:8). The economic elites’ power surpasses that of both local communities and national governments hence both are compliant with commercial interests. Economic rewards are concentrated within the elite structure but everyone shares the risks and negative consequences. Societies are larger than ever before and there are increasing numbers of people with only extremely limited social power (Bodley 2003).

When tribal people are incorporated into either the imperial or commercial world, the result is likely to be impoverishment and disempowerment. Diseases of poverty, which were not present before, become rampant and are compounded by lack of healthcare and the inability to acquire public assistance. If one were to create optimum scale societies, with optimum distributions of social power, this would alleviate current global problems (Bodley 2003).

Key Concepts

There are a few key concepts that are utilized throughout the dissertation. These are globalization, development, and poverty. Because these terms have such wide ranging definitions, a brief discussion of each will be useful for understanding how the terms are being used in the dissertation.
Globalization

One thing that many theorists on globalization agree on is that globalization today means economic liberalization. Globalization means that borders are supposedly open to trade and commerce (although most of the increase is trade between already strong economies), and that communication has become easier in most parts of the world, but it does not mean that other things such as people can easily cross borders.

There are three differing ideas of how long globalization has been occurring. The first is that globalization has always existed but there has been a sudden acceleration. The second is that it is a product of nineteenth century ideals of economics and democracy. The third is that it is a product of twentieth and twenty-first century technology (Appelbaum and Robinson 2005). I am of the opinion that globalization has always occurred. There has always been an exchange of information between groups of people; it is true that this has been greatly accelerated by modern technology.

There are also three competing ideas of the impacts of globalization. Frederick Cooper (2001) coined terms for these competing ideologies. The first is termed “Bankers Boost,” which takes globalization for granted and the main goals are to open borders to trade and commerce. The second is termed “Social Democrats Lament,” this approach also takes globalization for granted but claims that it actually does harm. The third approach is “Dance of Flows and Fragments,” which says that through media, pieces of culture in one area are taken, reinterpreted and made local.

If globalization centered on free exchange of ideas and beneficial technology such as medication, which would require less control of patents, I believe it could be a positive force. As it stands today, as a tool of liberalization, globalization benefits a few already
powerful societies and harms others. Many authors would disagree with me though. Johan Norberg, who wrote *In Defense of Global Capitalism* (2003) argues that globalization as liberalization is beneficial to all and if a country is not seeing the benefits, it is because that country closed its doors to globalization.

Most ideas of globalization make it appear as if the whole globe is connected and impacted equally by globalization. Ferguson (2005) states that globalization does not cover the entire globe but connects points together. For instance, trade could go from Britain to Zambia, but it does not cover the area in-between. Ferguson looked mostly at oil development and claims that this form of development creates enclaves that do not impact or help the rest of the society of which the enclave is part. If for instance, ExxonMobil has an oil enclave in Nigeria; global connections would be between ExxonMobil’s headquarters in the United States to the enclave without touching any other part of the globe or Nigerian society. This is especially true with off-shore drilling that has become more common off the coast of Africa.

Globalization is a key concept because people and organizations from around the globe shape not only what Zambia looks like but also the Gwembe Tonga villages of Nkandanzovu. Ideas of globalization are used to direct governments to limit spending in order to compete in the global market (Cooper 2001). Reduced spending has a direct impact on local communities. No two communities are impacted or react in the same way to the forces of globalization. This dissertation will address the impacts the local, provincial, national and global levels have on the Gwembe Tonga.
Development

The second concept is development. Development is defined as “the removal of poverty and undernutrition; it is an increase in life expectancy; it is access to sanitation, clean drinking water, and health services; it is the reduction of infant mortality; it is the increased access to knowledge and schooling, and literacy in particular” (Seshamani 1999). This definition, which is provided by Professor of Economics at the University of Zambia, Venkatesh Seshamani, is the one I like to use because it does not imply unlimited growth but focuses on items that are needed for human welfare. In addition, development must also be considered in terms of human development, which means it “is not just about eliminating deprivation with respect to material requisites of well-being. It also embraces political rights and freedoms, elimination of crime, preservation and promotion of indigenous cultures, stability of the family, and ethical, moral and spiritual progress” (Seshamani 1999).

However, many organizations relate development to growth. Questioning growth is not just academic; ideas of growth are shaping policy around the world (Ferguson 2006a, 2006b). The argument that growth is good for the poor is seductive and has and is being touted by important names in economic circles (African Development Bank and Economic Commission for Africa 2006; Collier and Dollar 2002; Sachs 2005a, 2005b). There are also counter views, especially from the Power and Scale perspective: “Growth also leads to national and global wealth inequality, threatening the viability of domestic-scale cultures and communities even in the most remote locations” (Bodley 1999). This leads to the question, what are the local Gwembe Tonga people’s concepts of development? What organizations are known to work in their area? Who has access?
What are the impacts? What development has been here before? Is there any visible impact left? Do the local people have the ability to influence what organizations are doing?

Poverty

The third concept is poverty. Recently ideas of poverty have begun to be addressed in terms other than monetary (Bodley 1999; Bonfiglioli 2003; Chigunta et al. 1998; Sachs 2005b). For instance, the United Nations uses the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) to measure poverty. The MPI along with other measurements such as the Human Development Index (HDI) look at three dimensions of poverty: health, education, and living standards. These help to indicate how a nation is fairing in human development and poverty but also can be used to measure the amount of inequality in a country.

For the purposes of this dissertation, poverty will be defined as a lack of power, inadequate access to social services, insecure livelihood and vulnerability to environmental risks, and poor access to infrastructure (Bonfiglioli 2003).

Vulnerability and insecure livelihoods are very important issues in the Chikanta area. Vulnerability is “the exposure of family-based economies to recurrent and unpredictable events, such as ecological risks, economic shocks, instability of market networks, as well as to recurrent (pluriannual or seasonal) food crises or famines and increasing loss of resilience or capacity to resist and recover after major crises” (Bonfiglioli 2003). Insecure livelihoods are linked to vulnerability because of the inability to access productive resources, control those resources, have land security, and access adequate technologies. This leads to households not being able to produce an
adequate food supply and an inability to purchase sufficient quantities of food (Bonfiglioli 2003).

The problem of poverty is not just one of income but also access. The issues of poverty cannot be solved by just regarding people and cultures as statistics (Escobar 1995). Often when culture is addressed by economists it is used as a factor that impedes development (Ahmed and Cleeve 2004). Anthropology should be at the forefront of putting a human face on issues of poverty.

Fieldwork and Methods

The fieldwork for this research was conducted in the Nkandanzovu area of Zambia over a period of a year from June 2008-June 2009. Nkandanzovu is a collection of villages, located in the frontier region of Chikanta in southern Zambia where many ethnic groups, the most numerous of which is the Gwembe Tonga, have moved to practice agriculture. When I arrived in Nkandanzovu, my focus was going to be just on the village of Sunu, but as I started conducting interviews, I noticed how intertwined Sunu was with the village of Junza so I added Junza to my sample. I have decided to use pseudonyms for the villages because of the small size and kinship ties in the villages (indeed villages are often have the last name of a founding family or headman); it would be hard to keep informants unidentified.

There were many hurdles that I had to overcome during the research period and I was not in the village for as long as I wanted to be. First, I had to wait a long period of time to get a visa in order to stay in Zambia. This made it so that I was stuck in Lusaka, the capital of Zambia, and could not get to the village. Once I finally made it to the village, I kept having to leave due to illness. I was sick with malaria six times, had
typhoid once, injured my back, as well as having some other bouts of illness that were never diagnosed. I was a frequent visitor to Dr. Sanjay in Livingstone. In total, I was in the village for seven months, but actively conducting fieldwork for six months. This also contributed to a longer period of time in writing my dissertation than I had intended because I was unwell for quite a long time when I returned home.

Fortunately, I was able to spend extended periods in the village and while I was in the village, I interviewed 75 people (32 men, 43 women). This was every adult man and woman within the two villages. Because of the limitations of time in the village, I was not able to conduct follow-up interviews. My knowledge of ciTonga is limited, but it was a source a great amusement so the villagers. Fortunately, I was able to recruit a research assistant who is fluent in both English and ciTonga help with the interviews. Because of the long history of research among the Gwembe Tonga, there are many well-trained research assistants in the area. The same research assistant helped with every interview except for 2, in both cases it was a woman who had married into the interpreter’s family and he had not given them a gift in order for them to be able to speak to him. He did not wish to give the gift and I had another person help with those 2 interviews.

I had a set list of interview questions (see Appendix II) which included semi-structured and open-ended questions that I asked everyone but the process was informal and often there would be additional questions that I would ask or additional information that others wanted to give me. I was going to interview the adult members of a household together, but during the first interview the husband spoke and the wife agreed with him. After that interview, I decided to interview each adult individually so that the answers would not be influenced by another household member’s opinion.
In addition to interviewing every adult within the 2 villages of Junza and Sunu, I interviewed people working with different organizations in the area. This included clinic workers, veterinary assistant, teachers and the headmistress at the school, and people with prominent positions within developmental organizations such as the Social Cash Transfer Scheme (SCTS), cooperative, Henwood foundation, and women’s clubs. Each person was interviewed once using open-ended questions (What does your organization do? How long has it been operating in this area? What has been successful? What problems have you encountered? What is still needed?)

I also used participant observation. I lived at the same homestead for the time I was in the village. I participated in the life of the family through eating, farming, food preparation, and other daily activities (games, songs, evening discussions, etc.). Although I never became a master nshima maker and my attempts at pounding maize resulted in hilarity, I was able to understand the daily activities of a homestead, the household relationships and division of labor of a polygynous family and their extended kin. Also over the course of my fieldwork many conflicts arose in the village (accusations of cheating, stealing, killing of cattle). Through participant observation, I was able to take note of what happened when a problem arose in the village, whose advice people would seek out and what members of the village would get together to form a solution. These observations also helped me to understand what activities were actually being undertaken to shape the development process in the village in a way that I was not able to see just through the interview questions.

Other methods that I employed included attending meetings and taking detailed notes on what was said and who attended. During times I was not in the village, my
research assistant attended any meetings and took the same type of detailed notes. Often meetings were called by never happened, I was still able to take note of who was there to attend. By attending meetings and having my research assistant attend meetings if I was outside of the village, I was able to track how often people attended meetings, how often people spoke during meetings, and whether others agreed or derided what was said during meetings.

There was also a period of preliminary research conducted over a four and a half week period in the summer of 2006 as part of an NSF research methods training program. Lisa Cliggett and Deb Crooks, both from the University of Kentucky led the program. Through both formal and informal interviews, I worked with seventeen informants. These informants lived in the Nkandanzovu area but not necessarily within the villages of Junza and Sunu. These interviews were important for understanding how the cooperative system works in the area.

Outside of Zambia the research consisted of a literature review. This included background reading on the Tonga, Zambia, theory, and development. In addition, I made a detailed study of World Bank, corporate, and NGO documents concerning past projects in the area.
(1) A person has the right to- (a) the highest attainable standard of health, which includes the right to health care services and reproductive health care; (b) accessible and adequate housing; (c) be free from hunger, and to have access to adequate food of acceptable quality; (d) clean and safe water in adequate quantities and to reasonable standards of sanitation; (e) social security and protection; and (f) education. (2) A person shall not be denied emergency medical treatment. (3) The State shall provide appropriate social security and protection to persons who are unable to support themselves and their dependants (The Technical Committee on Drafting the Zambia Constitution 2012)

Before addressing the village level, it is important to situate the local within a national context. Decisions made at a national level (or indeed global level), such as development plans, government priorities, and government spending, directly and indirectly impact those living in rural areas such as Nkandanzovu. As can be seen from the above quote from the new draft of the Zambian constitution, there are many lofty goals, which the government wants to implement but the local reality is normally quite different.

Background

Zambia is located in southern Africa, bordered by Tanzania, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Botswana, Namibia, Angola, and the Democratic Republic of Congo (see Figure 2.1). The total land area is 752,612 square kilometers and the population is estimated at 13.84 million (Economist Intelligence Unit 2012). Life expectancy is 52.57 years and the poverty ratio is 68% (CIA 2012; World Bank 2011). Out of 221 countries ranked, Zambia is 207 in terms of life expectancy. One reason why the life expectancy is
so low is because the adult prevalence rate for HIV/AIDS is estimated at 13.5% and most likely higher due to lack of testing capability. This is the sixth highest rate of HIV in the world (CIA 2012). Without the AIDS epidemic, life expectancy could rise by at least 10 years (Kahn 1999, Seshamani 1999).

**Figure 2.1 Map of Zambia**

![Map of Zambia](image)

Source: Economist Intelligence Unit 2012

English is the official language but there are 43 local languages spoken as well as numerous dialects. Bemba (3.3 million speakers), ciTonga (990,000), Nyanja (803,000) and Lozi (610,000) are among the most populous languages spoken (Lewis 2009).

Zambia’s capital city is Lusaka, which has a population of 1,526,000. Two other large cities are Kitwe (562,000) and Ndola (518,000) both in the Copperbelt Province, north of Lusaka (Economist Intelligence Unit 2012). The majority of the population in Zambia is rural. The urban population accounts for 36% of the total population and this number
increases at a rate of 3.2% a year (Central Intelligence Unit 2012). The difference in the rates of poverty for urban versus rural in Zambia is quite large. In Lusaka province in 2006, the rate of poverty was 29%, in the Southern province the rate of poverty was 73% (Central Statistics Office N.D).

Transparency International (2011), which is a European-based anti-corruption organization, has given Zambia a rating of 3.0 with 10 being very clean and 0 being highly corrupt. This gives Zambia a rank of 101 out of 178 countries. In comparison, the World Governance ratings compiled by the World Bank (2011) also gives Zambia a low rating for control of corruption, with a score of -0.57 out of a range of -2.5 being weak to 2.5 being strong. This gives Zambia a country ranking of 33.59%, with 100% being the highest. Freedom House (2011) ranks Zambia as partially free. Their scale goes from 1 representing the most free and 7 the least free rating. For political rights Zambia received a ranking of 3 and for civil liberties Zambia received a ranking of 4. They found that while Zambia had some success prosecuting certain officials for corruption such as the national secretary for the MMD who was sentenced 5 years in prison, the government was also protecting other officials against prosecution for corruption.

The political entity now known as Zambia was known as Northern Rhodesia and was overseen by the British South Africa Company from 1891 until 1923. After 1923, the government of Northern Rhodesia was taken over by the United Kingdom. Zambia won its independence on October 24, 1964 (CIA 2012). The first president of Zambia was Kenneth Kaunda, who was born at Lubwa Mission, near Chinsali in the Northern Province. During his rule, Kaunda tried to promote a strong national identity while assuring Europeans that the goal was a multi-racial society in which everyone could have
a say. He developed an ideology for development known as humanism; the core tenet was governmental control of major industries (Simon et al. 2008). This resulted in the 51-percent-nationalization of the copper mines (Ferguson 2005). Kaunda’s party was the United National Independence Party (UNIP). The strength of the party was threatened when the United Progressive Party (UPP) was formed in 1971. In reaction, Kaunda made Zambia a one-party state and positioned all civil service workers under the management of UNIP members (Simon et al. 2008).

Kaunda ruled for 27 years. There were many problems in his presidency which ultimately led to his defeat in the elections held in October 1991. Zambia borrowed heavily to support its centralized economy. Eventually the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) imposed austerity measures based on their structural adjustment program. These measures were so unpopular in Zambia that they led to food riots, and eventually resulting in the union leaders victory in demolishing the one-party state. Although defeated in 1991, Kaunda continued to run in every election until 2001 (Simon et al. 2008).

In 1991, Frederick Chiluba became Zambia’s second president. Chiluba was a union leader and active in the campaign for a multiparty democracy in Zambia. This movement culminated in the formation of the official political party, Movement for Multiparty Democracy (MMD) in 1990 (Simon et al 2008). Chiluba won reelection in 1996. This was officially, the second multiparty election but there was really no party that could challenge the ruling party or their policies (Rakner 2003). When elections were held in 2001, Chiluba was going to run again with the support of many in the MMD but because of diplomatic pressure, he did not seek a third term in office (Simon et al. 2008).
In 2001 Levy Mwanawasa was elected into office as the MMD candidate. Mwanawasa formed the Task Force on Economic Plunder (TFEP) and was instrumental in charging Chiluba with over 100 counts of corruption (Simon et al 2008). This included a charge of stealing over 35 million dollars in public funds and transferring them to an account in England. Chiluba was acquitted after a six-year trial. In 2007, Chiluba had charges brought against him again and this time he was found guilty of stealing 46 million dollars of public funds (BBC 2011). Mwanawasa won reelection in 2006.

Mwanawasa’s untimely death in 2008 forced a special election for a new president. The candidates were Rupiah Banda who was vice-president under Mwanawasa (MMD), Michael Sata for the Patriotic Front (PF), Hakainde Hichilema for the United Party for National Development (UPND), and Godfrey Miyanda for the Heritage Party (HP) (EISA 2008). This election is the focus of much activity during my year of fieldwork as will be discussed in a later chapter. Rupiah Banda was the victor.

In 2011, the regularly scheduled elections were held. There were more candidates for this election than any other in Zambia history. These candidates included incumbent President Rupiah Banda (MMD), Michael Sata (PF), Hakainde Hichilema (UPND), Godfrey Miyanda (HP), Tilyenji Kaunda (UNIP), Ng’andu Magande for the National Movement for Progress Party (NMPP), Edith Nawakwi for the Forum for Democracy and Development (FDD), Dr. Frederick Mutesa for the Zambians for Empowerment and Development (ZED), Elias Chipimo Jr. for the National Restoration Party (NAREP), and Charles Milupi for the Alliance for Democracy and Development (ADD) (Africa Research Bulletin 2011). Michael Sata won the election with a platform that promised
new jobs and better distribution of benefits from copper mining which particularly resonated with new, young voters (Latham and Mukwita 2011).

As stated previously, one problem facing Zambia is rampant corruption. There are laws against official corruption. The example of Chiluba demonstrates that the government has made attempts to put the law into practice, but many government employees engage in corrupt practices without fear of punishment. Many of the problems faced include taking bribes to release prisoners, extorting money, and required “document processing fee” or “gas money” (U.S. Department of State 2010). There is a widespread belief that corruption is present in every level of the government. This belief is backed by the data collected from the World Bank, the Freedom House, and Transparency International. Indeed many people that I spoke to looked at it as just how things are done and many people said that they should be allowed to take money because everybody is. Village level corruption is the reason many gave for the failure of development programs, such as cooperatives that are supposed to be revolving funds, which had been started in the Nkandanzovu region. This is just one example of how policies at a national level are reflected at the village level and it is having a huge impact in the daily life of people in rural Zambia.

**Economics**

Zambia has been greatly impacted by globalization. My analysis starts with control by the British South Africa Company (BSAC), although one could look even earlier. The BSAC was a transnational company directed by Cecil Rhodes. The BSAC took an interest in Zambia because of its mineral wealth (Ferguson 1999).
During the era of the Federation (1953-1963), Britain combined the then semi-independent Southern Rhodesia, with the Protectorates of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland to form the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. The British government used the mineral wealth in Northern Rhodesia to support infrastructure building in Southern Rhodesia and to support the white settlers. At the same time, the colonial government largely ignored the infrastructure within Northern Rhodesia. In maybe one of the few times that the white settlers and native Northern Rhodesians agreed, both wanted an end to the federation and Zambia gained its independence in 1964 (Ferguson 1999). Southern Rhodesia became white-dominated Rhodesia in 1965, and then Zimbabwe in 1980.

With Zambian independence came animosity from the white-led governments of Southern Rhodesia and South Africa, who viewed an independent African-led nation to be a threat to their security. Because of this, the two governments passed trade regulations that were negative for Zambia. One example is a trade rule requiring buildings that were built in Zambia to use imported metal instead of local ant-resistant wood. Zambia needed to agree to most of the trade regulations because it needed to keep its trade routes open (Ferguson 1999).

After independence, when the Zambian government nationalized the mining industry, most of the supplies needed came from Britain and South Africa. Zambia is also dependent on trade routes which go through Zimbabwe and South Africa. The pricing and supply of copper is based on an oligopoly, similar to what is found with diamonds. Part of the reason the copper industry declined in Zambia is because cheaper copper was beginning to be produced in other areas such as Papua New Guinea,
Australia, and South Korea. Also, the owners of the new mines in these areas were the same corporations that made up the oligopoly in Zambia. Zambia could not compete (Ferguson 1999).

Because of Kaunda’s promotion of humanism, mines in Zambia during nationalization were socially thick, meaning profits from mining were utilized to provide social welfare. Through powerful unions, workers were able to get many social services such as hospitals, schools, retirement benefits, and safe working conditions. Also, during this time the mines employed many people and they were mostly Zambian. Now, due to liberalization and the privatization of the mining industry it is socially thin. Most of the people employed are foreign workers on short-term contracts and the benefits do not get spread out through the society as a whole. There are more ties from transnational corporations to the mines then there are from the mines to the Zambian society (Ferguson 1999). All of this impacts life for people in rural Zambia.

Most of the services once provided by the government have been outsourced to NGOs. This has led one government member to quip that external NGOs are Zambia’s external parliament. This is a direct result of the structural adjustment policies (SAPs) pushed by the IMF in the 1980s and 1990s. SAPs are one of the most visible aspects of globalization: an economic institution controlled by powerful governments telling or forcing another government to do what it wants. Under the SAPs most social spending had to be cut. Some say that SAPs failed because the Zambian government failed to implement the regulations properly. Others say that because external forces are controlling Zambian policy, it does not matter what form of government Zambia has or who is running the government because no one could do anything differently (Rakner
The current governmental crises unfolding in the European Union reflect similar processes in which global financial concerns are represented as more urgent than the impacts of budgetary “reforms” on local people.

Another visible sign of globalization in Zambia is the second-hand clothing industry. Because of policies favoring Southern Rhodesia and South Africa during the colonial era, Zambia was never able to create their own domestic garment industry. Most of the clothing worn in Zambia today is second-hand goods imported mostly from the United States, but also from Canada and Europe. Goodwill is a huge contributor to this. There are warehouses full of clothes deemed unsuitable to sell in their stores so they are packed up and shipped to places such as Zambia. There has also been an influx of “suitcase traders” who fly from Zambia to New York, Bangkok, and Singapore to buy goods to resell in Zambia (Hansen 2000). I met a few traders who would travel to Zimbabwe to buy goods and then travel back to Zambia to resell the products. It is lucrative work if one can do it, but it is also dangerous because it is illegal and there is a risk of losing the purchased goods if caught or even ending up in jail.

Today one of Zambia’s major trading partners is South Africa. Zambia’s other large trading partners are Zimbabwe (although this fluctuates based on conflict in the country), the E.U., Japan, China, and the United States. South African companies are also shaping the landscape of Zambia, especially in Lusaka. South African companies such as Shoprite, Spar, Nando’s, etc. are pushing local business farther outside the city. Also, with Shoprite and Spar, which are large grocery chains, local business often cannot compete with the prices and definitely cannot compete with the selection. This is also
occurring with a large influx of Chinese owned businesses which are taking the place of many Indian and Zambian owned stores (Hansen 2000).

In June 2011, Wal-Mart acquired majority control of Massmart Holdings Limited. Massmart is a South African company, with headquarters in Johannesburg, which is the leading retailer of home supplies and general merchandise in Africa. They have over 28,000 employees with operations in 13 countries in stores such as Game, Dion Wired, Makro, Builders Warehouse, Builders express, Builders Trade Depot, CBW, and Jumbo Cash and Carry. Currently most of their stores are in South Africa (305) with Mozambique a far distant second (17). Zambia currently has one Wal-Mart owned store, Game, which is located in the capital city, Lusaka (Walmart Corporate 2012).

Zambia earned $9.2 billion in 2011 from exports (Economist Intelligence Unit 2012). By far the biggest export is copper and copper articles (see table 2.1). This accounts for 75.42% of the export revenue. After copper, there are a myriad of other exports that make up very small percentages of the total exports. Electrical items account for 2.83%; base metals (besides copper) 2.44%; ores, slag, and ash 2.3%; cereals 2.18% (see Table 2.1) (International Trade Center 2012a). This shows that agriculture, in this primarily rural agricultural country, makes up a very small proportion of the national export economy even though it is the third largest contributor to GDP. The make-up of Zambia’s exports leaves the country vulnerable to fluctuations in the copper market. There is fear that a global recession could negatively impact copper prices which have been increasing steadily since a major nosedive in 2009. There are major mining projects underway that are supposed to reach completion in 2016. These will boost copper
exports by 50% between 2013 and 2016. So, if copper prices stay strong there is a positive outlook for economic growth in Zambia (Economist Intelligence Unit 2012).

Table 2.1 Zambia’s Exports and Imports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origins of gross domestic product 2011</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Fiscal indicators 2011</th>
<th>% of GDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>Public sector revenue</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>Public sector expenditure</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>Public sector balance</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Net public debt</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main exports fob 2011</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Main imports fob 2011</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copper and articles thereof</td>
<td>75.42</td>
<td>Machinery, nuclear reactors, boilers, etc</td>
<td>18.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical, electric equipment</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>Ores, slag, and ash</td>
<td>13.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other base metals and articles thereof</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ores, slag, and ash</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Mineral fuels, oils, distillation products, etc</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereals</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>Electrical, electric equipment</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination of exports 2011</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Origin of imports 2011</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Economist Intelligence Unit 2012; Central Intelligence Unit 2012; Global Finance 2011; International Trade Center 2012a; International Trade Center 2012b

Zambia has partnered with the World Bank since September 1965. There are currently 12 World Bank funded development projects underway in Zambia and an additional 3 have been proposed. To date, Zambia has seen a total World Bank investment of $37.51 billion (World Bank 2011b). Zambia qualified for debt relief from the World Bank and the IMF in 2005 and was able to write off a portion of its debt from approximately $7 billion down to $2 billion. As of 2012, Zambia had a total external
debt of $3,688,765,000 (World Bank 2012). As part of the debt relief Zambia had to accept economic reforms involving privatization and they had to develop a Poverty Reduction Strategy. This is laid out in “Vision 2030” and their “Sixth National Development Plan, 2011-2015” (SNDP) which is subtitled “Sustained Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction.”

“Vision 2030” was written to serve as a guide for all development and lays out a plan to have Zambia become a prosperous middle-income nation by 2030 by focusing on seven key principles: sustainable development, upholding democratic principles, respect for human rights, traditional and family values, a positive attitude to work, peaceful coexistence, and private-public partnership. The document also put forth the development goals that Zambia wishes to reach. These include annual real growth of 10%, maintain inflation rate at 5%, national poverty head count of less than 20% of population, income inequalities measured by a Gini coefficient of less than 40, safe water sources and improved sanitation for 100% of the population, education for everyone, and equitable access to quality healthcare (Republic of Zambia 2006).

The vision is to go from an agricultural based economy to an industrial based economy. As shown earlier, the agriculture accounted for 21.5% of the GDP in 2011, the national plan is for that to reduce to 10.08% by 2030. It is hard to envision what this would look like in a nation that is currently mostly rural and where the population in the rural areas are farmers. Although the plan does highlight the need for a focus on an export-led agricultural sector even while making industry a priority, and an equitable distribution of wealth (Republic of Zambia 2006), in most middle-income countries the
poverty gap between those who are the food producers and those who are in the industrial sector widens.

The SNDP is directed at achieving the goals laid out in “Vision 2030.” It is focused on the elimination of poverty and sustained economic growth because it puts forth that the main challenge for Zambia is that the quality of life, especially in rural areas, is low. The development strategies empathized to combat poverty are the provision of health care, education, water, sanitation, and access roads. The SNDP takes a slightly different approach to agriculture and calls for it to contribute 20% of the GDP. There is also a focus on social protection, which is defined as “a poverty reduction strategy that promotes human development, social equity and human rights” (Ministry of Finance and National Planning 2011). This is centered on providing social assistance to the most vulnerable households and orphans through programs such as the Social Cash Transfer Scheme (SCTS).

Although both “Vision 2030” and the SNDP specifically endorse the idea of socio-economic justice through equity in the distribution of wealth, the practice is very different especially at the village level. The Civil Society for Poverty Reduction (CSPR) reports, “in spite of the reported economic growth and poverty reducing expenditure, the prevalence of poverty remains unrelenting” (CSPR 2010). One problem seems to be that agriculture is being promoted as a business in order to alleviate poverty. This terminology is being utilized by rural farmers as a way to accumulate wealth through limiting payments for piecework, maize loans, and gifting maize (Sitko 2010). This is helping to solidify the wealth of farmers at the high social scale and entrenching those most vulnerable in poverty. Another issue is although “Vision 2030” and the National
Development Plans are created with the participation of various stakeholders such as civil society organizations, traditional leaders, government officials, and ordinary citizens; the government alone selects which programs to fund and is responsible for the subsequent payment of funds. This has resulted in programs that were listed as high priority in the National Development Plans being ignored in favor of programs the government wants to implement and not all the funds reach the targeted programs (CSPR 2010). Basically, the implementation of the Development Plans is taking a fairly democratic process of identifying needs for development and turning it into an elite-directed program.

What seem to be attracting the attention of the government are very powerful multi-national corporations. The development practices that are being put into place are clearly “business-friendly.” For an investment of not less than $500,000 in a priority sector or product (see appendix III), an investor will receive

- Zero percent tax rate on dividends for 5 years from year of first declaration of dividends.
- Zero percent tax on profits for 5 years from the first year profits are made. For year 6 to 8, only 50 percent of profits are taxable and years 9 & 10, only 75 percent of profits are taxable.
- Zero percent import duty rate on raw materials, capital goods, machinery including trucks and specialized motor vehicles for five years.
- Deferment of VAT on machinery and equipment including trucks and specialized motor vehicles. [Zambia Development Agency 2011]

If an investor puts in no less than $10 million they also receive the above incentives but can also negotiate with the government for additional incentives. Since mining was privatized, the industry has been shining example of who are receiving these additional incentives. There are 12 billionaires that have holdings in 5 multi-national mining companies operating in Zambia. Through the incentive program listed above, these
companies were able to get huge tax breaks and therefore took a larger share of the
profits. The effect has been to reduce revenues and to make it harder for the government
to implement poverty reduction measures in an equitable manner. Most of the
development projects and infrastructure gets directed to the Copperbelt Province in lieu
of other areas because of the mining industry.

The Zambia Development Agency (ZDA) will help investors acquire land, obtain
water, electric power, transport, communication services, and facilities (Zambia
Development Agency 2011). In other words, provide for corporations the very things
that most rural Zambians are living without. The construction of the Kariba Dam is a
perfect illustration of this type of development. The dam was constructed to provide
electricity the mining district in Zambia and part of Zimbabwe but most of the Gwembe
Valley which was directly impacted by the construction of the dam (large sections
flooded, forced relocation of people) remained without electricity. The Gwembe Tonga
Development Project (GTDP) did involve the electrification of parts but not all of the
Gwembe Valley but in the Nkandanzovu area, where this research took place, there was
no electric power.

To help understand even more how Zambia fits into the global economy, one can
look at the Credit Suisse Wealth Databook and the United Nations Development
Programme’s (UNDP) Human Development Indicators (HDI). The data from the Credit
Suisse Research Institute is the most inclusive study of world wealth of individual adults
ever undertaken. What this research shows is that as of 2010, Zambia has a very limited
amount of world wealth (.01%), compared with South Africa’s 0.7%, and is ranked as a
low income nation (see Table 2.2). This however, is an increase from 2000 when Zambia
had 0.0% of world wealth but still well below the regions average of 1.29%. Also within the report is an analysis of the equality of wealth distribution within nations. To show this, countries are giving a Gini score for wealth which can go from 0 to 100. A score of 0 would indicate that everyone has the same amount of wealth and there is no inequality. A score of 100 would indicate that a one person holds all the wealth and there is no equality. Zambia has a Gini score of 74.2 which indicates a high inequality in wealth distribution but is slightly better than the average for all of Africa which is 84.9. Zambia scored 126 out of 165 countries for wealth equality, with only Republic of Congo, Swaziland, Lesotho, South Africa, Botswana, Zimbabwe, and Namibia ranking as more unequal African countries (Credit Suisse 2010).

When income equality is examined, Zambia ranks 130 out of 153 nations based on income Gini scores combined from the UNDP HDI and CIA World Factbook data. Income is generally less unequal than wealth, and it is not surprising that Zambia’s income Gini score is 50.7, which is significantly more equal than its 74.1 wealth Gini. In Africa only Sao Tome, Lesotho, Liberia, Rwanda, South Africa, Angola, Botswana, and Namibia are more unequal by income.

Table 2.2 Wealth Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Region</th>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>GDP per Capita (USD)</th>
<th>Share of World GDP (%)</th>
<th>Wealth per Capita (USD)</th>
<th>Share of World Wealth</th>
<th>Wealth per Adult (USD)</th>
<th>Gini</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1,855</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Credit Suisse 2010

The HDI measures three basic traits of human development: health, education, and living standards. Based on these characteristics, countries are given a value (0 to 1;
with 0 being the lowest and 1 being the highest) and then countries are ranked from highest to lowest (1 to 187). In addition to the HDI, there is the Inequality-adjusted HDI (IHDI), which uses the same three basic traits as the HDI but takes into consideration the levels of inequality in a country. Another important component is the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI). The MPI indicates how a nation is fairing based on ten criteria: nutrition, child mortality, years of schooling, children enrolled, cooking fuel, toilet, water, electricity, floor, and assets.

Zambia’s HDI rank is 164 (see table 2.3). While the countries with lower HDI seem to be almost all African nations such as Rwanda (166), Benin (167), Gambia (168), Sudan (169), Cote d’Ivoire (170), Malawi (171), Zimbabwe (173), Ethiopia (174), Mali (175), Eritrea (177), Central African Republic (179), Sierra Leone (180), Liberia (182), Chad (183), Mozambique (184), Burundi (185), Niger (186), and Democratic Republic of the Congo (187), many of Zambia’s values are lower than the average for sub-Saharan Africa. The average HDI value for sub-Saharan Africa is .463 and Zambia’s HDI value is .430. Comparatively, South Africa’s HDI value is .619 and Kenya’s is .509.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.3 Zambia HDI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDI Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNDP 2011

Health

Zambia possesses a large network of health facilities due to the copper boom in the 1970s. Currently there are 1,327 healthcare facilities, 85% of which are government run, 9% are private sector, and 6% are religious affiliated. Individual access to healthcare varies greatly depending on whether one is living in rural versus urban Zambia. 99% of
urban households live within 5 miles of a healthcare facility contrasted to 50% of rural households (Chankova and Sulzbach 2006). In 2010, the total health expenditure was 5.9% of the GDP (see Table 2.4 for comparative figures). President Sata has just doubled health workers salaries, which will have a large impact on the expenditure for public health and on the national debt (Economist Intelligence Unit 2012). One major problem with the health system in Zambia is lack of trained workers. Zambia has less than half of the World Health Organizations (WHO) recommended health workforce. The problem is exaggerated at the rural level because most trained workers wish to work in urban areas. In urban areas there are 5 times more health workers than in rural areas. This is particularly skewed when looking at doctors. There are 20 times more doctors working in urban areas versus rural. Another problem is trained staff leaving Zambia altogether. It is estimated that there are 10% more Zambian trained doctors working in the United States and Canada then in Zambia. There is a similar trend with nurses (Mwanza 2010).

**Table 2.4 Comparative Health Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zambia</th>
<th>Zimbabwe</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
<th>Botswana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Expenditure total (% of GDP) (2010)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-year-olds vaccinated against diphtheria, pertussis, tetanus (DPT) (2010)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Births attended by skilled personnel (2007)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health expenditure per head (current US$: 2009)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant mortality (per 1,000; 2010)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS (% of people aged 15-49; 2009)</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with access to safe water, rural (2008)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with access to safe water, urban</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with access to sanitation (2008)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are an estimated 462 cases of Tuberculosis (TB) per 100,000 people per year in Zambia (World Bank 2012). This is 10th highest incident rates in the world, and it is widely recognized that TB is a disease of poverty. Zambia also has the 7th highest rate of TB/HIV co-infections. 70% of all new TB patients are co-infected with HIV. On a positive note, drug resistant TB seems to be a minor problem with only 26 cases confirmed in 2007 (USAID 2009).

The prevalence rate for malaria is 13,456 per 100,000 people per year and it is the leading cause of morbidity and mortality in Zambia. Over 50,000 people die from malaria every year, over 50% of hospitalizations are due to malaria, and it accounts for ¼ of childhood deaths (USAID 2011).

Rate of corruption and health expenditure at a national level in Zambia have direct consequences at the local level in the area of Nkandanzovu. Many feel that they can be corrupt because they see this happening in national politics with little to no consequences. The clinic in Nkandanzovu is understaffed and does not have the equipment and medicine that is needed. The Gwembe Tonga have had a long history of policy making on a national and global scale impacting their daily lives. The most obvious example being the forced relocation due to the construction of the Kariba Dam but is also reflected in what development is currently in the areas in the Southern Province were the Gwembe Tonga reside. Before looking at the specifics at the village level, who the Gwembe Tonga are will be addressed.
Chapter Three

THE GWEMBE TONGA

It is not fair that after being displaced we have not benefited from electricity that caused us to move. We are still depending on charcoal and candles. We also need lights like you people in the urban areas. We want to watch TV and have access to cell phones as well (Musonda 2008).

The Gwembe Tonga have long been affected by decision making at the national and global level. The Gwembe Tonga Research Project began in order to document life before and after the construction of the Kariba Dam. The Kariba Dam was a development project to provide electricity to the copper mines in the northern Zambia (then Northern Rhodesia) and for parts of Zimbabwe (Southern Rhodesia) and forced the relocation of the Gwembe Tonga to other areas in the Southern Province. This subsequently led to the migration of many to the Nkandanzovu area in the chiefdom of Chikanta.

Background

The Gwembe Tonga are Central Bantu-speaking farmers whose ancestors have resided in what is now southern Zambia for more than a thousand years. While not the first inhabitants of Zambia (see Barham and Mitchell 2008), the archaeological work done in the Gwembe Valley shows that the Tonga were one of the earliest farming tribes to inhabit Zambia, with origins dating back to the early Iron Age (Fagan 1967a, 1967b; Okafor 1983). Colson (1996) has shown that the Gwembe Tonga have used this information to construct their indigenous identity. In terms of social structure, the Tonga practice matrilineal descent, virilocal residence, are polygynous, and practice mostly
subsistence agriculture, depending on the area (Colson 1958, 1960). Before the construction of the Kariba dam, the Gwembe Tonga practiced shifting cultivation on alluvial soils along the Zambezi River. Land was inherited both through the mother and father. Their social organization was egalitarian and there was no system of headmen or chiefs. Disputes were settled only when all the elders of a neighborhood had their say (Colson 1960). It is believed that “Tonga” is a label given them by the Shona, their closely related Bantu-speaking southern neighbors who live in what is now Zimbabwe. “Tonga” is a Shona word meaning independent, and refers to their earlier lack of formal political structures (Saha 1994). They were an acephalus tribal society, but this changed under colonial times when the British government imposed on them a system of chiefs.

Some 57,000 Gwembe Tonga were relocated in the 1950s before the construction of the Kariba dam (Scudder and Habarad 1991). This removal affected Tonga living on both sides of the Zambezi River and was a forced resettlement. Before relocation the Gwembe Tonga had kin that they communicated with regularly on both sides of the river. After the dam was constructed and the lake formed these kin ties were severed. Little was known about the Gwembe Tonga who now reside in Zimbabwe, because of the difficulties of doing fieldwork in that location and the short amount of time available for research before the dam was built (Colson 1960).

Some people who were relocated had to move 100 miles from their original home and some were relocated among a different ethnic group. There has been increased population density, a decline in ritual activities, and more competition for limited resources. All of this has led to a higher vulnerability to food shortages and poverty (Colson 1960, 1971; Cliggett 2005).
During resettlement many Tonga were relocated upriver from their previous village. Many thousand, however, were relocated in the Lusitu area, which already was populated with a different ethnic group and was a hundred miles away from their original home. The move to Lusitu resulted in the only physical conflict between the Tonga and government agents which ended in nine deaths. The move also did not go smoothly because some of the original villages were not flooded for many years after relocation. Many Tonga believed that the government would move them back to their original village after they saw that relocation was a failure, so for years they did not make any effort at clearing agricultural land in the new location (Scudder and Habbarad 1991).

Even with the disadvantages of relocation, there was a boom period from 1962-1973. During this time many people were able to take advantage of a fishing scheme in the new lake, the government built roads in the Gwembe valley which made it possible for the Tonga to sell crops and open small businesses, and the government provided other services vital to well-being. Overall people remember this as a prosperous time, especially when compared to today. Also around this time in 1960, the Gwembe Tonga began to see compensation for losses incurred during relocation. Some of the money was paid to the Gwembe District Council as general compensation and the rest was put in a Gwembe Special Fund over a period of five years to use for development (Scudder and Habarad 1991).

With relocation has come greater population density and poorer quality soils, which have gotten worse over time. This has led to experiences of famine on a fairly regular basis. There are ways that the Tonga deal with famine such as not repairing or
rebuilding grain storage bins (so they look unused), eating indoors (so neighbors do not
know what food they have), and encouraging people to migrate (Cliggett 2005).

Cattle were not important to the Gwembe Tonga until the 1950s. During this time
the government started an anti-tsetse fly campaign and areas that were once unsuitable
for cattle became suitable. Because of the growing importance of cattle in relation to
wealth, power has shifted more to the men as owners of cattle. Women have also lost
control over land. Before relocation the women were the owners of the land near the
river. After relocation, all land belonged to the men who cleared the land. Now a woman
has to rely on her husband for access to land (Cliggett 2005).

Another loss for Gwembe women is beer brewing. In the past, women brewed
local beer which helped to redistribute income from the men to the women. Recently a
commercial beer factory has opened in the area and more men are drinking the
commercial beer than the local beer (Cliggett 2005). This at least is true in the Gwembe
area, in the Chikanta area there is limited access to commercial beer so locally brewed
beer is still the most important. Women also are able to sell vegetables and other goods
(such as buns which are especially popular when anthropologists are in the area) in the
permanent market in the village of Nkandanzovu in the Chikanta area.

Both men and women can get zyelo (spirits). If someone angers a woman who
has zyelo, the spirit could urinate in a grain bin or put blood in food to do harm. Because
of this, if a woman asks for food, people are reluctant to turn her down. However,
women do not control the zyelo; they are basically passive vehicles for the spirits. Men
however, actively control the zyelo. Men can use sorcery to harm enemies. Older men in
particular are feared as sorcerers. I know of one case in the Chikanta area where an older
man used the fear of sorcery to refuse access to the borehole on his property. Since relocation, especially in the overpopulated Lusitu area, sorcery and accusations of sorcery are on the rise. Active violence is also on the rise in Lusitu. There have been many deaths of animals due to poisoning with Rogon, a pesticide. There recently have been a few murders of people using Rogon as well (Cliggett 2005). Violence has also been occurring in the Nkandanzovu area. There have been shootings related to men being accused of witchcraft. This has resulted in injuries and a few deaths.

During the late 1970s, early 1980s there was an announcement broadcasted on the radio that whoever wanted free access to land could move to the Chikanta area. When Scudder visited the Gwembe in the 1980s, he found whole villages deserted because people moved to the new frontier area (Scudder and Habarad 1991). The Chikanta area is the focus of this dissertation.

Thayer Scudder was instrumental in helping to push the World Bank to give more compensation in the late 1990s. The result was the Gwembe Tonga Development Project (GTDP), which was meant to mitigate the negative impacts of the construction of the Kariba Dam by putting into place essential infrastructure such as boreholes, dams, water treatment, agricultural development, clinics, electrification, schools, land conservation, road rehabilitation, and flood control. Scudder also helped to ensure that the GTDP would have some projects in the Chikanta area as well as in the Gwembe Valley. The GTDP, using funds from the World Bank, constructed a school and health clinic in the area. The GTDP ended in 2006 because of lack of funding with many projects such as the construction of the Bottom road and the electrification of most house uncompleted (Musonda 2008). This is just one aspect of externally mediated events impacting
development in the area that can be utilized to identify the specific factors that may influence access to development benefits.

Many Gwembe Tonga are Seventh Day Adventist (SDA). The impact of the church has been such that some men are divorcing their multiple wives and staying married to only one. This is not true for everyone, though. Some have a very active role in the SDA church but are married to two or more women and have no plans on divorce. Divorce is fairly easy in the Tonga society because a woman can easily leave and return to her matrilineal kin.

**The Gwembe Tonga Research Project**

The Gwembe Tonga Research Project (GTRP) was conceived in the 1950s by then-director of the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute (RLI), Henry Fosbrooke, and the director of the Rhodes-Livingstone Museum, Desmond Clarke. The RLI began in 1937. Together, the anthropologists working for RLI, which included the second director Max Gluckman, helped form the “Manchester School” of anthropological thought. The anthropologists working in then Northern Rhodesia were considered to be socially progressive and often took the side of Africans against the colonial powers. Max Gluckman, at one point, was not allowed to return to the country because he disagreed with the Federation policy and instead agreed with African self-rule (Ferguson 1999).

Some people have argued that RLI anthropologists were colonial racists and helped to support colonial rule. Others have argued that they too often took the side of Africans and ignored the Europeans as a source of ethnographic data. Hortense Powdermaker once heard of an RLI anthropologist getting into a barroom fight with a white settler because of remarks the settler made about Africans. Hortense responded by
saying, “You should have been taking notes.” In the end, Ferguson (1999) argues, they were neither one nor the other. They were socially progressive, they had no qualms about showing their hatred for settlers and the colonial government, but at the same time they were part of the colonial structure.

When it was decided to construct the Kariba Dam, researchers learned that a large part of the Gwembe Valley was going to be flooded. The GTRP was created to study the social change of a group of people relocated because of a large-scale development project. The research was divided into three sections. Elizabeth Colson (1960, 1971) was brought on board to study the cultural aspects of the Gwembe Tonga and Thayer Scudder (1962) was to study the ecological aspects. Elizabeth Colson had previously worked with the Plateau Tonga, so she was a logical choice since she speaks ciTonga. Phillip Tobias (1958) conducted a human biological study. Desmond Clarke, with the help of Brian Fagan and Ray Inskeep, conducted archaeological surveys (Gillett and Tobias 2002).

The Gwembe Tonga Research Project is often broken down into three timeframes. One, the “Period of Stress,” from 1950-1962, this was the time of resettlement. Two, the “Period of Prosperity,” from 1962-1973, this was the time of independence and government social services. Three, the period of decline, from 1973 on and continuing into the present, this was (is) a time of worsening soil conditions, HIV, social service decline because of the collapse of the copper industry and the IMF’s structural-adjustment programs, etc. This has also been a period of creating new strategies to cope with the decline in living conditions. One strategy has been to move to new frontier areas, such as Chikanta, to access new land (Clark et al 1995; Cliggett 2005; Scudder and
Habarad 1991). The research project is still going strong, with new generations of anthropologists, including Lisa Cliggett who worked with Colson and Scudder and was selected to carry on the project, and also researchers from other disciplines adding to the knowledge and broadening the scope of the GTRP (Cliggett 2002; Scudder and Colson 2002).

**The Gwembe Tonga and the Plateau Tonga**

Writing in 1958, Elizabeth Colson stated that there was a subtle gradation of cultural practices between and within the Gwembe Tonga and the Plateau Tonga. Writing in 2000, Lisa Cliggett stated that although they share a name the Gwembe Tonga and the Plateau Tonga are separate and distinct ethnic groups. The difference may have to do with the passing of time and the shared history of relocation with the Gwembe Tonga, which I believed helped foster an ethnic identity that did not exist in the past vis-à-vis other groups.

Whether there is a subtle gradation of difference or the two groups are separate and distinct, there are a few practices that can distinguish between the Plateau Tonga and the Gwembe Tonga. For instance the Plateau Tonga use Iroquois kinship terminology and practice bilateral cross-cousin marriage. The Gwembe Tonga use Crow kinship terminology and do not practice cross-cousin marriage. The terminology difference suggests that the Gwembe Tonga are more committed to matrilineality, or at least that matrilineal descent groups are more important to them. The Gwembe Tonga say that they are a unique culture because they remove the upper incisors and canine teeth, although in the past both the Plateau Tonga and the Ila practiced this, and because each neighborhood has their own dance team (Colson 1960, 1980). Neither of these customs
are still being practiced, although there are some older women still living who had removed their upper teeth. For any of the differences that Colson cites, she also says that the differences are not rigid. If a Gwembe Tonga moved to the Plateau area, that person would follow the Plateau customs (Colson 1980).

Another difference can be the influence of Europeans. Most Plateau Tonga lived near the rail line, which led to early contact with Europeans. By 1905, there were Roman Catholic and SDA missionaries in the area. In contrast the Gwembe area was difficult to access and European contact did not really occur until the 1940s. The area around (and sometimes on) the land where the Plateau Tonga lived was the prime location for European settlers who made a living by agriculture. Because of the railway, the Plateau Tonga were able to sell cash crops much earlier than the Gwembe. All of these factors led the Plateau Tonga to view the Gwembe Tonga as rural and uncouth (Colson 1960; Dixon-Fyle 1977, 1978). In addition, the absence of tsetse flies allowed the Plateau Tonga to rely on cattle much earlier than the Gwembe Tonga, which also made possible use of plows and larger land holdings (Colson 1980).

Because the Gwembe Tonga are migrants into the Chikanta area, and much of the visible development around Nkandanzovu has “Gwembe” in the name, as in the GTDP, I thought there might be a divide between the Plateau and Gwembe Tonga in the area. This was not the case. When asked if there were any differences between Plateau and Gwembe Tonga, a few mentioned a slight difference in language. But most of my informants said it just meant that one’s ancestors were either from the valley or from the plateau and that people are just Tonga.
Because of overcrowding and lack of availability of farm land after relocation, the Gwembe Tonga make up the majority of migrants to the Nkandanzovu area. The history, political structure, and daily life of two villages in the Nkandanzovu area will be the focus of the next chapter.
Chapter Four

VILLAGE LIFE

When I ask Mutinta to explain the stark difference between her field and Chimuka's she answers without hesitation, “he got fertilizer and (hybrid) seeds from the government.” This is a common refrain heard throughout rural Zambia. As the government of Zambia attempts to institute policies in line with the principles of neoliberal economic ideology and governance, expectations of government support among the rural polity are increasingly met with the experience of government withdrawal (Sitko 2010).

The above quote highlights one of the many ways decisions made at the national level shape the lives of the Tonga. As previously stated, the Gwembe Tonga were relocated for the construction of the Kariba Dam. Once relocated there were pressures from overcrowding and lack of land for farming. Land that was part of the wildlife management area of Kafue Park was opened for settlement in 1979. This led to many Tonga, without enough land to farm but with enough resources to be able to move, to relocate to the Nkandanzovu area in the Chikanta chiefdom.

History of Settlement in region

The research villages of Sunu and Junza are located within the area of Nkandanzovu, a collection of seventeen villages with a population of approximately 2200 in about 360 households, which is located in the frontier region of the Chikanta chiefdom in the Kalomo District in the Southern Province of Zambia (Crooks et al. 2008). There are some 40,000 people living in the Chikanta chiefdom (Macha Works 2012). As a frontier region, there are many ethnic groups who have moved into the area to practice agriculture, the most numerous of which are the Gwembe Tonga. Migration to this area has taken place since 1979 when the government opened six wildlife management areas.
to human settlement. Some of these areas had been populated but were abandoned in the 1950s because of trypanosomiasis. Many of the migrants from the Gwembe Valley moved to the area that was a section of the Bbilili Hot Springs buffer zone along the southeastern border of Kafue National Park (see figure 4.1) (Cliggett 2000, Crooks et al. 2008). The major push for migration was degradation of and limited access to land in the Gwembe Valley (Cliggett 2000, 2001; Scudder and Habarad 1991, Unruh et al. 2005).

Figure 4.1 Map of Zambia Showing Locations of National Parks

The box indicates the general location of area opened for migration. Source: Expert Africa 2012
Life was difficult in the new area. Land had to be cleared, there were few water resources and the area is prone to droughts, and there were many wild animals to contend with (Crooks et al. 2008). But for those willing to put in the work and live with the challenges, there was access to land that was not available in the valley.

The move from the Gwembe Valley to Chikanta was extensive. Research conducted in 1988, showed entire villages in the valley that were deserted (Scudder and Habarad 1991). The majority of people who originally moved to the Chikanta area were middle class. The wealthiest people had access to land in the valley and the poorest could not afford to move. The middle level did not have access to land but had enough wealth to move. There has been a secondary wave of migration to the Chikanta area as poorer relatives move up to join wealthier relatives already established in the area (Elizabeth Colson: personal communication).

During interviews, I asked where people moved from and when they moved (see table 4.1). In order to get a sense of the first wave of migration and secondary migration into the area, the data has been separated by decade and also separated by whether those that moved already had relatives in the area. The first wave of migration was in the early 1980s and after that, except for a few outliers in the early 1990s, everyone who subsequently migrated to the area had relatives already there.

Some people gave the information of where they moved from in terms of village and some gave the information in terms of Chiefdom. If an informant was unsure of when they moved, I combined the data with what other informants, who were part of the same move, said about the date of relocation. This often happened if an informant moved with their parents and they were very young at the time. There were also five people who
were born in the area and are now reaching an age where they are getting married and establishing their own family in the villages.

Table 4.1 Migration to Nkandanzovu Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Informants</th>
<th>Year Moved</th>
<th>Location Moved From</th>
<th>Relatives in Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1986, 1989</td>
<td>Sinazongwe, Sinafala, Nameeto</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1990, 1992</td>
<td>Chief Macha, Malima, Maamba</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Born here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Originally there was just Nkandanzovu village, but over time as more people have moved to the area, the village has been split into smaller villages. Villages are made up of individual homesteads of normally related families (Cliggett 2005). The homestead consists of a family: husband, wife or wives, and children. Sometimes there is also an
elderly parent and relative’s children staying in the homestead. There will be a house for every adult and possibly structures used as a boys or girls group house (Cliggett 2005). The villages of Sunu and Junza combined have 33 homesteads with approximately 252 people. Homestead size ranged from 4 people up to 32 people.

**Photograph 4.1 Typical Homestead**

The majority of farmers in the area focus on maize but there is also contract cotton production, and a permanent market in the area (Cliggett 2005). Most farmers in Chikanta are “emergent” farmers, who cultivate 5-20 hectares of land using draught power (Rakner 2003). There are currently two land tenure systems in Zambia: the customary tenure and the leasehold tenure. In 1995, the Zambia Land Act was created to facilitate the transference of customary land to titled land (Sitko 2010). In spite of that,
the rural farmer occupies land mainly held under the traditional tenure which is managed by local chiefs (Republic of Zambia 2006). The chiefs give permission for a farmer to have certain land for their household and farming. Traditionally, the claim to the land is cemented by the clearing of the land. There are farmers who have portions of land that remains uncleared. They feel this land is theirs, it was approved by the chief, but there is a fear that someone else could clear it and then win a dispute over land ownership if the case goes to traditional court (Sichone 2008). This dual system is becoming distorted in rural areas through the creation of a furtive market for renting and selling land (Sitko 2010).

The agricultural production in the area is considered to be “advanced” because the farmers produce and sell crops to buy consumer goods as well as producer goods such as fertilizer and seeds that can be used to enhance production (Baker 1984). The Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflection (JCTR) has calculated the Basic Needs Basket (BNB), for many areas in Zambia. The BNB reflects the bare minimum cost of living not everything that would be needed to live a humane life (JCTR 2006). The exemplar for a rural village in the Southern Province is the Libala area in the Kanzungula District. It was found that the BNB in the area for a family of seven is 2,400 calories a day and the cost of essential non-food items was ZMK 74,500 a month. The average family was consuming 1,700 to 2,000 calories a day depending on the time of year and was able to purchase ZMK 22,600 worth of non-food items a month (JCTR 2011). While the items that make up the BNB and reported diet in the Libala area are not completely indicative of the diet in the Nkandanzovu area, the key item is lack of a sufficient amount of maize grain (see Appendix IV for a list of food and non-food items and their subsequent
values). Maize grain is needed to make the dietary staple, *nshima*, and when people report that they will not have enough food for the year, it is a lack of this. All other food is considered to be relish.

**Photograph 4.2 Permanent Market**

The Village in the Political Structure

Each of the seventeen villages in Ndandanzovu has a headman. The Nkandanzovu area has a senior headman and then the larger territory known as Chikanta has a chief (see table 4.2). The senior headman is responsible for adjudicating land disputes and other local conflicts and also is a cooperative administrator and as such helps to control the distribution of inputs from the Fertilizer Support Program (FSP) (Sitko 2010). Each village has to pay a maize tax to the chief. The chief is responsible
for the distribution of customary held land, the distribution of information in his chiefdom, and taking concerns to the government. Five chiefs from each province serve at the House of Chiefs. These chiefs are elected for a five-year term, by all the chiefs in a province and their duties entail: discussion of bills that relate to custom or tradition before they are given to the National Assembly; discussion on matters pertaining to national development; discussion and resolution on matters that relate to customary law and practice; and discussion and creation of recommendations to local authorizes regarding the welfare of a local community (Technical Committee on Drafting the Zambian Constitution 2012).

Table 4.2 Villages of Junza and Sunu within Zambian Political Structure from National to Local

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Head of Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zambian</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province (Southern)</td>
<td>Provincial Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District (Kalomo)</td>
<td>District Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituency (Dundumwenzi)</td>
<td>Member of Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward (Omba)</td>
<td>Area Councilor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiefdom (Chikanta)</td>
<td>Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Area (Nkandanzovu)</td>
<td>Senior Headman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village (Junza and Sunu)</td>
<td>Headman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The traditional village political system also fits into the national political structure. Within the national political system, each village is part of a ward. Sunu village and Junza village along with the rest of Nkandanzovu and other surrounding villages are part of Omba ward (see figure 4.4). Each ward is represented by an area councilor. A constituency is an area which is represented by a member of parliament.
Nkandanzovu is located in Dundumwenzi Constituency (see figure 4.3). This constituency includes all of the Chikanta chiefdom and part of Siachitema chiefdom. The constituency is located within the Kalomo district, which is one of 11 districts in Southern Province (see figure 4.2).

**Figure 4.2 Map of Zambia Showing Locations of Districts**

Modified from GEGA 2001
Figure 4.3: Map of Southern Province Showing Locations of Constituencies

Modified from Zambian Economist 2011

Figure 4.4: Map of Kalomo District Showing Locations of Wards

Modified from Weller et al. 2004
History of Development in Region

In 2006, I conducted preliminary research over a four and a half week period among the Gwembe Tonga in Nkandanzovu as part of an NSF summer field school in research methods. This research focused on ways small-scale development projects impact stratification in a community. I decided to focus on agricultural loan cooperative programs because these seemed to have the greatest impact on peoples’ livelihoods. In addition, one informant early in the fieldwork complained about the favoritism in the cooperatives. The question then became who can access the loan programs and what problems do farmers and those involved in the cooperative see with how the programs are run. Because of the limited time available in the field, the scope of the research was limited. Through both formal and informal interviews, I spoke to seventeen informants.

In 2006, I focused on two specific development programs in Nkandanzovu, the Gwembe Tonga Development Program (GTDP) and the Community-based Natural Resources and Sustainable Agriculture (CONASA) program; this is because both of these programs had agricultural input cooperatives as part of their agendas. The GTDP built a school and clinic with World Bank funding. The World Bank gave money to the Zambian government and the government created the GTDP under the Zambian Electricity Corporation (ZESCO). Before 2001, when the construction started there was only a health post and a small school in Nkandanzovu. Many in Nkandanzovu are hoping for a second phase of the GTDP but it is unclear if this will happen.

CONASA also began in 2001. The program, funded by USAID, worked in conjunction with the Zambian Wildlife Authority (ZAWA). The programs ran in five chiefdoms throughout Zambia. CONASA was started to teach community sustainable
agricultural practices, and to help villagers learn about HIV, gender issues, business practices, and how to protect wildlife and other natural resources. As part of protecting wildlife, CONASA tried to control poaching in the area. Starting in 2002 through 2004 one informant collected illegal firearms throughout the chiefdom. By 2004, they had collected over 38,000 firearms. CONASA phased out in 2005.

**History of loan programs**

Both the GTDP and CONASA started agricultural loan cooperatives as part of their programs. The intent for the cooperatives was to improve agriculture among the farmers. Although neither program is actively running in Nkandanzovu any longer, the loan programs, set up as revolving funds were still operating. The cooperatives give loans of fertilizer and seed maize. The loan program for CONASA started in 2001 when it gave the community 200x50 kg bags of fertilizer and 50x10 kg bags of seed maize in the form of a grant. These inputs were given to the Village Area Group (VAG) which gave out the inputs on a loan basis. Fifteen people sit on the VAG. The VAG is a subcommittee of the Community Resource Board (CRB), which also has fifteen members. The VAG runs the loans for the Community cooperative. In order to get a loan the farmer would sign a contract with the VAG. The VAG could then decide whether the farmer was a good farmer and whether he would pay back the loan and either approve or decline the application.

The farmer would have to give a membership fee once and then every year would have to give a down payment for the inputs and would pay the rest after the harvest. The membership fee for the Community cooperative started by CONASA is 5,000 ZMK, which is equivalent to around US $1.50. According to one informant, the membership
fee for the Gwembe Tonga cooperative is 10% of the amount of fertilizer that you would want in the first year. The down payment would have to be in cash but the remaining loan could be paid in cash or in-kind (maize). Last year the fertilizer was selling for 110,000 ZMK per packet if paid in cash and farmers were limited to eight packets, which would fertilize one hectare. The seed maize was selling for 75,000 ZMK, with a 2x10 kgs limit which is also enough for one hectare. If the farmer wanted to pay with maize, a 50 kgs packet of fertilizer would go for 2x50 kgs of maize. For 10 kgs of seed maize, the farmer would pay 5 buckets of maize, which is around 4 gallons. Not surprisingly, most people prefer to pay back their loans in maize because it works out to be much cheaper for the farmers. If a farmer went to sell 2x50 kgs of maize at the low end they could get 30,000 ZMK. In addition, if some farmers have the cash up front, they could pay 600,000 ZMK for eight packets of fertilizer and 2x10 kgs of seed maize. Having some farmers pay up front allows the cooperative to buy more inputs to give out as loans to other farmers. Those who would get the fertilizer on loan would have to pay a down payment of 30,000 ZMK per bag.

The cooperative under the GTDP, which started in 2001, is run in the same way but there is a different committee that accepts applications and gives out the loans. Ten people sit on the committee for the Gwembe Tonga cooperative.

The Food Reserve Agency in cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture helps to supply fertilizer to cooperatives at a 50% discount. This means that in 2005, the Community cooperative was buying fertilizer at 64,000 ZMK including the cost of transport. The fertilizer is purchased at the District Agriculture Office in Kalomo.
The best strategy for the farmer is to pay for the loan in maize, but that is not the best strategy for everyone overall because if more people were able to pay cash upfront more inputs could be purchased for the cooperative.

**Problems with the loan programs**

**Not enough fertilizer**

What was found in 2006, was that one problem with the cooperatives was that there was a lack of fertilizer and a shortage of facilities to store the fertilizer when it was brought to Nkandanzovu. The Gwembe Tonga cooperative stores their fertilizer in the New Apostle church and the farmers come to that church to pick up their inputs. The lack of fertilizer was something that both people involved in the cooperatives and the farmers complained about bitterly. While most farmers stated that they did not have enough money to buy fertilizer when I asked them why they did not use it on their fields, many also stated that there was not enough to go around. For instance, one informant said, “Only a little fertilizer got brought here and it was not enough for everyone and also I didn’t have any money.”

People attribute the lack of fertilizer and seed maize to bad harvests. When observing women at the borehole in Nkandanzovu, I heard an older woman telling the other women that the people in the area that she was from that were able to buy seed maize had a good crop but people who did not, have nothing now.

The limited fertilizer and seed also limits the amount of people the cooperative approves for loans. Last year the Gwembe Tonga cooperative accepted about 200 people for loans of seed and/or fertilizer. One informant stated, “If we have enough fertilizer they accept but if you don’t have enough some of them are turned down, whether they like
it or maybe because they don’t have it.” Because of this, more people are turned down based upon “the quality of the person and the character of that particular farmer” which creates hard feelings in the community.

**Nonpayment**

There were two reasons why people did not pay back the loans that they received for fertilizer. The first was that people were willing, but unable to pay back the loans. If this happens the farmer would be advised to pay back the loan the following year. It is possible that if a person is unable to pay, his land will be taken and sold to cover the loan. This is not a usual solution but it can happen.

Other people did not pay back the loan because they felt entitled to it. According to one informant, “they are saying this is ours because we were displaced during the construction of Kariba dam so we can’t pay. We lost our grandparents, our grandwhat so they are refusing to pay back.”

If it is believed that someone is deliberately not paying back the loan, they could be taken to court. Another informant stated that, “in 2003 we had about 112 people who could not pay back; some of them are deliberately not paying back because when the court case came they were able to pay. 3/4s managed to pay back. If a person does not pay back a loan, they will be unable to get a loan again. This also hurts the revolving fund because there will not be enough money coming in to get more fertilizer in future years.

**Access**

Many of the farmers I talked to complained about favoritism in the cooperatives. Those that I spoke to that are on committees and decide who is able to get loans stated
that any eligible farmer is able to get a loan. The committee is able to decide who is an eligible farmer based upon whether he is considered to be a good farmer or not. I was told that, “It depends on the quality of the person and the character of that particular farmer.”

The committees also look at the ability of the person to pay back the loan. This means that the larger farmers are favored over the farmers that do not have very many hectares to farm because it is believed that only the larger farmers have the ability to pay back a loan. Overall, many people that I spoke to said that the fact that some farmers get turned down and others get the loans is creating bad feelings in the community.

### Table 4.3 Access to Fertilizer based on Socio-Economic Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic status</th>
<th>Hectares farmed</th>
<th>Used fertilizer in the last season</th>
<th>Used manure in the last season</th>
<th>Good year for crops</th>
<th>Maize for family consumption</th>
<th>Extra Maize</th>
<th>Accessed fertilizer in the past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Middle</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Middle</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>&lt;7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Middle</td>
<td>≈7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Middle</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Middle</td>
<td>&lt;15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Middle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>≈2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table (Table 4.3) looks at access to loans based upon socioeconomic position. The information comes from ranking exercises and also from my observations.
when visiting people’s homesteads.

As you can see in the past year, the only farmers that had access to chemical fertilizer were in the high middle category. The exception to this is one farmer in the low middle category, however, he was a headman so I believe that he was able to manipulate social networks in a manner that others in his bracket were unable to do.

There has also been some movement in the way people are ranked. For instance, one of the people in the low middle would have been ranked higher and in the past would have been considered for loans but wealth is related to cattle ownership and many cattle were wiped out through corridor disease (transmitted by ticks).

**Photograph 4.3 Successful Harvest using Fertilizer**

![Successful Harvest using Fertilizer](image)

Because there is limited fertilizer, farmers are limited to 8 bags which is enough
for one hectare. However, if someone has enough resources his wives and older children (with voter’s registration cards) can also become members of the cooperative, so for instance if a man had 3 wives and they all signed up, he could get 32 bags of fertilizer. Then if it comes time to pay the farmer could only pay off a couple of the loans and still be able to get fertilizer the next year. Because this involves having enough money for membership fees and the down payment of the loans, this also favors large farmers. For instance, one farmer mentioned he was able to get 24 bags of fertilizer.

Ways for some to manipulate system

When I returned to Nkandanzovu in 2008, I found even more problems with the cooperatives. When the GTDP started the cooperative, it had 80 million ZMK. While I was there, people wanted to lodge a complaint with the district office because they felt that the cooperative was not given enough fertilizer. The cooperative was only giving enough fertilizer for 5 hectares. The cooperative receives fertilizer based on the equity in the bank. It was only then that people found out there was only 3.8 million ZMK left. 11 million ZMK was used to buy 6 bulls earlier in the year, so 65 million ZMK was gone. This was because of nonpayment of loans and also there were some accusations of embezzlement. In addition, Nicholas Sitko (2010) found that the farmers who were denied fertilizer who all relatively young and did not have direct kinship ties to the most powerful families in the area.

Everyone I spoke to during the second visit to Zambia said the CONASA revolving fund has completely stopped and is no longer a functioning cooperative.

Other Development Programs in Region

School
The village school in Nkandanzovu was built with funding from the GTDP (which was completed in 2005) and goes up to grade 9. In addition to the school buildings, 12 staff houses were built and the classrooms and staff houses have solar-powered electricity. Classes are taught by government teachers whose salary is paid for by the government and community teachers whose salary comes from school fees. There is also a budget given by the government to buy supplies, and textbooks are given out to students once a year. This is far short of the amount of books and supplies actually needed and many students are left without books and supplies.

**Photograph 4.4 Clinic**

![Clinic](image)

**Clinic**

With GTDP funding, Nkandanzovu was able to have a clinic constructed. This
was also completed in 2005. There is a nurse who is a government employee and has trained to be a midwife. There is also an Environmental Health Technologist who is supposed to promote sanitation in the village but because of staff shortage at the clinic, sees patients as well. This is also a government position. Then there is a dresser. She is paid through government grant money and is supposed to do cleaning and washing. She has not had medical training but she also sees patients.

**Safe Motherhood Action Group (SMAG)**

This is a new program designed to promote pregnant women’s’ health and to ensure safe deliveries. The program is run through the government with support and funding from UNICEF. The nurse working at the clinic in Nkandanzovu had a two day training session in June of 2008 and is now trying to get two people to go around the villages to gather data about problems during pregnancy. The data would go to the clinic and also to the government so a plan for the area could be implemented. The program also trains people to be midwives. There has been training in other areas of Zambia, but the nurse said that in Nkandanzovu, no one has wanted to do the training because people want to be paid and that is not possible. As part of the Millennium Development Goals, the government of Zambia has quickly expanded the range of SMAG, which as of 2010 serve 43 districts, but there needs to be further review of the effectiveness of the program (UNICEF 2012).

**Veterinary Assistant**

The position of veterinary assistant is a government position and the duties are to insure that the animals are in good health and to provide services in telling people how to keep and care for animals. The veterinary assistant can prescribe medicines for animals.
The government does not provide medicine unless there is an outbreak of foot and mouth disease or rabies, which are considered to be diseases of national importance. Otherwise, the veterinary assistant buys medicine in town and resells them in the village.

**The Henwood Foundation**

This program began in 2007. The program is part of the New Apostolic Church (NAC). The founder, George Henwood, was the first apostle in the Kalomo district. The goal of the foundation is to eliminate poverty throughout Zambia by improving food security (NAC 2010). The Henwood Foundation’s vision statement is, “A Zambia in which communities are free from hunger and disease, and have the skills to improve their livelihoods” (NAC 2010)

Nkandanzovu was considered for the program because there is a New Apostolic Church in the area. A meeting was held at the school to choose lead farmers to attend a 5-day workshop to train in how to use compost fertilizer and to learn conservation farming methods. The lead farmers were then expected to return to their villages to teach others the conservation farming techniques. Twenty-five lead farmers were chosen in the Nkandanzovu area.

With compost, farmers tend to get a medium yield unlike the high yield that could be raised with chemical fertilizer, but a farmer will always get a medium yield as opposed to fertilizer which strips the soil so that after a few years of use the yield will go down. The program has not been accepted by many people in the village because creating the compost is hard work and needs special equipment such as a shovel, hoe, marked rope, and two plastic drums. The program was originally intended to supply these materials to farmers but now the farmers have to supply themselves. Also, the program encourages
indigenous crops. One of the lead farmers told me that people have a hard time accepting a new program unless they are given fertilizer, money, or maize seed. No one wanted the seeds offered except for kale and cabbage. In 2008, they also offered maize seed so a few more people seemed interested in the program. They would like to have 500 active farmers in the program but as of 2008, there were only 45.

**Social Cash Transfer Scheme (SCTS)**

This is a government program, which began in 2004, and is run by the Ministry of Community Development and Social Services. In the beginning the German Technical Assistance to Zambia (GTZ) provided funding but is no longer involved. Training for facilitators from the Nkandanzovu area began in 2007 and the program began in 2008. The program tries to support people with disabilities, the chronically sick, and the elderly. Households with children receive 100,000 ZMK (about $19 USD) every 2 months. Households with no children receive 80,000 ZMK (about $15 USD). The facilitators made a list of people who they believed needed assistance, then they went to the different homesteads and helped people fill out the applications. Then the applications were ranked in order of need and given to the office headquarters in Kalomo. The money is given out at the school by a teacher and the vice-headmistress. There are 30 homesteads receiving funds through the program and each applicant is reassessed every two years.

**Women’s Clubs**

Women’s Clubs operate under the Ministry of Development. An application for a club has to be submitted to the government. If the club is approved, to join women can pay a membership fee, which is deposited in the women’s club’s bank account. Women’s Clubs can have different goals depending on the area in which they are
operating. Many in towns and cities are organized to help women with small-scale enterprises. In the Nkandanzovu area, these programs are seemingly being utilized to help provide women with subsidized fertilizer and seed provided through the FSP; also sometimes with animals such as goats. However, the clubs have a male overseer, supposedly to help the women who are members with banking and transport. This leads to the male overseer being able to control the distribution of fertilizer through the clubs. Women do not have control over agricultural product and what little money they obtain is normally spent on household items such as clothing, kitchen goods, and medicine (Sitko 2010). Often what happens is when there is fertilizer and seed the members do not have enough money to buy it themselves but others (with the approval of the overseer) will buy the allotted share through them and the women will receive a small bag of fertilizer from the purchaser.

_Cotton Contract Farming_

Farmers can contract with cotton companies to grow cotton in their fields. The company gives the farmer everything they need to grow the cotton. When the cotton is harvested, the company will pay the farmer minus the cost of the supplies. When the harvest is poor or prices are low, the farmer may become indebted to the company. In 2011 cotton growers in Zambia were being offered ZMK 3,200 per kilogram but in 2012 they are only being offered ZMK 2,000 per kilogram. The Zambia National Farmers Union (ZNFU) has urged farmers not to sell their cotton at such a low price (Times of Zambia 2012). Dunavant is the price-leader and offers a minimum pre-planting price to farmers, which later can be adjusted (Tschirley and Kabwe 2009).
In Zambia, cotton was controlled by one state-owned company LINTCO, until 1994. In 1994, LINTCO was sold to two private companies Lonrho and Clark Cotton. In 1999, Lonrho’s assets were sold to Dunavant. In 2006, Cargill bought Clark Cotton. Currently there are ten cotton companies working in Zambia but Cargill and Dunavant together have 80% of the market share (Tschirley and Kabwe 2010). In 2003, 12% of all households in the Southern province were growing cotton. This totaled 17,778 households and accounted for 13% of total cotton producing households in Zambia. Cargill only operates in the Eastern province, which accounts for 65% of Zambia’s cotton production (Tschirley and Kabwe 2009).

The main cotton company in the Nkandanzovu area in 2008 was Dunavant Zambia Limited which was a subsidiary of one of the largest cotton traders in the world, Dunavant Enterprises, based in Memphis, Tennessee. Dunavant was also one of the largest private corporations in the United States, with revenues exceeding a billion dollars in 2002. In 2010, Dunavant was purchased by the Louis Dreyfus Group, which is one of the four largest global agricultural products conglomerates in the world (Dunavant 2012). They are the “D” in what Dr. John Bodley calls the “ABCD Four,” the four companies that dominate global agriculture (Archer Daniels Midland (ADM), Bunge Ltd, Cargill, and the Dreyfus Group). Dreyfus, is owned by a French multi-billionaire family, is headquartered in Paris, and has gross revenues topping $120 billion (Bodley 2012). Dreyfus is a true global elite that is able to shape growth and development at a global level to maximize their profits which has impacts at the village level such as in Nkandanzovu.
Working against the cotton grower in Africa are subsidies provided to cotton producers and exporters in the United States. These subsidies are so large that they distort the global market and as a result, drive down prices for growers in other places such as Africa. Cotton growers in the United States are industrial farmers. They have large land holdings, equipment, and financial and material inputs. In 2001/2002 farmers in the U.S. received $3.9 billion in subsidies. This works out to at least .52 cents per pound of cotton. The World Bank estimates that removal of the U.S. cotton subsidies would produce $250 million per year for West African cotton farmers. Looking at rural cotton growers in Benin, researchers found that a 40% reduction in farm-level prices for cotton resulted in a 7% short-term and 5-6% long-term reduction in per capita income (Minot and Daniels 2002).

Impact of world cotton prices on rural farmers seems to show a relationship with the number of farmers producing cotton in an area, how many of these farmers are larger farmers with relatively high income, and how much of the household income is derived from cotton (Minot and Daniels 2002). In Zambia, cotton is the number one agricultural export and is grown almost entirely by small farmers (Tschrley and Kabwe 2010). More research needs to be done on the cotton industry in Nkandanzovu to see what impact it is having on rural poverty in the area.

**Village Power Structure**

When asked who had the most power in the village, people repeatedly told me the headman (see table 4.3). I was not too surprised by this answer, but I was surprised that not a single informant selected the wealthiest person in the village, a family that I see wielding considerable power in the village. Less than half of the informants said that the
chief had the most power. Those who did repeatedly told me that development is concentrated in the chief’s area. One reason many cited for this was because the chief felt like the area already had enough development because of the GTDP. So even though the chief does not really have a constant presence in the village many felt that he was able to influence the shape of the village in ways that others could not. A few informants, mentioned more than one person as being equal in power. The three informants who said they did not know were recently married and very young.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person with Power</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village Headman</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Chairman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Headman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Villager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are existing development programs in the area: such as the cooperation, school, clinic, SMAG, veterinary assistant, Henwood Foundation, SCTS, women’s clubs, and contract cotton. Many of these have problems but there are also benefits for those who can access what they have to offer. I hypothesize that those with most social power will be able to access these programs for their own gain. There was a brief introduction to who is viewed to have the most power in the village. The next chapter looks at the breakdown of the social hierarchy amongst Junza and Sunu and how that is reflected in what development is accessed and known of in the Nkandanzovu area.
Chapter Five

LOCAL IDEAS OF DEVELOPMENT

Agricultural production and productivity is very low in Zambia though it has the potential to enhance economic growth and reduce poverty. Good performance in the sector translates into overall improvement of the country’s GDP, creates jobs, and expands the tax base. This is mainly because the majority of Zambians depend on agricultural – related activities for their livelihood. Therefore, the failure of agriculture to secure livelihoods is considered as a major factor contributing to rural poverty. In addition, rural areas suffer from deficiencies in access to basic amenities such as health services, safe water, quality education, and infrastructure that worsen the poverty situation. Significantly, and related to the foregoing, rural areas have attracted very little investment except in isolated areas. Most farmers lack markets and support services and incur high production costs. Attracting investment, expanding markets, providing adequate support services, and making agriculture competitive should be a means to improve rural livelihoods. (CSPR 2011)

The above statement is part of the Sixth National Development Plan and represents the national take on rural development. Part of my hypothesis is that an individual’s ability to influence the development process or to even have knowledge of the existing developmental structure, i.e. the organizations working in a community, may be connected with social power, social standing, ability to access networks, and wealth. To look at this, one needs to see how the Gwembe Tonga conceptualize development; what the Tonga feel is needed at the village and household level; and if the ability to effectively access development opportunities is linked to social power in the village structure. This chapter begins with how the Tonga conceptualize development. This is important because I went into the village with a set idea about what development was and what development I would see in the Nkandanzovu, but was unsure if people in the area viewed it in the same way. I also wanted to see if people felt they were active participants in the development of Nkandanzovu or if they felt more passive and needed
to have outsiders bring in development.

The next topic is knowledge of development in the area, and if any benefits have been received from present development. When I was in the village for the first time in 2006, I was told, “There is no development here.” To me that was such a powerful statement. I could see things that I would put in the category of development such as the school, clinic, cotton companies, cooperatives, etc. So I wanted to question how many people had this view that there was no development, and why they felt that way. Then, what people feel is needed at the village and household level is addressed. This helps to answer the question of what people would want to bring into the area if they could control the development process.

How the Tonga Conceptualize Development

The informants were asked what development is, and their answers can be sorted into three categories that show a lot about agency within the development rubric (see table 5.1). The first category really showed ideas of self-dependence in achieving goals. For instance, one informant said, “development is something that comes from people uniting and working together to reach a goal that will be beneficial to everyone.” Another said, “When people come together to help each other improve their lives. For instance, if 10 people came together and contributed small amounts of money to buy fertilizer and gave to one member of the group and next year a different member, they would help each other develop.” One more person stated, “Being better. It applies to people who were lowly in society and then through hard work and dedication they begin to lead better and decent lives.” Another said, “Something that happens when people group themselves and come up with ideas on how to make their lives better.” In total, 14
respondents in some way described development as people working hard to achieve their goals.

Another category of responses showed the exact opposite, a lack of personal agency in development. These ideas about what development is show a need for an outside source to bring about a desired goal. The terminology used by people to describe development switched from coming together and working for; to finding something, receiving something, or others bringing something. For instance, one informant said, “If you were poor, then you find something good, it means you have development.” One said, “Bringing in new things for the people like fertilizer and hybrid maize seed.” Another stated, “When people bring certain things that the community doesn’t have.” And yet another said, “Receiving something to carry you forward in life.” A total of 24 informants’ definitions fit into this category.

The third category removed agency altogether. People discussed change from bad to good or from poor to rich but did not attach a catalyst for the change. One person stated, “The change of people’s lives from poor to being rich.” When asked what being rich meant, the informant said, “being in possession of what you need to eat, wear, or use at any given time.” Another person said, “A step from a poor situation to a much better situation.” Another said, “People living better lives.” Most commonly people stated, “Improvement of people’s lives from bad to good.” 36 informants’ responses were of this variety.

There was one person who when asked what development was, stated she did not know. She was sixteen and had been married for about a year.
Table 5.1 Perceptions of Development in the Villages of Junza and Sunu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondents (n=75)</th>
<th>Category of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Self-dependence in Achieving Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Lack of Personal Agency in Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Removal of Agency as Part of Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Did Not Know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Knowledge of Development in the Area

Over and over I was told that there was no development in the area, but there really were many obvious improvements (the clinic and school being the most visible) that would normally be considered “development”, so I wanted to try to gauge knowledge of what was in the area. People who were on numerous committees tended to have the most knowledge of development. This often tied to social position in the community (see table 5.3). I decided to use the household as the level of my analysis. This tends to subsume the category of gender, which is an important aspect of intra-household relations. A lot has changed in terms of gender relations among the Gwembe Tonga, especially due to changing relationships to land and cattle due to relocation after the Kariba Dam. There is gender inequality in the village, although this plays out differently in each household. There has been much research done which looks at gender amongst the Tonga (see Cliggett 2005, Sitko 2010). Men control the product of farm labor and dole out the maize to their wives for the purpose of feeding themselves and their children and then the women could use any extra to buy household goods. Women also have different access to land, different strategies for scarcity, and the women’s clubs which are supposedly for women’s empowerment are being controlled by men. But for the most part access to development programs and the ability to access items such as fertilizer to have a larger yield of maize impacts the entire household and not just one member.
In order to establish social rank in the community, many factors were addressed, including the following:

- Number of hectares farmed;
- Total hectares available;
- Could afford transport to town when needed;
- Experienced hunger in 2008;
- Enough food available to last the year;
- Used fertilizer in the past five years.

These were all questions that I asked in the interviews. I also factored in my observations of the material condition of the homesteads:

- Overall condition of structures in the homestead;
- Presence of small animals such as chickens and goats;
- Ownership of cattle;
- Household/farming goods such as plows, ox-carts, bicycles, and radios.

I also took into consideration social power in the village. Throughout my fieldwork, I took note of how many times people attended meetings, how many times people voiced their opinions, how much others seemed to value their opinions, and how often others would seek out their advice if a problem arose.

I ranked all informants based on these categories and then asked my research assistant his opinion of my rankings. He concurred with all of my rankings except for one household that I ranked in the high category because they had a vehicle in the homestead. I learned that the owner of the vehicle sold off most of his cattle to buy parts for the vehicle, and now it does not run and he no longer has as much wealth in cattle.
Because of this and the answers in the interviews, I put that household in the middle category. There is one outlier in the rankings as well. Most of the time, social rank linked with the number of committees that members of the household served on, but there is one household that is in the low category but serves on three committees. This is a large household and some of the wives are very active and respected in the community. The husband however, has accumulated debts throughout the village and many of the wives told me they would be in a better position if the husband was able to manage their resources better.

Based on the above criteria, out of a total of 33 households: 4 households were in the high category; 9 households were in the middle category; 6 households were in the low category; and 12 households were in the poor category (see table 5.2). Two households had to be left out of the rankings due to lack of information on enough significant criteria.

Many people only knew of organizations that they were part of, for instance they would know of the cooperative because they were a member. The exception to this was the women’s club. People mentioned the women’s club even if they were not a member or did not receive benefits. One possible reason for this is because the women’s club received fertilizer while I was there so it was a topic of conversation amongst people. When asked what development was in the area, many people said none – but then when asked about specific programs, they did know of their existence (this was the case when people were too poor to afford the fees for cooperative or women’s club). Also when asked what development they had specifically benefitted from people, many people listed
the clinic and the school although these were not often mentioned when asked what
development was in the area.

**Table 5.2 Social Ranking of the Homesteads in Junza and Suna (with select criteria)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Rank</th>
<th># of People in Household (n=230)</th>
<th>Hectares</th>
<th>Enough Food for Year</th>
<th>Fertilizer/Inputs</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.3 Knowledge of What Development is in Area at a Household level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Rank</th>
<th>Known Development</th>
<th>Benefits last 10 years</th>
<th># of Committees served on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Cooperative from GTDP, SCTS, veterinary program, school, clinic, women’s club</td>
<td>Children in school, medicine from clinic, fertilizer from cooperative, fertilizer through wife from women’s club, bulls, goat</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Henwood foundation, SCTS, women’s club, cooperative, CDF, school, clinic</td>
<td>Through GTDP was trained to be community agricultural worker, paid for training to implement SCTS, fertilizer through cooperative, clinic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>SCTS, Henwood foundation, cotton companies, women’s club</td>
<td>Learned conservation techniques and got seed from Henwood foundation, fertilizer and goat from women’s club (shares the goat with another and they split the offspring)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>GTDP, women’s clubs, cooperative</td>
<td>Bull from GTDP, school, clinic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>FRA, Women’s club, clinic</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Women’s club, cotton companies</td>
<td>None (although says would have gotten fertilizer from women’s club if not sick)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Women’s club</td>
<td>Fertilizer and seed from Cooperative from CONASA, seed from GTDP cooperative, medicine from clinic</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Women’s club</td>
<td>Benefits buy buying fertilizer from people in clubs who are not using their share</td>
<td>0 (but was in the past)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Henwood foundation, SCTS</td>
<td>From Henwood foundation received training in conservation farming, maize seed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>GTDP, school in Male-Male</td>
<td>School, clinic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Cotton companies, women’s club</td>
<td>Nearby borehole, cotton companies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Source of Assistance</td>
<td>Assistance Provided</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Cooperative, women’s club</td>
<td>Fertilizer in past</td>
<td>Fertilizer and seed from CUSA Zambia (no longer operating), goat, 1 bag fertilizer from women’s club, good prices for maize from Namboard (no longer functioning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Women’s club, cooperative</td>
<td>Fertilizer and seed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>SCTS</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Clinic, school, women’s club</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Women’s club</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Women’s club</td>
<td>Benefits from those</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Women’s club</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>School, clinic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>School, clinic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Women’s club, cooperative</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Cotton companies</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Women’s club, cooperative</td>
<td>Not directly, but</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Women’s club, cooperative</td>
<td>said because others</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Women’s club</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Women’s club</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>SCTS</td>
<td>K100,000 every two</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Women’s club</td>
<td>Indirectly from</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>Vaccines for</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Cotton companies, SCTS, Women’s club</td>
<td>SCTS give money</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note on acronyms – CONASA (Community-based Natural Resources and Sustainable Agriculture), CDF (Constituency Development Fund), FRA (Food Reserve Agency), GTDP (Gwembe Tonga Development Project), SCTS (Social Cash Transfer Scheme), SDA (Seventh Day Adventist)
What is Needed at the Village and Household Level

It is important to distinguish between desired development at the village level and household level because they are thought of in two separate ways. When I originally went to Nkandanzovu in 2006, I asked what people felt was needed to improve their lives. People responded with a list of household items and major projects for the community. When asked how the wanted development could be accomplished, no one was readily able to answer because acquiring household goods versus community projects involve two different strategies. When I returned to the area in 2008, I asked about each form of development individually.

Village level

The biggest problem that the majority of informants wanted to address is lack of clean water (see table 5.4). The closest borehole for the majority of people I spoke to in the village was about an hour away on foot. People utilized shallow wells in the garden for drinking water. The water is not suitable for consumption and causes many illnesses. There are some outliers in the village who live about an hour and a half walking distance from the majority of the homesteads in the village. These outlying homesteads have a borehole that they are relatively close to and their children attend school at Male-Male instead of Nkandanzovu. The school in Male-Male does not go up to the same level as the school in Nkandanzovu, so at some point the children will either have to stop attending school or walk two and a half hours to the school in Nkandanzovu.

The next concern was a program for discounted fertilizer and other agricultural inputs. As people use the fields for many years, they see a decline in soil fertility, and their maize is subject to variations in the weather, such as not enough rain, or too much
rain, which can result in insufficient food crops to feed a family for the year. The programs to introduce composting have not had much success and the cooperatives/women’s clubs do not receive enough fertilizer for those who would like to purchase it.

The condition of the road is also a concern because people feel that they could get a better price for their maize if they had easier access to the market in Choma. According to statistics compiled by the government, 60-70% of rural farmers have not benefitted from liberalization reforms undertaken in the 1990s under the SAPs prescribed by the IMF because they live far from markets where inputs can be purchased at lower prices and where output can be sold for a profit (Republic of Zambia 2006).

Also, if a person needs medical care outside of the clinic, it is very difficult to get to town. Vehicles leave the market in Nkandanzovu around 7 at night and arrive in Choma in the morning, if the vehicle does not break down or get stuck too many times. The distance between Choma and Nkandanzovu is a little over 100 kilometers. Leaving Choma, one can get transport around 2 in the afternoon and be in Nkandanzovu around 10 at night. These are best scenario timeframes, in the dry season. The distance to Kalomo is not great, about 70 kilometers, but the road becomes almost impassable during the rainy season and many vehicles do not attempt the drive under these conditions. Even in the dry season, the road is full of potholes and it is not uncommon to get stuck, resulting in the 70 kilometer trip taking a whole day. The ride is unpleasant as my back can well attest after a mad ride one day into Kalomo.

The clinic is a very long walk for some people. Often times someone will have to take the entire day to walk to the clinic, wait to be seen and walk back. There is also
always the chance as well that there will not be any medicine. Many people I spoke to said that the government workers sell the medicines to the stores in the market in Nkandanzovu, so instead of providing medicine they tell people to go buy the medicine in the store. The clinic workers say that the government has the wrong population figures and so it does not send enough medicine. The end result is that the clinic normally runs out of medicine each month.

There is a shortage of proper tools for testing common illnesses such as malaria. I was tested for malaria three times in the village, each time I was told that I tested negative. Finally I would get so sick that I would go into town and each time get retested there and test positive. There is also a shortage of trained staff. One person was hired to dress wounds and wash linens but because there were not enough people to see patients, so the wound-dresser was also seeing patients as well. The dresser has no training and on one of my trips to the clinic to get tested for malaria, I had to tell her to swab my finger with iodine before poking my finger. It was in the kit but she was not using it.

Also said to be needed were cattle for community use and a dam for watering animals. Many would like to see more schools and/or to have the school in Nkandanzovu upgraded. In Nkandanzovu a student can go up to grade 9, and then would have to go outside Nkandanzovu for further education. This is out of reach for many families who struggle to get money to go into Choma, or Kalomo if someone is ill. Also as previously mentioned, many students have to walk hours to reach school, so having more schools would help. The school in Nkandanzovu also could use more buildings to house the students that do attend. Three people would like a cell phone network. There are many people who have cell phones but there is no reception to use them in the village.
Also mentioned was relief food. The government has a limited amount of relief food to give each year and so it tries to target the areas suffering with hunger the most. In the past, Nkandanzovu has received relief food but did not in 2008. A shed for storing fertilizer and maize/cotton to sell would help people achieve lower prices for fertilizer and higher selling prices for their maize and cotton. Also mentioned were a dip tank, improved market area, agricultural area, bridge, and electricity. Two people mentioned support for orphans and widows as a development need. The SCTS addresses this as well as do some of the churches in the area who collect donations and distribute them, but the number of orphans and widows far exceeds the help these programs are and can give.

Overall, whether or not people mentioned boreholes, a program for discounted/more fertilizer and inputs, road, and more clinics/medicine/staff did not tie in with the social rankings I developed. It did not matter if someone had a low or high ranking, everyone wanted to see these three items happen in the area. There were a few items that stood out as only being mentioned by people in certain social rankings. Cattle for community use was mostly mentioned by those in the low and poor categories. Whereas the dam for livestock was mentioned by those in the high and middle categories. This is not particularly surprising because those in the high and middle categories have cattle and those in the low and poor categories do not (or they have only very few). A few other items only mentioned by those in the high and middle categories were cell phone network, dip tank, and agricultural expert. The only people to mention relief food were in the poor category.
Table 5.4 Development that is Wanted in the Area of Nkandanzovu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>SOCIAL RANK</th>
<th>TOTAL # OF INFORMANTS (n=75)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MIDDLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boreholes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program for discounted/more fertilizer and inputs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Clinics/medicine/staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle for Community Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dam (for livestock)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More schools/school upgraded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell phone network</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief food</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shed (for storing fertilizer and maize and cotton to sell)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for orphans and widows</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip Tank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased/improved market area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural expert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Informants were not limited to one response for type of development wanted
**Household Level**

At the household level almost two-thirds the informants mentioned cattle (see Table 5.3). Cattle are a source of wealth that can be sold at times of crisis and also can be used for plowing so therefore are a means by which people can plant more maize. Fertilizer and inputs were second, and were mentioned by one-third of people interviewed. These items also directly relate to household security because they help increase the amount of food that can be grown. Household animals such as chickens and goats were mentioned by fourteen people, mostly women. People can eat the eggs and both the chickens and goats as needed. They also can be sold at times of scarcity.

Farming implements are also considered to be very important. Even if you have cattle, you will need a plow for them to be of any use in the fields. A hand grinding mill helps women when they need to make *chibwantu* which is a filling beverage made with maize. This is an important food item that people can take with them into the fields and is very vital. The maize does not need to be ground as fine as mealie-meal which is needed for *nshima*. This was one of my favorite things to consume while in the village and I drank it long after I realized I was allergic to it. Four people who were the poorest in the village listed food as a desired item. By contrast, 4 people, including some of the wealthiest in the village, mentioned a vehicle as a desired item. Ox-carts help with transporting large amounts of maize.

Land was mentioned by 3 people. As more people have moved up into this area seeking land, and as children born here reach maturity and want a part of the family land, land will become more of a scarce resource. As of 2009, many people had land they had not cleared or land that they were not farming every year.
Table 5.5  Items Wanted at Household Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF ITEM</th>
<th>SOCIAL RANK</th>
<th>TOTAL # OF INFORMANTS (n=75)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MIDDLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilizer and inputs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household animals (chickens, goats)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming implements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand grinding mill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox-cart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean drinking water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammermill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking Utensils</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better house(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVDs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Informants were not limited to one response for type of item wanted
Clean drinking water was mentioned by three people, but I feel that most people consider clean water to be a village level issue instead of a household level issue. A hammermill was mentioned by a few people as well. Like a vehicle, stating a desire for a hammermill was an indicator of a higher level of wealth. A hammermill is needed to turn maize into mealie-meal and if one owns a hammermill then you can charge others a fee for each bucket of maize converted into flour. Also mentioned were cooking utensils, better houses, bedding, television, DVDs, satellite dish, medical treatments, and a bicycle.

In addition to the needs and desires expressed by the people living in the village, I also spoke to workers in the area (teachers, veterinary assistant, and clinic workers) to get their perspective of what was needed in their areas. The clinic workers said that there needed to be a way to communicate with the outside. Also, they want to build a mothers’ shelter at the clinic. The government has given cement and iron sheets for a shelter, but the community has to make bricks and get enough maize together to hire a builder. Because of the bad harvest in 2008, people were not able to give enough maize. Other issues raised were more equipment, money to feed patients, more staff, an incinerator for medical waste (at that time it was being put in the latrines), more medicine, and better salaries.

The veterinary assistant said that there needed to be a program to make drugs for animals cheaper. As well as a dip tank which would help reduce disease, transport and money for fuel, teaching aids, road improvements, and communication with the outside.

The teachers said what was needed was materials such as books, chalk, and pencils, road, bridges, house for boarders (some students are staying at the teachers’
houses), more boreholes, more classrooms to upgrade school, more staff, library, and laboratory.

**How to Accomplish Desired Development at the Village and Household Level**

When I asked specifically what was needed at the community and household level, I followed the questions by asking how those goals could be accomplished. Common explanations of how to accomplish community development often seemed to lack ideas of agency. People often said that NGOs had to come in, or the government needed to provide the things needed (see Table 5.4). There were many answers like, “NGOs need to help. The headmen should get together and talk to the chief to have him bring NGOs here.” Or, “There is nothing one can do on one’s own. Need organizations to help, it’s the only way to solve our problems.”

Those who said the government needed to step in and help, overwhelmingly, mentioned the government in the form of the area councilor and MP. “Need to have the area councilor and Member of Parliament work on it. They are supposed to bring in NGOs.” There were a few vague answers such as, “Need someone to bring those things here” Many people said that they need my help. This was normally preceded by a discussion about how nothing was working the way it was because of government corruption. Corruption as a hindrance to development in the area was mentioned frequently. “I realize the nation does not have a lot of money to bring these things. It would have to happen at the expense of other services in Zambia, and can only be done if the government was clever enough to let other countries give grants not loans to help out. Once money is given it has to be used for intended purpose and not swindled.”
Table 5.6 How to Accomplish Development at Community Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How to Accomplish Community Development</th>
<th>SOCIAL RANK</th>
<th>TOTAL # OF INFORMANTS (n=75)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MIDDLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to have the government help (area councilor, MP)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need NGOs to help</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need you (the author) to help</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to have the headman go to the chief</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor countries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better farming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need someone to bring those things here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (said there was nothing the community needed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinic workers need to approach the proper authorities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in community need to get together and agree to build through contributions and physical work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only one person responded that help with community development could be done by those in the village for themselves. He was discussing the need for a road and more structures at the clinic and school, he said, “People in community need to get together
and agree to build through contributions and physical work." Social ranking was not an indicator of response except for the answer “I do not know”. This was only a response from people who ranked in the low and poor categories.

When discussing what was needed at the village level, the top three answers that the majority of people agreed on were boreholes, access to discounted fertilizer/inputs, and a road. The answers on how to achieve these items showed a lack of agency. In total, 72% said there was a need for people or organizations from the outside to bring these into the community. By contrast 1% said village development could be achieved through better farming or coming together to build what was needed, 21% did not know or did not have an answer.

For the household level, there was more of an idea that these were items people could supply for themselves if they worked hard enough (see Table 5.5). Most responses dealt with the ability to grow more crops so there would be a surplus to sell. For most people this meant the need to borrow animals so eventually they could buy their own. “You can buy animals by selling crops – so if someone with animals could help farm, I would have more crops and extra money to buy animals.” Other people saw the need to borrow animals, but felt that this option was not available to them. “There is no way to get animals, unless relatives would loan animals until I could get my own but I do not have a relative like this.” Along the same lines, many said that selling farm produce was the answer but could never really help because of the vulnerability to the weather. “Through the sale of farm produce but I could only sell enough if there are good rains.” Some people felt that what they wanted at a household level was unattainable. “There is no way to get this because we have no money and no ways to get money.”
Table 5.7 How to Accomplish Development at Household Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How to Accomplish Household Development</th>
<th>SOCIAL RANK</th>
<th>TOTAL # OF INFORMANTS (n=75)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MIDDLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling surplus crops if possible</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need NGOs that could give animals or fertilizer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to borrow animals to grow more crops to sell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not possible</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Cotton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join women's clubs/cooperatives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People like you (the author)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look for land elsewhere</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying those things</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government should provide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell a goat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor countries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I decided to treat selling cotton as a separate category from selling surplus crops because it is important to be clear that this is a separate strategy. Everyone grows maize and everyone hopes to grow enough to have a surplus to sell. If one decides to grow cotton, it is 100% to sell and one has to make the gamble that selling cotton is going to bring in enough money to balance losing the amount of maize one could have grown on that land. This is a strategy that most people in the poor social ranking are not employing because they cannot spare the land. People in all three of the other categories (high, middle, low) seem to be growing cotton. Factors that seem to impact the decision to grow cotton are age (those who are elderly do not grow cotton), having enough land so some can be dedicated to cotton, and if they have seen others make money from growing cotton.

Respondents who said that there was a need for NGOs or the government to help did occur, but much less frequently. When respondents did bring up NGOs it was addressing the need for them to provide animals or fertilizer so they could grow more crops. Or, it was addressing the need for organizations that could help women specifically. “I cannot do much, my husband has the responsibility to make plans for the development of the household and if I made plans they wouldn’t work out because it wouldn’t be what my husband wanted. If an organization came here for women, I could make plans to develop the household instead of waiting for my husband’s failing ideas.”

Respondents in all the social rankings answered that they could accomplish household development by growing more crops and selling the surplus. In reality, this is a solution that, while everyone sees it as a desirable development goal, is only working for those in the high and to some extent middle social rankings. The people in these
categories can often access fertilizer that is needed in order to reduce their vulnerability to weather variations and they have the cattle that one needs to farm large sections of land. Because of these two factors, they often have a surplus to sell. Those in the low and poor category rarely access fertilizer which leaves them in a very vulnerable position if there are droughts or floods, and because they lack cattle they can only farm a small portion of land even if they have a larger portion. Often this results in the poor not having a surplus to sell and also not having enough food to feed their family throughout the year.

When discussing what was needed at the household level, the top two responses were cattle and fertilizer/inputs. In contrast to the response on how to achieve village level development, the answers for how to achieve household development showed agency; 65% of the respondents gave an answer that would not involve outside assistance for getting the desired household items (such as selling more surplus, borrowing relatives cattle to farm more land, selling cotton). By comparison only 18% said that they needed an NGO/government to provide the items and 17% did not know what the solution would be or said it could not be done.

Part of the difference in the responses to how community level versus household development could be accomplished may have to do with the history of development in the area. Community development has been something given as compensation for forced relocation because of the construction of the Kariba Dam. Household development on the other hand, even though there are NGOs and governmental agencies impacting development at this level, is something that has been incorporated into the prevalent national discourse of maize production as a business (see Sitko 2010) and as such is
viewed as something that can be accomplished at the household level with better farming and hence achieving a larger yield.

These responses I received to the question of how to accomplish the desired development at the village level are what ended up shaping this research. I was surprised that with the exception of one person, all the responses seemed to imply there was nothing that could be done within the community to make the improvements so many wanted to see. I began to realize that even though these were the responses I was receiving, there were things that people were actively doing to bring development into the area and reshape the structure of the village. These activities are what form the basis of the next chapter.
Chapter Six

STRATEGIES TO BRING DEVELOPMENT

“There is no other development. It is hard to come together for applications because it takes a senior headman to have everyone come together and agree what money would be used for. The senior headmen have more power to get stuff.” (Village Headman)

As shown in chapter five, when I was talking to people about development over and over they told me that there was nothing they could do to bring development about in the area. They either said that I needed to talk to organizations and have them come work here or they said that it was the responsibility of the area councilor, the MP, or the government. But paradoxically, when I looked around, I could see that people were actively trying to encourage development in the area in some significant ways. When coding the data it became clear that the strategies that people were employing can be sorted into five categories: voting, witchcraft, church membership, meetings, and applications to the government. I will discuss all of these in the present chapter.

Voting

During the time I was in the village, the president, Levy Mwanawasa died (August 2008) and there was a special election to vote for a new president. Because this was an election that had to be held outside of the regular election schedule, people who were not already registered to vote could not participate. Before a regularly scheduled election there is opportunity for those who were too young during the previous election to register and for those who had moved or lost their card to reregister. Because this was
not available during the special election, there were many in the village (and in the
country) who were not able to vote.

For those eligible to vote in the village, the voting strategy was twofold. One was
to vote for Hakainde Hichilema (HH) from the United Party for National Development
(UPND). This was the Tonga candidate and the idea was that if you are able to vote a
Tonga candidate into office he would look after the Tongans when president. As one
informant stated “I voted for the person who is in my tribe because he should have a
better idea of the needs of the people in Tongaland.”

**Photograph 6.1 Campaign Sign for HH**

The other strategy was to vote for Rupiah Banda from the MMD (Movement for
Multi-Party Democracy). It was considered highly likely that Banda would win because
he was the vice president under Mwanawasa. The idea was that if you could show a high voter turnout for the MMD then the party would not overlook the area later.

Voting for HH was the favored strategy, in the last election there were 1672 votes for the UPND and only 72 for the MMD. At a meeting to encourage people to vote for MMD in the village one man stated “it is important not to vote because someone is of the same tribe. The Tonga have tried to rule for 40 years and have failed, but it is better to vote for Banda who can implement programs.” This went along with many comments about HH not being able to win. “HH should not have run because he cannot win. He had a good chance when invited to be vice president for MMD (under Mwanawasa) but he turned it down so now there is no future for HH.” Another person stated, “HH is likely to come out 3rd in the elections.”

Another issue raised was the fact that it was a special election. “In 2011 anyone is free to vote for whoever they want but in this election let Banda finish Mwanawasa’s programs.” And, “It is obvious that Banda can lead the country because since Mwanawasa’s death he has been doing pretty well.”

Also a fear raised at the meeting was that if MMD did not win, it was unlikely that UPND would win but possible that the PF (Patriotic Front) would win and then all development projects already started would stop. “Opposition parties would stop any development projects already started and start new ones so it is best to vote for MMD.”

One person stated, “don’t vote for Sata (PF) – his symbol is a boat which is a sign that the money that should go to fertilizer will go to fishing.” Actually, there seemed to be some fear that Sata would win the election. “A vote for HH could give Sata the win. Sata
has the hat of the devil. He will kill all with HIV and go to war with neighboring countries because he thinks the soldiers have nothing to do.”

There were also concerns about corruption. “If any besides Banda is elected they will just go into office to steal and then accuse Mwanawasa of having stolen.” People also said during my interviews that they voted the way they did because of concerns over corruption. One person said they voted “For two reasons, one the person is still young and energetic and has fresh ideas and two; the person is wealthy so he doesn’t need to steal government money.” (See table 6.1).

### Table 6.1 Participation in Special Election

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of respondents Voting (n = 27)</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Thought person could bring development/fix problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Everyone else was voting for the person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Promise to abolish school fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Person is from the area, so will help the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promise to help with access to fertilizer and other inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not corrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wanted the person to carry out Mwanawasa’s vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of respondents not voting (n=48)</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Could not register/registered in a different location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lost national registration card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Was sick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Was not around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Child/spouse was sick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not worthwhile because all politicians are alike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Too young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Didn’t know how to vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Had chores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Could not physically get to voting location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I interviewed 75 potential voters about their participation in the special election. Overall, 27 people interviewed said they had voted compared to 48 who did not. Because
this was a special election and so many people could not vote, the decision to vote did not seem to tie in with social rank in the village. People from all rankings voted and people from all rankings did not vote. Age did play a factor. Those who were young could not register and those who were elderly did not walk to the voting center, which was at the school so the walk could range from 1 hour to 2 ½ hours depending on location of the homestead.

While voting for president was foremost on peoples’ minds during my fieldwork, there are other important elections in which people vote for specific political positions with the express goal of bringing development into the area. One such position is the Area Councilor. The Area Councilor is responsible for a ward (in this case Omba ward). Another position is Member of Parliament (MP). The MP is responsible for a Constituency (in this case Dundumwenzi Constituency). As part of the responsibilities for a Constituency, the MP is in charge of the CDF (Constituency Development Fund). As of 2011, each CDF had about $160,000 to use for development (Chileshe N.D.).

Many people told me that they felt that the money that was supposed to be used for development in the area was being misused. There was a football match held by the MP in 2008. The MP bought jerseys, and footballs, and slaughtered a cow. While this was a widely attended event, there were a lot of complaints afterwards that the MP used funds from the CDF that should have been used for something really needed in the area. Also, there are towns such as Kalomo in the Kalomo district. These towns are more populated than Nkandanzovu and easier to access because they are on the main road that runs from Lusaka to Livingstone. It is easier to develop projects and use CDF funds in these areas.
**Witchcraft**

This category is not so much about bringing in outside sources of development but more about trying to get more wealth, normally in the form of land and/or cattle. How to acquire more wealth is unquestionably the underlying development problem confronting people. This can be done using accusations of witchcraft, but also in what is alarmingly becoming more common -- trying to kill those accused of witchcraft.

Both men and women can get *zyelo* (spirits). If someone angers a woman who has *zyelo*, the spirit could urinate in a grain bin or put blood in food to do harm. Because of this, if a woman asks for food, people are reluctant to turn her down. However, women do not control the *zyelo*; they are basically passive vehicles for the spirits. Men are capable of actively control the *zyelo*. Men can use sorcery to harm enemies. Older men in particular are feared as sorcerers (Cliggett 2005). I know of one case in the Chikanta area where an older man used the fear of sorcery to refuse access to the borehole on his property.

Since relocation, especially in the overpopulated Lusitu area, sorcery and accusations of sorcery are on the rise. Active violence is also on the rise in Lusitu. There have been many deaths of animals due to poisoning with Rogon, a highly toxic rat poison containing the anti-coagulant Warfarin. There recently have been a few murders of people using Rogon as well (Cliggett 2005). This trend seems to be repeating in the Nkandanzovu region. There was a man who was killed right before I went to the village in 2008 and two more were shot while I was in the field. Many people whom I spoke to about the shootings said that others were jealous of the men who were shot and accused them of using witchcraft to amass wealth. It is believed that family members hired
outsiders to come in and shoot those accused of witchcraft. With the family member gone, the wealth would be dispersed. The men targeted were normally older and in the high social ranking, but one incident was of a younger man, in the middle social ranking but still with enough cattle and land to invoke jealousy.

There were other deaths that were blamed on witchcraft. One headman wanted to divorce his first wife. He claimed that some of her cattle were actually his and then the wife fell ill. His sons claimed that he was using witchcraft to make their mother sick and get the cattle. The case even went to the police in Choma and the headman had to give up some of his cattle. In November the headman was complaining about a mild sore throat and said his back hurt. He went to the clinic, but did not believe it to be serious. Two days later he died. On the day of his death he had a dispute with his son. The son had recently moved to a different village because of the dispute over cattle. When that son was here he was farming land that was his father’s, so when he shifted the land went back to his father. For some reason, he came back here and started planting. The father accused him of stealing land and they had harsh words. People think that the son used witchcraft against his father and that is why he died.

A member of one of the households that I classified as high in the social ranking of the village told me that someone had defecated in his field. This is supposed to cause destruction of the crops already planted and to prevent any other crops from growing in the field. He said that he was not too worried about that actually working, but was worried that someone would come and physically destroy his crops or steal from his fields during harvesting. He had recently caught a person stealing groundnuts from his homestead.
Overall, witchcraft seems to be a strategy employed by those who are of poor/low social ranking against those who are middle/high social ranking in order to gain more wealth or resources that could bring more wealth. As put forth by Elizabeth Colson (2006),

Only humans have *munyono*, which can be translated as envy or malice. This leads to a desire to harm those who have what one wants or who thwart one in some fashion. Only humans have ambition (*kuyanda kusumbuka*, “a desire to raise oneself”, or *kulitunta*, “to inflate oneself”) that makes them willing to harm others to advance their own interests. Both envy and ambition and the sources of much human suffering, but primacy is given to ambition: the desire to be preeminent and to have more than is obtainable through one’s own labour and the assistance of ancestors.

As those who are most vulnerable to crop failure during inclement weather become more entrenched in poverty because of successive years of poor harvests, even as those who are less vulnerable continue to amass more resources, the witchcraft problem is likely to grow.

**Church Membership**

Faith-based organizations (FBOs) are plentiful in Zambia. President Frederick Chiluba, Zambia’s second president who served from 1991 to 2002, declared Zambia to be a Christian nation. Missionaries have had a large impact as well. Church membership is popular among the Tonga in their 20s and 30s because of an emphasis on belief. As Elizabeth Colson (2006) wrote:

If the good things in life depend primarily upon an ability to believe, this empowers the young who otherwise are disadvantaged by a lack of capital, including the social capital obtained by training for the kids of jobs that underwrites better material conditions and through contacts that make for preference in employment. To believe that God will help one to acquire wealth and happiness requires no special skills or knowledge, no
accumulation of material or mental capital…In a time when young men and women have fewer opportunities than their elders once had and frequently have reason to feel exploited by their elders, a religion that emphasizes the freedom of the individual to achieve his or her own future has obvious attractions.

Church membership also has tangible benefits through FBOs. Although it did not seem to be widely known by local people, one organization that was working in the area, the George Henwood Foundation, is linked to the New Apostolic Church. While one does not have to be a member of the church to benefit from the foundation, knowledge of the organization did seem to be linked with church membership. Church membership crossed all social rankings but participation in a program such as the Henwood Foundation seemed to be limited to the high/middle social ranking. One reason for this is because the program was still fairly new in 2008 and leaders were chosen to help develop the program in the area. Those who were chosen tended to be people who were looked up to in the community, had a good education, good farming skills, and already served on other committees. The goal was as the program developed, it would spread to other farmers in the area.

World Hope is a Christian relief and development organization headquartered in Alexandria, Virginia. The organization is perhaps best known for its program Hope For Children, which works to help support children who have been orphaned or abandoned. The program helps to fund schooling, supplement nutrition, and cover basic medical supplies. In addition, World Hope helps to build wells in areas throughout Zambia (World Hope International 2012). A team from World Hope held a meeting in a neighboring area, Bulyambeba, in 2009, because they wanted to start a program for orphans in that area. This meeting was attended by a member of the development
committee. After the meeting the person from the development committee spoke to the World Hope officials about getting World Hope to work in Nkandanzovu as well. He was told that the pastor of the Wesleyan church needed to go to Kolomo and fill out an application at the office for World Hope to work in the area. The member of the development committee shared this with the pastor and the pastor seemed to be willing to do this when he found out what needed to be done. Right now, each member of the church pays k2,000 to help with orphans in the area.

Photograph 6.2 Person who was part of the Henwood Foundation
Meetings

When I asked how development could be brought to the area, meeting with officials and discussing the problems in the area was the number one response. There were many meetings throughout the time I was in the village and even more meetings that people went to but never happened, normally because those who were supposed to be organizing the meeting never showed. When I first arrived in the village, there was a meeting put on by the vice chairman of the development committee (in Bulyambeba) to discuss issues in the area.

Many issues were put forth by the vice chairman. “It is important to have a toilet in every household so no disease will spread from blowing dust. Most headmen are saying that people do not have toilets. If the headmen have organizations within their village such as women’s clubs, they can petition the central office (in Bulyambeba) for funds from the government.” This is another benefit of the women’s clubs. The members did not see much in the way of fertilizer and inputs, but there is the ability to petition for funds in a manner that people cannot accomplish as individuals.

The vice chairman also stated, “The CDF has been organized to fill in potholes. It is possible to get money from them if there is a bad road. For the road you must make applications, which cannot come from a lone person. The headmen have to come together. You also have to make applications for boreholes. For villages that did not make applications, I will bring forms next time, so you can get boreholes.” Filing applications forms is a strategy employed by the villages in my study. At first I was going to just focus on one village but I learned that the village where I was living and the neighboring village (these are considered to be separate villages but are spatially
intertwined) joined together to put in an application for a borehole residents of both villages could use. Nothing developed from this while I was in the village.

The vice chairman of the development committee also stated, “For development to happen, people have to band together, 5-10 headmen for a proposal. Development will not go to an individual. There have to be toilets at the market. It has to be clean. The headmen should organize a meeting about this. The council (Council for local government and housing) is very strict about this and will be checking.” This was a concern raised by people who held meetings, the chairman of the development committee and also the chief, but it did not seem to rank as an immediate concern for those living in the village. Also discussed was HIV, “It is important to encourage people to get tested for HIV, so they will know their status.” The clinic cannot conduct HIV testing but sometimes people come from Kalomo for testing.

The chief does not come to the village very often; he did visit in 2006 and also in August of 2008. At his visit in 2008, the chief complained about a lack of people who attended the meeting he held. So few people attended that they fit into one classroom. Many people did not attend because of a comment made by the chief in 2006. The chief thought that headmen were encouraging people not to attend. He said that it could be that headmen were not happy with his rule or they thought he was going to complain about people owing him money. The chief also said that maybe they were loyal to another chief. Apparently a person living here who was originally from the valley filled out paperwork to be subchief over all the people from the valley. The chief threatened to chase him out of the area but the people in this area do not really care for the person who wants to be subchief so there is not a real threat to the chief’s power.
The chief said that the meeting was about development and that he wanted views of what the people thought they needed and how they could work together to accomplish these things. The topics addressed by the chief included a series of issues such as: punishment for parents who marry off school going girls; punishment for parents who do not pay for children to go to school; hygiene at home and in the market; specific buildings for pigs because if they are allowed to move about they can spread disease; the need for a police post in Nkandanzovu; the need for every child to go to school; and the need for every married person to pay k20,000 for the PTA fund not just people with children. He also discouraged people from shifting out of the area, and promised there would be cell phone service in every area of his chiefdom. These topics put forth by the chief are development issues. In effect, the chief was defining what the development needs were in the area.

After listening to the issues addressed by the chief, the people in attendance were able to ask questions. This was the time that the people in attendance were able to tell the chief what they felt the development issues in the area were. Many people mentioned that there needed to be a bridge to go to school. As of 2009, children had to cross a river that floods in the rainy season. Two children drowned going to school a few years ago. A headman complained about clean water and the need for boreholes. The chief said this was not his task, but was the task of the area councilor and he said people needed to vote for a good councilor, although he did promise to sit with the councilor to discuss the issue. The area councilor lives in Bulyambeba. People also complained about the poor harvest and wanted the chief to bring in relief food. He said he would look into it and that he had people looking into how badly crops were damaged. The worst hit areas are
already receiving aid and he expected that this area would receive aid in November, December, or January (which never occurred). People complained about need for trained neighborhood watch people in order to combat crime before the police post could be set up. Chief said he would look into it. Overall, except for an agreement on needing some sort of way to combat crime, the items needed that were put forth by those living in the area and the list set down by the chief were not addressing the same wants/needs for the area.

Then there was a report about recent activity that fell under the Gwembe Tonga Development Project (GTDP). The village sold a total of 4 bulls and bought 6 bulls which are owned by the community as a whole. There was a meeting held to decide who would get the bulls. The chief did not say anything about this. I was told by more than one person that he had taken one bull originally even though they were not meant for him.

The meeting to promote the MMD would fall under this strategy as well. During the meeting the organizer said, “I want people to tell me their problems here so after I will tell Banda how many people voted for him here and maybe he will work on the problems.” This led to many people voicing opinions about what needed to be addressed in the village. Many people talked about the road, cell phone network, boreholes, and the bridge for getting to school. One person also said there needed to be ambulances at the clinic and television.

Lastly there is myself. I realized about halfway through my fieldwork that I was a strategy. People wanted to meet with me and to talk to me about what was needed in the village. Before I conducted an interview, I told people that I was not there to bring
development but wanted to get their opinions about development and the village. In a way though, I think people felt that there was a better chance of having results come from talking to me than from talking to the chief or MP. One reason for this could be because of the GTDP. Thayer Scudder was instrumental in having the Gwembe Tonga finally see some compensation for the construction of the Kariba Dam and also instrumental in having that compensation occur not just in the Gwembe Valley but also in the Nkandanzovu area (school, clinic, and cooperative). Also, surveys conducted by Lisa Cliggett have been used to encourage the construction of more boreholes in the area.

The strategy of meeting attendance is a bit of a mixed strategy. For some meetings such as the meeting with the vice chairman of the development committee and the meeting with the chief, it was mostly headman, and high/middle ranking individuals in attendance although anyone could attend if they wished. The headmen are supposed to attend and share any relevant information with the people in their village. Most of the others who were in attendance served on another relevant committee or had a topic they wished to discuss. The meeting for the MMD was more widely attended both by women and men of all social rankings. This seemed to correspond with which people voted, although it was raised during the meeting that when a party campaigned in the area during the last election, they brought chitenges (cloth) for everyone and many expected this during the meeting for the MMD.

Applications to Government/Organizations

Much of this has been addressed within the other categories but it is important to note that this is a strategy within itself. The headmen for two villages joined together to fill out an application for a borehole. This did not come to fruition while I was there, but
there are boreholes in the area that exist because headmen put in applications with the government. Having headmen come together to fill out applications has benefits. If the government approves the application for the borehole, there still needs to be money paid by the villages. If two villages apply together, they can share the cost.

Women’s clubs exist because of an application process and then they can apply through the development committee in Bulyambeba for funds from the government to support projects such as the construction of toilets. The CDF exists to fund development projects if people apply, although many people say that the money that is in the fund is misused and does not actually go to development projects.

In order to be a part of the SCTS, implemented by the Ministry of Community Development and Social Services (MCDSS) one needs to fill out an application. In this case, people trained by the SCTS went to people’s homesteads to help them fill out the applications and then took the applications to Kalomo.

This is what I saw people doing to encourage development while I was in Nkandanzovu. I also asked people how development could be brought into this area. Overwhelmingly, people said that they needed to go to meetings, find out what needed to be done and then do that. There is more agency in the process then I think people realize. As shown in chapter 5, most people felt there was nothing they could do to bring wanted development to the area. They said that they had to wait for an NGO or government official to bring what was needed. However, through voting, witchcraft, church membership, meetings, and applications to the government people are actively working to shape the area of Nkandanzovu.
CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

As a homogenizing force, the discourse of development seeks to turn the complexity of locally rooted social ills into neat bundles that are “legible” to the gaze of development experts and government bureaucrats and amenable to their proposed solutions. Yet, while explicit efforts to “develop” rural Zambia were initiated even before World War II, poverty and hunger continue to shape many aspects of rural Zambian life today (Sitko 2010).

An individual’s ability to influence the development process or to even have knowledge of existing developmental structure, i.e. the organizations working in a community, are influenced by social power, social standing, ability to access networks, and wealth. In addition, people with higher social power have more agency in the development process and are more actively utilizing strategies to bring in development.

This dissertation illustrated the strategies used by the Gwembe Tonga to access development opportunities in a rural village in the Southern Province of Zambia. These strategies were voting, witchcraft, church membership, attending meetings, and applications. In order to illustrate this, three issues were examined: how the Gwembe Tonga conceptualize development; what the Tonga feel is needed at the village and household level; and if the ability to effectively access development opportunities is linked to social power in the village structure. People generally described development as an improvement of their lives. The difference seemed to come out when people where describing an improvement at the village level or the household level. When discussing what was needed at the village level, the top three answers that the majority of people agreed on were boreholes, access to discounted fertilizer/inputs, and a road. The answers
on how to achieve these items showed a lack of agency. In total, 72% said there was a need for people or organizations from the outside to bring these into the community. By contrast 1% said village development could be achieved through better farming or coming together to build what was needed, 21% did not know or did not have an answer.

When discussing what was needed at the village level, the top two responses were cattle and fertilizer/inputs. In contrast to the response on how to achieve village level development, the answers for how to achieve household development showed agency; 65% of the respondents gave an answer that would not involve outside assistance for getting the desired household items (such as selling more surplus, borrowing relatives cattle to farm more land, selling cotton). By comparison only 18% said that they needed an NGO/government to provide the items and 17% did not know what the solution would be or said it could not be done.

The ability to effectively access development opportunities that are currently in the village is linked to social power/wealth in the village. The 4 households ranked in the high social power category knew on average 5 current development programs in the area and all stated that they had received benefits during the last 10 years. Of the 9 households ranked in the middle category, the households on average knew of 2 development programs only one household did not know of any development programs and only 2 households stated that they had not received benefits during the last 10 years. Once you move to the low category, the 6 households on average knew of 1 development program (most commonly the women’s club), 3 households did not receive any benefits and 1 household did not receive direct benefits but said that they benefit when others are able to have a better harvest. In the poor category, the 11 households knew on average 1
development program, 3 households did not know of any development programs, 5 households did not receive any benefits, and 2 households said they did not receive direct benefits. Two households were receiving funds from the SCTS.

The benefits that people said they received also connect with their social standing. Every household (except one that has no interest in fertilizer because of age) received fertilizer and inputs, 2 of the 4 households received bulls, 2 of the 4 households received goats, and 2 of the 4 households had members who were trained to help implement different development programs in the area. In the low and poor categories, the only benefits that people say they receive are from the school in terms of education for their children, medicine/services from the clinic, and money from SCTS which targets the most vulnerable. The development that can directly improve quantity of crop yield and ability to farm is going to those with the highest social ranking. That is, those that have the highest social standing are the people who are able to gain access to the programs best able to enhance their wealth and/or position in the society.

As for trying to bring in development through voting, witchcraft, church membership, meetings, and applications, this too is often influenced by social standing in the village. The incidents of witchcraft, accusations of witchcraft, and associated violence have a lot to do with jealousy and greed. Those men who were older, more established, and normally of high social rank often were accused of using witchcraft as the means for obtaining their possessions. Instead of solving this in a more traditional way (which involves a witchfinder and ultimately a redistribution of wealth) some have resorted to hiring people to shoot those who are thought to use witchcraft. Many of the
people thought to be behind these shootings are poorer relatives who feel they have a right to the land and/or cattle possessed by the older male relative.

Church membership and voting are true equalizers. They are open to everyone and people in all social categories voted and attended church. The organizations that are associated with the churches in the area, such as the Henwood Foundation, are a different story. In choosing people that they wanted to train as lead farmers, people who would be leaders in the foundation and would be able to help teach the techniques to others, they understandably choose people who were already looked up to in the community, had a good education, good farming skills, and already served on other committees. These people tended to be in the high and middle social categories. People in 3 homesteads mentioned the Henwood Foundation as part of the development already in the village and all 3 were trained as lead farmers in the program. Not one person in the low or poor category mentioned the program as even existing in the area.

The meetings held in Nkandanzovu while I was there, such as the meeting put on by the vice chairman of the development committee and the meeting held by the chief were only attended by the village headmen and a few other people of high standing in the community. This is part of the duties of a headman to attend meetings like these and then share the appropriate information with those living in the village, but at the same time, those who attend the meeting can set the agenda and raise issues that they feel are important. Those holding the meetings are also important. The vice chairman of the development committee and the chief have far more power than anyone in Nkandanzovu, even those of high standing. Before the floor is opened to those attending the meetings, those who are holding the meeting discuss the topics they feel are important. In this way
the vice chairman and the chief are trying to influence the direction of development in the area, highlighting sanitation, toilets, and even shelters for pigs. These are items that no one mentioned when I asked what development was needed in the village and homesteads. It is possible that they are a concern but by far not what the majority wish to focus on first.

Applications to the government or organizations are normally put forth by those with high standing in the village as well. The headmen are responsible for applications for boreholes. Pastors have to apply for organizations such as World Hope to come work in the area. In the case of a program such as the SCTS, a select few people in the area of Nkandanzovu were trained to select those individuals they felt were the most qualified for the program. Then they went to the homesteads and helped the individuals fill out the paperwork. If you have no education, no ability to fill out an application yourself, you will have to wait for others to do it.

The implication of this study is simple. The majority of people within the two villages are being left out of the development programs that best help to improve wealth and livelihood. Those that are best able to utilize programs such as the cooperative, women’s clubs, and the Henwood Foundation to enhance their wealth and ability to grow crops are those who already have a high standing in the village. Even the school which was mentioned as a benefit for many people in the low and poor category does not benefit everyone because many people cannot afford the fee to send their children to school. Somehow the development process needs to benefit the majority and not just the top few. This seems like a lofty goal because those who have high status tend to be the ones chosen to help implement programs and are the ones who attend meetings and fill out
applications which are the two main ways to influence the development process from within the village. Without change, those who are the most vulnerable to food shortages will continue to be at the mercy of inclement weather, continue to not grow enough food to feed their family throughout the year, and continue an unbreakable cycle of poverty.

**Implications**

As stated previously, this micro-level case study helps to explain why solutions to poverty are so problematic, and suggests that development efforts that focus on the creation of an equitable distribution of social power, instead of just focusing on infrastructure and production levels may be the most successful at reducing and hopefully ending poverty. Any development project that is put in place today will be working within a system where there are already existing inequities. Without addressing these inequities, only those who will see the most benefits will be those with the most social power/wealth in the project area. It does not have to be this way, in the tribal world where there are not central political authorities and political decision-making is truly democratic, there is more of an equitable distribution of resources. This is also the case in small nations that put in an effort to accomplish a fair distribution of income and/or wealth.

One much discussed development project currently operating in Africa in the Millennium Villages Project (MVP). The project was started in 2005/06 with the support of the Earth Institute (headed by Jeffery Sachs), Columbia University, and Millennium Promise. There are currently 14 clusters of villages in 10 countries. The interventions in the villages focus on five things: agriculture, health, education, infrastructure (such as water and sanitation), and business development. During the first five years the project
built infrastructure such as roads, water systems, wireless connectivity, and off-grid power. They also built schools and classrooms, trained teachers, built clinics, trained community-health workers, and increased crop production. Apparently all with the goal of environmental sustainability and gender equality. In the next five years, the MVP wants to reduce their monetary contributions to the villages and have local governments, NGOs, and the villages themselves to take over the financing. In 2010, a Millenium Village was launched in Zambia. The village Konkola is located in the copperbelt of Zambia (Millennium Villages 2011).

The MVP has analyzed improvements in 11 villages and the statistics look impressive, using averages from 11 villages. Malaria prevalence has decreased from 25% to 7%, children using insecticide-treated malaria nets increased from 7% to 51%, households with access to clean drinking water went from 17% to 68%, and maize yields increased from 1.3 metric tons per hectare to 4.6 metric ton per hectare (Millennium Villages 2011).

However glowing the Millennium Villages self-published reports are there appears to be some significant problems with the project. The MVP says that it is spending about $160 per person for the project but this seems to not include many off-site expenses, donations, and other costs. One estimate shows that cost are really around $6,000 per household and around $12,000 per household that has been “lifted out of poverty” (Oransky 2012). These costs are simple not sustainable if one wants to reach a wider scope of villages in Africa. If one takes into account just Kenya, to cover the entire country with Millennium Villages, aid would have to increase from $100 million to $1
billion and this is using official MVP figures not what others are actually saying is being spent (Rich 2007).

A question is raised as to whether the project itself is sustainable. Do people in the villages have agency in the decision making or are they passive recipients. If they are part of the decision making process, who is making the decisions? A few key people, the villagers collectively? In an early analysis by an outside economist one key sentence leads me to believe that decisions are being made by a few key people. It reads, “Here the dozen men and women who constitute the village’s agriculture committee make decisions key to the success of the whole project” (Rich 2007). Who are these twelve, how did they get chosen and are other voices listened to or do these twelve get to shape the face of development for the entire village? A little later, we find out there were elections for committees on agriculture, education, health, and a few other key areas. The people elected to these committees would be able to decide how the MVP money would be spent. It turns out that not very many people voted; those who did, did not know who to vote for; and people used witchcraft to scare people into voting for them. The results of the elections were that the most powerful clan in the village now heads every development committee (Rich 2007). A clear example that without taking equity and justice into account, the benefits of development will be more easily accessed by those with more power in the existing village structure.

Another key problem is the development philosophy behind the Development Villages. Jeffery Sachs is a key proponent of the MVP, in Sachs major economic writing (2005a, 2005b) he argues that economic growth is good for the poor and as Sachs is the brain behind the MVP, it is its philosophy as well. Sachs (2005a) argues that the main
problem with aid in Africa is that there has never been enough to make a significant
difference and what has been given has been focused in the wrong area being directed
into food aid and humanitarian relief instead of getting to the root cause of poverty. What
would help the average farmer in Africa would be capital to be able to invest in their farm
in order to be able grow a surplus to sell and therefore start earning money. In the
publication from the MVP looking at the next five year stage for the project there is a
section entitled “Scaling Up & Sustaining Growth” (Millennium Villages 2011). But as
Bodley (1999) states, “Growth also leads to national and global wealth inequality,
threatening the viability of domestic-scale cultures and communities even in the most
remote locations.” The MVP seems to be throwing a lot of money at the problem of
poverty, but is not addressing the already existing power structure. The averages used to
show how the villages have been lifted out of poverty hide inequality in how the benefits
are distributed. Indeed as my research shows, if social equity is not taken into
consideration, the people with the most social power will be the ones most likely to be
able to access the benefits from a development project such as MVP and the most
vulnerable in the society will continue to not be able to break the cycle of poverty.

Another example of development, Basilwizi Trust, is impacting the lives of the
Tonga in the Zambezi Valley. The project began in 2002 specifically targets
communities that were displaced by the construction of the Kariba Dam in 1957. In the
beginning Basilwizi targeted Hwange, Binga, Gokwe north, and Nyaminyami districts of
Zimbabwe but expand in 2010 to include the district of Sinazongwe in the Gwembe
Valley of Zambia (Basilwizi Trust 2011). Basilwizi is lead by an 11 member Board of
Trustees. The Board is made up of traditional leaders, community activists, clergy, and
development/legal professionals. Two of the trustees are women and all are from the Zambezi Valley (Basilwizi Trust 2010). One concern is that the voices of the board members may have more weight than those of the people living in the villages when it comes to shaping the development process, especially with two of the members of the Board being chiefs.

Basilwizi’s mission statement is focused on building the capacity of the Tonga and Korekore communities –men, women, young and old, able and disabled – with skills, knowledge required to enhance their self reliance and self determination through community empowerment and sustainable livelihoods strategies in order to improve the conditions under which they live [Basilwizi Trust 2011]

This seems to imply that Basilwizi is taking into account the creation of an equitable distribution of social power. Indeed, the founder of Basilwizi, Dickson Mundia, said,

Sustainable livelihoods, HIV and AIDS, inclusion of marginalised groups in the development process and outcomes, gender equity and education within the context of rights-based approaches are central to the realisation of a poverty free Zambezi valley. Improved community organisation, participation and involvement in decision-making processes are crucial premises for building sustainable well-being and resilience to poverty and disaster risks in the Zambezi valley. [Basilwizi Trust 2010]

Basilwizi works within four main areas: advocacy; education and culture support; health (with a focus on HIV and AIDS); and livelihoods. These areas were selected because they were believed to be essential in tackling the underlying causes of poverty (Basilwizi Trust 2010).

In addition, a main goal is to have the beneficiaries be the primary agents for any developmental change. This is a goal in order to have development be participatory and to involve equitable distribution instead of just economic growth through the improvement of peoples’ capabilities and broadening their choices. One way this is done
is through community meetings, although in Basilwizi documents it is stated that there has been a problem having everyone attend meetings (especially those who are disabled) which leads to some people having more of a voice than others (Basilwizi Trust 2010). In other words, Basilwizi would like the recipients of the program to be the catalyst for change and any benefits from the development should be shared equally.

In addition to equity within a community, Basilwizi also tries to address advocacy so the communities will have more of a voice within the government structure. Community members have been trained in skills such as leadership and communication, advocacy and lobbying, conflict resolution and community based monitoring and evaluation. This has encouraged community members to not only discuss what is needed development with Basilwizi but to join together and address their needs to governmental authorities. This has been effective with different communities realizing the construction of a school, bridge, and the development of a stock theft task force in 2011 (Basilwizi Trust 2011).

There are a lot of problems that Basilwizi is facing. The Trust has received funding from the Austrian Development Agency, UNICEF, Hivos, the Firelight Foundation, the European Union, DFID Civil Society Challenge Fund, Action Aid International Zimbabwe, Jesuits Orphans Trust, and the Austria-Zimbabwe Friendship Association but in 2011 the funding based dwindled in part due to the closing of the Austrian Embassy in Harare because of austerity measures in Austria and Basilwizi has had to operate on a shoestring budget, had to cut staff, and has been unable to fund some programs (Basilwizi Trust 2010).
Most other problems stem from lack of funding, especially as more communities wish to be part of Basilwizi. There is inadequate staff and lack of monitoring and evaluation. This also leads to the inability to work in more remote areas and no resources to focus on improving roads or communication networks to be able to access more areas. Not to mention Zimbabwe’s unstable political and economic situation (Basilwizi Trust 2010).

In general, the focus on equity and advocacy sounds promising but there are many hurdles in making Basilwizi a well-functioning and effective program in Zimbabwe and Zambia. There also needs to be outside evaluation to show if the claims Basilwizi are making about fair distribution of benefits are true.

This highlights the difference between programs such as the Millennium Villages that get widespread media attention and large scale funding from numerous sources (see appendix V) but without a plan for equity that will not be able to ensure the end of poverty for most in their villages in the long-term versus a program that has equality as a top priority but lacks what it needs to be truly effective.

The micro-level case study of two villages in Zambia shows why most development programs do not succeed in having wide-spread benefits. Most development work looks at progress in terms of averages, per-capita, or national GDP figures which tend to hide the disproportionate success of the programs. At the village level, people can be disadvantaged by global and national structures but there are also local, village level inequities that keep people from realizing development benefits. The solution needs to be one where the focus is on equitable wealth distribution so all people would have the resources they need to have a successful life and break free of the cycle
of vulnerability. This however, is not the development strategy that is receiving the most support.
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APPENDIX I

ACRONYMS

ADD – Alliance for Democracy and Development
BNB – Basic Needs Basket
BSAC – British South Africa Company
CDF – Constituency Development Fund
CONASA – Community-based Natural Resources and Sustainable Agriculture
CSPR – Civil Society for Poverty Reduction
CUSA Zambia – Credit Union and Savings Association of Zambia
DPT – Diphtheria, Pertussis, Tetanus
EISA – Electoral Institute for the Sustainability of Democracy of Africa
FBOs – Faith-Based Organizations
FDD – Forum for Democracy and Development
FRA – Food Reserve Agency
FSP – Fertilizer Support Program
GDP – Gross Domestic Product
GTDP – Gwembe Tonga Development Project
GTRP – Gwembe Tonga Research Project
GTZ – German Technical Assistance to Zambia
HH – Hakainde Hichilema
HP – Heritage Party
HIV – Human Immunodeficiency Virus
IMF – International Monetary Fund
JCTR – Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflection
MMD – Movement for Multiparty Democracy
MPI – Multidimensional Poverty Index
MVP – Millennium Village Project
NAC – New Apostolic Church International
NAMboard – National Agricultural Marketing Board
NAREP – National Restoration Party
NGO – Non-Governmental Organization
NMPP – National Movement for Progress Party
NSF – National Science Foundation
PF – Patriotic Front
SAPs – Structural Adjustment Policies
SDA – Seventh Day Adventist
SMAG – Safe Motherhood Action Groups
SNDP – Sixth National Development Plan
TB – Tuberculosis
TFEP – Task Force on Economic Plunder
UNICEF – United Nations Children’s Fund
UNIP – United National Independence Party
UPND – United Party for National Development
UPP – United Progressive Party
USAID – United States Agency for International Development
VAG – Village Area Group

WHO – World Health Organization

ZAWA – Zambian Wildlife Authority

ZED – Zambians for Empowerment and Development

ZESCO – Zambia Electricity Corporation

ZNFU – Zambia National Farmers Union
APPENDIX II

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1) How many children do you have?
2) How old is the oldest?
3) How old is the youngest?
4) Do they all live here?
5) Do you have any children at school in town?
6) Do you have others staying here?
7) What grade did you finish?
8) When did you move here?
9) Where did you move from?
10) Did you have relatives here already?
11) What do you grow?
12) How many hectares do you have?
13) How many hectares do you farm?
14) How many hectares are maize and how many are cotton? (only asked this if they mentioned growing cotton)
15) Do you have enough food for the year?
16) Did you purchase fertilizer for this year?
17) Last year?
18) If you go to the clinic would you find medicine?
19) Could you go to Choma if needed?
20) What is development?

21) What development is in the area?

22) Have you seen any benefits from development in the last 10 years?

23) Are you a member of the cooperative/women’s club?

24) Why not? (only asked if question was no)

25) Did you receive any benefits from cooperative/women’s club (asked if answer to 23 was yes)

26) What is needed in the village?

27) How can that be achieved?

28) What is needed in the household?

29) How can that be achieved?

30) Do you serve on any committees?

31) Who has the most power in the village?

32) Did you vote?

33) Why not? (if answer was no)

34) Why did you vote for the person you voted for? (if answer was yes – I had to reassure most people that I didn’t want to know who they voted for, just why they voted)
APPENDIX III

PRIORITY SECTORS FOR INVESTMENT

1. Floriculture fresh flowers and dried flowers
2. Horticulture fresh and dried vegetables
3. Processed foods wheat flour other processed foods
4. Beverages and stimulants
   4.1. Tea and tea products
   4.2. Coffee and coffee products
5. Production and the processing of the following products in the textile sector
   5.1. Cotton
   5.2. Cotton yarn
   5.3. Fabric
   5.4. Garments
6. Manufacturing of the following engineering products
   6.1. Copper products
   6.2. Iron ore and steel
   6.3. Cobalt
   6.4. Other engineering products
7. Beneficiation of phosphates and any other related material into fertilizer
8. Beneficiation of rock materials into cement
9. Production and processing of raw timber into wood products
10. Production and processing of the following products in the leather sector:
    10.1. Cattle hides
    10.2. Crust leather
    10.3. Leather products
11. Power stations and generation of power
    11.1. Building of mini-hydro power stations
    11.2. Building of thermal, hydro and solar power stations
    11.3. Operation of thermal, hydro and solar power stations and the generation of thermal, hydro and solar power
12. Education and skills training
13. Information and Communication Technology (ICT)
    13.1. Development of computer software
    13.2. Assembly/manufacture of ICT equipment
14. Health
    14.1. Manufacture of pharmaceutical products;
    14.2. Repair and maintenance of medical equipment;
    14.3. Provision of laundry services to medical institutions;
    14.4. Ambulance services;
    14.5. Medical laboratory services;
    14.6. Diagnostic services; and
    14.7. Other medical services.
15. Education and skills training
16. Manufacture of:
   16.1. Machinery & machinery components
   16.2. Iron & steel products
   16.3. Electrical and electronic products & components & parts thereof;
   16.4. Chemicals & petrochemicals
   16.5. Pharmaceutical & related products
   16.6. Wood & wood products
   16.7. Palm oil & their derivatives
   16.8. Pulp, paper & paper board
   16.9. Textile & textile products
   16.10. Transport equipment, component & accessories
   16.11. Clay-based, sand-based & other non-metallic mineral products
   16.13. Professional medical, scientific, & measuring devices/parts
   16.15. Leather & leather products
   16.16. Packaging & printing materials
   16.17. Fertilizer
   16.18. Cement

17. Tourism

18. Processing of:
   18.1. agricultural products
   18.2. forest products
   18.3. non-ferrous metals & their products
   18.4. gemstones

Source (Zambia Development Agency 2011)
APPENDIX IV

BASIC NEEDS BASKET FOR LIBALA AREA, KAZUNGULA DISTRICT
Basic Food Items for Average Family of Seven in Libala Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Food Needs (Jan-March Ideal)</th>
<th>Average Actual Food Consumed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize grain</td>
<td>100Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassava tubers</td>
<td>20Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>300g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>5Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet potatoes</td>
<td>2Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh fish</td>
<td>5Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry fish</td>
<td>1Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>5Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundnuts</td>
<td>5Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomatoes</td>
<td>10Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onions</td>
<td>2Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape (kale)</td>
<td>4Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassava leaves</td>
<td>1Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumpkin leaves</td>
<td>3Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>2Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okra</td>
<td>2Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>1Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking oil</td>
<td>2 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Maize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chibwantu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goat meat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oranges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese cabbage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Calories/person/day</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Protein/person/day</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Calcium/person/day</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Iron/person/day</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Vit A/person/day</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td>750 mls x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matches</td>
<td>5 boxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath Soap</td>
<td>4 tablets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Soap</td>
<td>2 x 400g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaseline</td>
<td>1 x 500mls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotion</td>
<td>1 x 400mls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milling</td>
<td>100Kgs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>74,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (JCTR 2011)
APPENDIX V

FUNDING SOURCES FOR MILLENIUM VILLAGE PROJECT

1) AccessBio
2) Adessium Foundation
3) Agrium Inc.
4) Aid for Africa
5) Runa N. Alam
6) Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA)
7) Alston & Bird LLP
8) Amgen Inc.
9) Anonymous
10) Apax Foundation
11) Atlas Foundation
12) Alan and Jane Batkin
13) Bead for Life
14) Beardwood
15) Goetz Bechtolsheimer
16) Becton, Dickinson & Company
17) Bennett College
18) Randy Best and Nancy Kemper Best
19) Morton K. and Jane Blaustein Foundation
20) Blossom Foundation
21) Andrew Boszhardt
22) Charles and Elizabeth Bowlus
23) Brightline iTV
24) Nina Brink Storms and Karen Brink
25) BuildOn
26) Doug and Theresa Cahill
27) Cairo to Capetown
28) CareerBuilder.com
29) Carleton University
30) The Case Foundation
31) CCMP Capital Advisors
32) Matthew and Lisa Chanoff
33) Gary Cohen
34) Dolores Connolly and Daniel Casey
35) Jon S. Corzine Foundation
36) Creative Artists Agency
37) Andrew Cunagin/Rinehart Capital Partners LLC
38) Curaterra Foundation
39) DATA
40) Design 21
41) Clarence and Anne Dillon Dunwalke Trust
42) Do Something
43) G. Volkert H. Doeksen
44) J.W. Doeksen
45) Renee and Bob Drake
46) Earth Institute, Columbia University
47) EDUN
48) Eliminate Poverty Now
49) ENI
50) Ericsson
51) Eureko Achmea Foundation
52) Facebook Causes
53) FEED Projects
54) FIND
55) Finnegan Family Foundation
56) George and Patricia Ann Fisher Family Foundation
57) The John and Christine Fitzgibbons Foundation
58) Jeffrey and Sheryl Flug
59) Mimi Frankel
60) Peter and Marya Frankel
61) FreeAssociation
62) General Electric
63) General Service Foundation
64) Glaser Progress Foundation
65) GlaxoSmithKline
66) Global Health Corps
67) The globalislocal Fund
68) The Goldhirsh Foundation
69) Goldman Sachs Gives
70) Good Shepherd Catholic Church
71) GoodAdds
72) Government of Ethiopia
73) Government of Finland
74) Government of Ghana
75) Government of Ireland
76) Government of Japan
77) Government of Kenya
78) Government of Malawi
79) Government of Mali
80) Government of Nigeria
81) Government of Norway
82) Government of Rwanda
83) Government of Senegal
84) Government of Tanzania
85) Government of Uganda
86) Patricia P. Grace
87) Harold Grinspoon Foundation
88) William and Sue Gross Foundation
89) Gyeongsangbuk-do Province, Republic of Korea
90) H2O Africa
91) Hard Rock Café International
92) William and Flora Hewlett Foundation
93) Darko Horvat
94) Howcast
95) The Hunger Site/GreaterGood.org
96) International Center for Tropical Agriculture
97) Christoph Janz
98) JM Eagle
99) Jumo
100) Leonard and Tobee Kaplan
101) Kidz-Med
102) The Kingdom Foundation
103) Phillip Knight
104) Dan Knox
105) Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA)
106) KPMG Member Firms
107) L’Uomo Vogue / Condé Nast Italia
108) Terri Lecamp / Plainfield Asset Management, LLC
109) John Legend’s Show Me Campaign
110) The Lemmon Foundation
111) The Lenfest Foundation
112) Lenovo
113) Stephen Lewis Foundation
114) The Libra Foundation
115) Doron Livnat
116) John M. Lloyd Foundation
117) MAC Global Foundation
118) John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
119) Marjorie Magner
120) The MAIA Foundation
121) A.L. Mailman Family Foundation
122) Shigeki Makino
123) The Martin Family Foundation
124) MCJ Amelior Foundation
125) Lizanne and John Megrue, Jr.
126) The Merck Company Foundation
127) Merry Year International
128) Millennium Campus Network
129) Millennium Development Ethiopia
130) Millennium Promise
131) Millennium Promise Japan
132) Millennium Promise Netherlands
133) Millennium Promise UK
134) Sara Miller McCune
135) The Countess Moira Charitable Foundation
136) The Prince Albert II of Monaco Foundation
137) Monsanto
138) J. Todd Morley
139) The Mosaic Company
140) National Dance Institute
141) National Health Services
142) The Nduna Foundation
143) Nestlé
144) The Neuberger Berman Foundation
145) Nika Water
146) Nike Foundation
147) Christopher Norton
148) Novartis Foundation for Sustainable Development
149) Nyawara Collaborative
150) OmniPeace
151) ONEXONE Foundation
152) Only the Brave Foundation
153) Open Society Foundations
154) Opportunity International
155) David and Lucille Packard Foundation
156) Cheryl Palm and Pedro Sanchez
157) Betsee Parker
158) PepsiCo Foundation
159) Julia Pershan and Jonathan Cohen
160) Pfizer
161) Earl N. Phillips, Jr. Family Foundation
162) Playing for Good
163) Bonnie Potter
164) Premiere
165) Presbyterian Church of Basking Ridge
166) The Principality of Monaco
167) Proctor & Gamble
168) The Ceil & Michael Pulitzer Foundation
169) Kirk Radke
170) Raising Malawi
171) RAPJ Foundation
172) RESULTS
173) Right to Play
174) Pilar and Stephen Robert / Source of Hope Foundation
175) Rockefeller Foundation
Edward and Suzanne Rogers
Charlotte and Henry Rosenberger
Albert B. Sabin Vaccine Institute
Sanofi Aventis
Santa Maria Foundation
SapientNitro
The Schaden Family
Shaklee
Sight and Life
Sime Darby Berhad
The Simmons Family Foundation
Harold C. Simmons
Sister Fund
Mrs. Barbara and Ambassador Clifford
M. Sobel
Soros Economic Development Fund
Alan and Mary Spitzer / Freeman Kelly Family Fund
Square One Foundation
St. John the Evangelist Church
St. Mark’s Episcopal Church
The Stillwater Foundation
Edward M. Stuart / Stuart Family Fund
Sumitomo Chemical
Swiss Lung Foundation
TABLE FOR TWO International
Theory
ThinkMTV
Tides Foundation
Time Warner, Inc. in memory of
Mr. Robert Joffe
Angelo Tomedi
Tommy Hilfiger Corporate Foundation
Mary Louise Turner
Tyson Foods
UBI Energy & Petroleum Ghana, Ltd.
UNAIDS
UNFPA
UNICEF
UNOPS
UN Trust Fund for Human Security
UNWTO ST-EP Foundation
Undercurrent
Unilever
The United Nations Foundation
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
221) University of Notre Dame
222) USA Pro Cycling Challenge
223) Vale
224) Hugo van der Goes
225) Coen and Wendy van Oostrom
226) Vestergaard
227) Vivek Vishwanathan
228) Vision of Humanity
229) Walker Family Foundation
230) Waseda Prep School
231) Roger Waters and Laura Durning
232) Robert Willumstad
233) Gary L. Wilson / Wilson Family Foundation
234) World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF)
235) World Bank
236) World Food Programme
237) Yara Foundation
238) Amre and Caroline Youness
239) Zain/Airtel
240) The Michael Zamkow and Sue Berman
       Foundation

Source (Millennium Villages 2011)